

DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.
Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175)
lwlee@diversitylaw.com
Simon L. Yang (State Bar No. 260286)
sly@diversitylaw.com
515 South Figueroa Street, Suite 1250
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 488-6555
Facsimile (213) 488-6554

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF TULARE

RODOLFO TELLEZ, as an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated, and as a
private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUN VALLEY RAISINS, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. VCU284414

[Assigned to Hon. Nathan Ide]

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Date: August 8, 2022
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Department: 2

Complaint Filed: September 23, 2020

1 Plaintiff's motion for an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement was
2 filed with the Court on July 15, 2022, and a hearing was held before this Court on August 8, 2022.
3 Simon L. Yang of Diversity Law Group, P.C. appeared on behalf of Plaintiff, Rodolfo Terllez, and
4 Justin T. Campagne of Campagne & Campagne, a Professional Corporation appeared for Defendant,
5 Sun Valley Raisins, Inc.

6 **I. RECITALS**

7 1. On or about September 4, 2020, Plaintiff notified Defendant and the Labor and
8 Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") that Defendant allegedly fails to furnish employees with
9 wage statements that accurately show Defendant's name or show its address at all. On that basis, on
10 September 23, 2020, Plaintiff initiated this class action on behalf of all current and former employees in
11 California who were issued wage statements. The initial complaint alleged that Defendant's failure to
12 furnish wage statements that accurately show Defendant's name or to show its address at all violates
13 Labor Code section 226(a).

14 2. On June 15, 2022, the Parties attended a mandatory settlement conference. The Parties
15 were able to negotiate the settlement terms in the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement (the
16 "Agreement").

17 **II. FINDINGS**

18 3. The Court conditionally certifies the following Class: all current and former employees of
19 Defendant in the State of California, who were furnished wage statements showing "SVR" instead of
20 Sun Valley Raisins, Inc. at any time from September 23, 2019, through July 14, 2022.

21 4. The Court hereby approves the terms and conditions provided for in the Agreement. The
22 Court finds that on a preliminary basis the Agreement falls within the range of reasonableness of a
23 settlement and appears to be presumptively valid, subject to any objections that may be raised at the
24 final fairness hearing and subject to final approval by the Court. It appears to the Court on a preliminary
25 basis that the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable as to all potential Class Members when
26 balanced against the uncertain outcome of further litigation relating to liability and damages issues. It
27 also appears that investigation, research, and proceedings have been conducted so that counsel for the
28 Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It appears to the Court that settlement

1 at this time will avoid substantial additional costs by all Parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that
2 would be presented by the further prosecution of the action. It also appears that settlement has been
3 reached as a result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive arms-length negotiations.

4 **III. ORDERS**

5 After considering the papers and evidence, arguments of counsel, and all other matters presented
6 to the Court, and having taken the matter under submission, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** as follows:

7 5. The Court grants preliminary approval of the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement
8 (“Agreement”) submitted by the Parties. The Agreement appears to be fair, adequate, and reasonable to
9 the Class.

10 6. The Court appoints and designates: (a) Plaintiff, Rodolfo Tellez, as Class Representative,
11 and (b) Larry W. Lee and Simon L. Yang of Diversity Law Group, P.C. as Class Counsel for the Class.
12 Class Counsel is authorized to act on behalf of the Class with respect to all acts or consents required by,
13 or which may be given, pursuant to the Agreement, and such other acts reasonably necessary to finalize
14 the Agreement and its terms. Any Class Member may enter an appearance through his or her own
15 counsel at such Class Member’s own expense. Any Class Member who does not enter an appearance or
16 appear on his or her own behalf will be represented by Class Counsel.

17 7. A final fairness hearing on the question of whether the proposed Agreement, the
18 allocation of payments to Class Members, attorneys’ fees and costs to Class Counsel, the payment to the
19 Labor Workforce & Development Agency, and the Class Representative Award should be finally
20 approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to the members of the Class is set for
21 _____, 2022, at _____ in this Court.

22 8. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the Notice of Class Action Settlement
23 (“Class Notice”), which is attached as Exhibit A to the Agreement and this Order. The Court finds that
24 distribution of the Class Notice to Class Members substantially in the manner and form set forth in the
25 Agreement and this Order meets the requirements of due process and shall constitute due and sufficient
26 notice to all parties entitled thereto.

1 9. The Court appoints and designates Phoenix Settlement Administrators as the
2 Administrator. The Court hereby directs the Administrator to provide the approved Class Notice to Class
3 Members using the procedures set forth in the Agreement.

4 10. Any Class Member may choose to opt out of and be excluded from the settlement as
5 provided in the Agreement and Notice Packet and by following the instructions for requesting exclusion.
6 Any person who timely and properly opts out of the settlement will not be bound by the Agreement or
7 have any right to object, appeal, or comment thereon. Any request for exclusion must be in writing and
8 signed by each such Class Member opting out and must otherwise comply with the requirements
9 delineated in the Notice Packet. Class Members who have not requested exclusion by submitting a valid
10 and timely request for exclusion shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Agreement, and
11 Judgment.

12 11. Any Class Member may object to the Agreement or express his or her views regarding
13 the Agreement. Any Class Member may present evidence and file briefs or other papers relevant to the
14 issues to be heard and determined by the Court as provided in the Notice Packet.

15 12. A Motion for Final Approval shall be filed by the Class Representatives no later than
16 sixteen (16) court days before the final fairness hearing.

17 13. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the final fairness hearing
18 and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to the Class. The Court retains
19 jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the Agreement.

20 14. Should for whatever reason final approval is not granted, the fact that the Parties were
21 willing to stipulate to certification of a class as part of the settlement shall have no bearing on the issue
22 of whether a class should be certified in a non-settlement context.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 DATED: _____, 2022

THE HONORABLE NATHAN IDE