

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK
DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858)551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Email: Kyle@bamlawca.com
Website: www.bamlawca.com

Nazo Koulloukian (SBN 263809)
nazo@koullaw.com

KOUL LAW FIRM

3435 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1710
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Telephone: (213) 761-5484
Facsimile: (818) 561-3938

Sahag Majarian, II, Esq. (SBN 146621)
Sahagii@aol.com

LAW OFFICES OF SAHAG MAJARIAN II

18250 Ventura Blvd.
Tarzana, CA 91356
Telephone: (818) 609-0807
Facsimile: (818) 609-0892

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE**

MANUEL FRANCO and ALFONSO
GUZMAN, on behalf of themselves, on
behalf of all persons similarly situated,
and on behalf of the State of California as
a private attorney general,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

STATES LOGISTICS SERVICES, INC.,
a California Corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **30-2022-01239095-CU-OE-CXC**

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

Hearing Date: July 24, 2025

Hearing Time: 2:00 p.m.

[Hearing scheduled by Order dated March 7, 2025]

Judge: Hon. Layne H. Melzer

Dept.: CX102

Action Filed: January 3, 2022

Trial Date: Not set

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT on July 30, 2025, the Court entered the
3 Judgment in the above entitled action. A true and correct copy of the Judgment is attached hereto
4 as Exhibit #1.

5 Respectfully submitted,

6
7 Dated: July 30, 2025

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK
DE BLOUW LLP**

8 By: /s/ Kyle Nordrehaug
9 Kyle R. Nordrehaug
10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

3 I, Kyle Nordrehaug, am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am
4 over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 2255 Calle Clara, La
5 Jolla, California 92037.

6 On July 30, 2025, I served the document(s) described as:

7 **1. Notice of Entry of Judgment**

8 X (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE): I caused the above entitled document(s) to be transmitted
9 through electronic mail to counsel Defendant at the following address(es):

10 Jackson Lewis P.C.
11 Nicole M. Shaffer
12 Kimberley L. Litzler
13 Denise MacMurray
14 Gabriela Rubio
15 200 Spectrum Center Drive, Suite 500
16 Irvine, CA 92618

14 Emails:
15 Nicole.Shaffer@jacksonlewis.com
16 Kimberley.Litzler@jacksonlewis.com
17 Denise.Macmurray@jacksonlewis.com
18 Gabriela.Rubio@jacksonlewis.com

17 Attorneys for Defendant
18 STATES LOGISTICS SERVICES, INC.

18 X (ONLINE TO THE LWDA): I caused the above-described document to be delivered to the
19 Labor Workforce Development Agency via online process at the PAGA Filing website in
20 accordance with the procedure imposed by the LWDA.

21 X (State): I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
22 above is true and correct.

23 Executed on July 30, 2025, at La Jolla, California.

24 /s/ Kyle Nordrehaug
25 Kyle Nordrehaug

EXHIBIT #1

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

MANUEL FRANCO and ALFONSO
GUZMAN, on behalf of themselves, on behalf
of all persons similarly situated, and on behalf
of the State of California as a private attorney
general,

Plaintiffs,
vs.

STATES LOGISTICS SERVICES, INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 30-2022-01239095-CU-OE-CXC

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT

Hearing Date: July 24, 2025
Hearing Time: 2:00 p.m.

Judge: Hon. Layne H. Melzer
Dept.: CX102

Action Filed: January 3, 2022
Trial Date: Not Set

ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT

1 The Motion of Plaintiffs Manuel Franco and Alfonso Guzman (“Plaintiffs”) for Final
2 Approval of Class Action Settlement, Class Representatives’ Service Payments, and Attorneys’
3 Fees and Costs (“Final Approval Motion”) came on regularly for hearing before this Court on July
4 24, 2025, at 2:00 p.m., pursuant to the California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court’s early Order
5 Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (“Preliminary Approval Order”).
6 Having considered the parties’ First Amended Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement
7 (“Agreement” or Settlement”), which appears in the record as Exhibit #1 to the Declaration of
8 Norman Blumenthal [ROA #172], and the documents and evidence presented in support thereof,
9 and recognizing the sharply disputed factual and legal issues involved in this case, the risks of
10 further prosecution, and the substantial benefits to be received by the Class Members pursuant to
11 the Settlement, the Court hereby makes a final ruling that the Settlement is fair, reasonable and
12 adequate, and is the product of good faith, arm’s-length negotiations between the parties. Good
13 cause appearing therefor, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs’ Final Approval Motion and
14 hereby ORDERS the following:

