

DANIEL F. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 251488
daniel@gaineslawfirm.com
ALEX P. KATOFISKY, ESQ. SBN 202754
alex@gaineslawfirm.com
EVAN S. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 287668
evan@gaineslawfirm.com
GAINES & GAINES, APLC
4550 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Suite 100
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: (818) 703-8985
Facsimile: (818) 703-8984

Attorneys for Plaintiff Samuel Placencia
and Proposed Class Counsel

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
06/13/2022

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: J. Alfaro Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – POMONA COURTHOUSE SOUTH

SAMUEL PLACENSIA, on behalf of
himself and all “aggrieved employees”
pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ARM AND J CORPORATION, a
California corporation, dba PUENTE
HILLS CHRYSLER DODGE JEEP RAM,
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO: 21PSCV00211

Assigned to the Hon. Peter A. Hernandez, Dept. O

CLASS ACTION

**[PROPOSED] ORDER AND JUDGMENT
GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

DATE: June 13, 2022

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

DEPT.: O

**Reservation #: Court scheduled per Minute
Order on March 8, 2022**

Action Filed: March 12, 2021

1 Plaintiff's Motion for an Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement came
2 before this Court on June 13, 2022. The above-captioned Action is a class action lawsuit brought
3 by Plaintiff Samuel Placensia ("Plaintiff" or "Placensia") against Defendant Arm and J
4 Corporation, a California corporation, dba Puente Hills Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram ("Defendant")
5 (all together, the "Parties"). Plaintiff alleges, on behalf of a class of certain of Defendant's current
6 and former employees, that Defendant failed to pay all wages, failed to provide meal and rest
7 periods or compensation in lieu thereof, failed to reimburse business expenses, failed to pay wages
8 due timely upon separation of employment, and failed to comply with itemized wage statement
9 provisions. Defendant denies any and all alleged wrongdoing and denies any liability to Plaintiff
10 or to members of the Class. Defendant contends that that it has complied at all times with California
11 law, including the California Labor Code, the Industrial Commission Wage Orders, and the
12 California Business and Professions Code.

13 On March 8, 2022, this Court entered an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of
14 Settlement, resulting in certification of the following provisional Settlement Class: all non-exempt
15 employees employed by Defendant in California at any time between March 12, 2017 and October
16 31, 2021.

17 That Preliminary Approval Order further directed the Parties to provide Notice to the Class,
18 which informed absent class members of: (a) the proposed Settlement, and the Settlement's key
19 terms; (b) the date, time and location of the Final Approval Hearing; (c) the right of any Class
20 Member to object to the proposed Settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to exercise that
21 right; (d) the right of any Class Member to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and
22 an explanation of the procedures to exercise that right; and (e) an explanation of the procedures for
23 Class Members to participate in the proposed settlement.

24 The Court, upon Notice having been given as required in the Preliminary Approval Order,
25 and having considered the Settlement Agreement and Release of Claims (the "Settlement"), as well
26 as all papers filed, hereby ORDERS, ADJUDGES AND DECREES AS FOLLOWS:

27 \\
28

1 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action and over all Parties
2 to the Action, including all members of the Settlement Class.

3 2. The Court finds that the Settlement Class is properly certified for settlement
4 purposes only.

5 3. The Notice provided to the Settlement Class conforms with the requirements of
6 California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Civil Code section 1781, California
7 Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, and any other
8 applicable law, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, by providing
9 individual notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and by
10 providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein to the
11 Class Members. The notice fully satisfied the requirements of due process.

12 4. The Court finds the settlement was entered into in good faith, that the settlement is
13 fair, reasonable and adequate, and that the settlement satisfies the standards and applicable
14 requirements for final approval of this class action settlement under California law, including the
15 provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, Rule
16 3.769. The Court approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$366,788.

17 5. Zero (0) Class Members have objected to the terms of the Settlement.

18 6. Four (4) Class Members have requested exclusion from the Settlement. Those Class
19 Members are Arnaldo Jara Casavielles, Ambrocio Ruiz, Angel Marin, and Araceli Manzo.

20 7. Upon entry of this Order, compensation to the Class Members shall be affected
21 pursuant to the terms of the Settlement.

22 8. In addition to any recovery that Plaintiff may receive from the Net Settlement Sum,
23 and in recognition of the Plaintiff's efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, the Court hereby
24 approves the payment of a Service Payment to Plaintiff Samuel Placensia in the amount of Ten
25 Thousand Dollars (\$10,000). This shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.

26 \\

27 \\

1 9. The Court approves the payment of attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the sum of
2 One Hundred Twenty-Eight Thousand Three Hundred Seventy-Five Dollars and Eighty Cents
3 (\$128,375.80), and the reimbursement of litigation expenses in the sum of Eight Thousand Five
4 Hundred Eighty-Four Dollars and Forty-Four Cents (\$8,584.44). This shall be paid from the Gross
5 Settlement Amount.

6 10. The Court approves and orders payment in the amount of Seven Thousand Five
7 Hundred Dollars (\$7,500) to Phoenix Settlement Administrators for performance of its settlement
8 administration services. This shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.

9 11. The Court approves and orders payment in the amount of Fifteen Thousand Dollars
10 (\$15,000) to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency for its 75% share of PAGA
11 penalties. This shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.

12 12. Upon the entry of this Order and Judgment, Plaintiff and all Class Members shall be
13 bound by the release of claims as set forth in the Settlement.

14 13. This "Judgment" is intended to be a final disposition of the above captioned action
15 in its entirety, and is intended to be immediately appealable.

16 14. This Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to all matters related to the
17 administration and consummation of the Settlement, and any and all claims asserted in, arising out
18 of, or related to the subject matter of the lawsuit, including but not limited to all matters related to
19 the settlement and the determination of all controversies relating thereto.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Dated: 06/13/2022



22 *P A H*

23 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
24 Peter A. Hernandez / Judge
25
26
27
28