15 1. Final Judgment is hereby entered in conformity with the Agreement and this Final
16 Approval Order. Notice of entry of this Final Judgment shall be given to all Parties by Class
17 Counsel on behalf of Plaintiffs and all Class Members. The Final Judgment shall be posted on the
18 Administrator’s website as set forth in the Class Notice to the Class. It shall not be necessary to
19 send notice of entry of this Final Judgment to individual Class Members. Pursuant to Labor Code
20 section 2699, subdivision (1)(2), Class Counsel shall submit a copy of this Final Judgment to the
21 LWDA within 10 days after its entry.

22 2. The conditional class certification is hereby made final, and the Court thus certifies,
23 for purposes of the Settlement, the following Class:

24 All individuals who were employed by Defendant in the State of California and
25 classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.

26 The Class Period means the period of time from May 2, 2020, through July 20, 2024.

27 3. Plaintiffs are hereby confirmed as Class Representatives. Norman B. Blumenthal,
28

1 Kyle R. Nordrehaug, Aparajit Bhowmik, Jeffery S. Herman, Sergio J. Puche, Trevor G. Moran of
2 Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, Nazo Koulloukian of Koul Law Firm, and
3 Sahag Majarian, II of Law Offices of Sahag Majarian, II are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.

4 4. The Class Notice was provided to the Class Members as set forth in the Settlement,
5 which was approved by the Court on March 7, 2025, and the notice process has been completed in
6 conformity with the Settlement and the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that
7 said notice was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. and was reasonably calculated
8 to communicate actual notice of the litigation and the proposed settlement to the Class. The Class
9 Notice provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein,
10 informed the Class Members of their rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of California Rule
11 of Court 3.769, and due process.

12 5. The Court finds that no Class Members objected to the Settlement, that seven (7)
13 Class Members opted out of the Settlement, and that the 99.5% participate rate in the Settlement
14 supports final approval. The names of the Class Members that requested exclusion from the
15 Settlement are Charles Alfred Meacham Jr., Richard Joseph Galvin, Alyssa Rylee Desimone,
16 Raymond Del Puerto, Guillermo Cornejo Curiel, Anthony Marcellino Estrada, and Lorri D.
17 Spiering.

18 6. The Court hereby approves the settlement as set forth in the Settlement as fair,
19 reasonable, adequate, and directs the parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its terms.

20 7. For purposes of settlement only, the Court finds that: (a) the Class Members are
21 ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable; (b) there are
22 questions of law or fact common to the Class Members, and there is a well-defined community of
23 interest among the Class Members with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c) the
24 claims of the Class Representatives are typical of the claims of the Class Members; (d) the Class
25 Representatives have fairly and adequately protected the interests of the Class Members; (e) a
26 class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy;

1 and (f) Class Counsel are qualified to serve as counsel for the Class Representatives and the Class
2 Members.

3 8. The Court finds that given the absence of objections to the Settlement, this Order
4 shall be considered final as of the date of entry.

5 9. The Court finds that the Individual Class Payments, as provided for in the
6 Settlement, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Administrator to distribute the
7 Individual Class Payments in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

8 10. The Court orders Defendant States Logistics Services, Inc. (“Defendant”) to
9 deposit the Gross Settlement Amount of \$1,149,500.00 with the Administrator, ILYM Group, Inc.,
10 within fourteen (14) days of the Effective Date defined in the Agreement.

11 11. The Court finds that Class Representative Service Payments in the amount of
12 \$10,000.00 each to the Plaintiffs, for a total of \$20,000.00, are reasonable in light of the risks and
13 burdens undertaken by the Plaintiffs in this litigation and for their time and effort in bringing and
14 prosecuting this matter on behalf of the Class. The Court finds that these payments are fair,
15 reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Administrator make these payments in conformity
16 with the terms of the Settlement.

17 12. The Court finds that attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$383,166.67 and litigation
18 costs of \$35,366.06 for Class Counsel are fair, reasonable, and adequate in light of the common
19 fund created by the Settlement. The Class Counsel Fees Payment shall be apportioned among
20 Class Counsel as follows: 50% to Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 25% to Koul
21 Law Firm, and 25% to Law Offices of Sahag Majarian, II. The Class Counsel Litigation Expenses
22 Payment shall be allocated as follows: \$29,334.34 to Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw
23 LLP, \$3,360.71 to Koul Law Firm, and \$2,571.01 to Law Offices of Sahag Majarian, II. The
24 Administrator is ordered to distribute these payments to Class Counsel in conformity with the
25 terms of the Settlement.

26 13. The Court orders that the Administrator shall be paid \$13,950 from the Gross
27 Settlement Amount in conformity with the terms of the Settlement, for all of its work done and to
28

1 be done until the completion of this matter and finds that sum appropriate.

2 14. The Court finds that the PAGA Penalties payment to the in the amount of
3 \$25,000.00 is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The PAGA Penalties amount shall be allocated 75%
4 (\$18,750) as the LWDA PAGA Payment California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
5 (“LWDA”), and 25% (\$6,250) to the Individual PAGA Payments to be distributed by (a) dividing
6 the amount of the Aggrieved Employees’ 25% share of PAGA Penalties (\$6,250.00) by the total
7 number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and
8 (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee’s PAGA Pay Periods. “Aggrieved
9 Employees” are all individuals who were employed by Defendant in the State of California and
10 classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period. The “PAGA Period” is
11 July 6, 2020 to July 20, 2024. The LWDA was notified of the settlement and served with a copy
12 of the Agreement, and the LWDA has not objected to the Settlement. The Administrator is
13 ordered to distribute this LWDA PAGA Payment and the Individual PAGA Payments in
14 conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

15 15. This Court orders that any settlement checks shall be valid for 180 calendar days
16 from the date of issuance of the check, and that any settlement checks that remain uncashed after
17 180 days after they are mailed shall be distributed to the Controller of the State of California to be
18 held pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law, California Civil Code § 1500, et seq., in the name
19 of the Class Member to whom the check was issued.

20 16. Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement
21 Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed of the Wage Portion of the Individual Class
22 Payments, Plaintiffs, Participating Class Members, Aggrieved Employees will release Defendant
23 and each of its former and present directors, officers, shareholders, owners, attorneys, insurers,
24 predecessors, successors, assigns and subsidiaries (collectively, the “Released Parties”) as follows:
25 All Participating Class Members will release all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could
26 have been alleged, based on facts stated in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the
27 period of time from May 2, 2020 to July 20, 2024 (the “Class Period”) during employment in a
28

1 non-exempt position in California, which includes claims for failure to pay minimum wages,
2 failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide required meal periods, failure to provide required
3 rest periods, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to reimburse employees
4 for required business expenses, failure to provide wages when due, unfair competition based on
5 these claims, and derivative penalties (“Released Class Claims”). In addition, all Aggrieved
6 Employees will release all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonable could have
7 been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notices, which
8 occurred during the period of time from July 6, 2020 to July 20, 2024 (the “PAGA Period”) during
9 employment in a non-exempt position in California (“Released PAGA Claims”).

10 17. This document shall constitute a final judgment pursuant to California Rule of
11 Court 3.769(h), which provides, “If the court approves the settlement agreement after the final
12 approval hearing, the court must make and enter judgment. The judgment must include a
13 provision for the retention of the court’s jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the terms of the
14 judgment. The court may not enter an order dismissing the action at the same time as, or after,
15 entry of judgment.” The Court will retain jurisdiction pursuant to CCP § 664.6 and CRC 3.769(h)
16 to enforce the Settlement, the Final Approval Order, and this Judgment.

17 18. Plaintiffs shall file a final report of the Administrator on or before July 21, 2026.
18 The final report must include all information necessary for the Court to determine the total amount
19 of the settlement funds actually paid to the Participating Class Members and Aggrieved
20 Employees, and the amount of unclaimed funds, if any, remitted to the State Controller’s Office. If
21 the settlement funds are not completely disbursed by the report deadline, counsel must request a
22 continuance. The Final Accounting Hearing is set for August 6, 2026, at 2:00 p.m. in Department
23 CX102.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**



26 Dated: July 30, 2025

27
28

HON. LAYNE H. MELZER
JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT
