



SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

GILBERTO RUEDA, PAVEL BOVSUN, and
ELIZANDRO VALENZUELA, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CLARKWESTERN DIETRICH BUILDING
SYSTEMS LLC; and DOES 1 through 20,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2021-00307823-CU-OE-GDS

*Assigned for all purposes to:
Hon. Lauri A. Damrell, Dept. 22*

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

Date: April 12, 2024
Time: 9:00 a.m.

BY FAX



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

1 This matter came on for hearing on April 12, 2024, at 9:00 a.m., in Department 22 of the
2 above-captioned Court on the unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement
3 pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769, this Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval,
4 and the Joint Stipulation of Settlement ("Settlement Agreement"), a copy of which was filed in
5 conjunction with the Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

6 Having received and considered the Settlement Agreement, the supporting papers filed by
7 the Parties, and the evidence and argument received by the Court in conjunction with the
8 unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and the instant Motion
9 for Final Approval, the Court grants final approval of the Settlement and HEREBY ORDERS
10 AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS:

11 1. Pursuant to the Order Granting Preliminary Approval, a Notice Packet was sent to
12 each Settlement Class Member by first-class mail. These papers informed the Settlement Class
13 of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive an Individual Settlement Payment, their right
14 (a) to comment on or object to the Settlement, (b) to request exclusion from the Settlement and
15 pursue their own remedies, and (c) of their right to appear in person or by counsel at the final
16 approval hearing and to be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time
17 were provided by each of these procedures. No member of the Class filed written objection to
18 the proposed Settlement as part of this notice process or stated an intention to appear at the final
19 approval hearing.

20 2. The Court finds and determines that this notice procedure afforded adequate
21 protections to Settlement Class Members and provides the basis for the Court to make an informed
22 decision regarding approval of the Settlement based on the responses of the Settlement Class.
23 The Court finds and determines that the notice provided in this case was the best notice
24 practicable, which satisfied the requirements of law and due process.

25 3. With respect to the Settlement Class and for purposes of approving this Settlement
26 only, this Court finds and concludes that: (a) the members of the Settlement Class are
27 ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are questions
28 of law or fact common to the Settlement Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest

1 among members of the Settlement Class with respect to the subject matter of the Action; (c) the
2 claims of Class Representative Josh Arquieta are typical of the claims of the members of the
3 Settlement Class; (d) the Class Representative has fairly and adequately protected the interests of
4 the members of the Settlement Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for
5 an efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) the counsel of record for the Class
6 Representative, i.e., Class Counsel, are qualified to serve as counsel for Plaintiff in their
7 individual and representative capacities for the Class.

8 4. The Court has certified a Settlement Class, as that term is defined in and by the
9 terms of the Settlement Agreement as all current and former non-exempt employees who are or
10 were employed by Defendant in California at any time from September 14, 2017 through March
11 15, 2023, and the Court deems this definition sufficient for purposes of California Rule of Court
12 3.765(a).

13 5. The Court hereby confirms Aegis Law Firm, PC and Lauby, Mankin & Lauby
14 LLP as Class Counsel.

15 6. The Court hereby confirms Plaintiffs Gilberto Rueda, Pavel Bovsun, and
16 Elizandro Valenzuela as the Class Representatives in this Action.

17 7. The Court finds and determines that the terms set forth in the Settlement
18 Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate and directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement
19 according to its terms, having found that the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and
20 non-collusive arm's-length negotiations facilitated by a neutral mediator. The Court further finds
21 that the Parties conducted extensive investigation, research, and discovery and that their attorneys
22 were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that the
23 Settlement will enable the Parties to avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs,
24 as well as delay and risks if the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. The Court has
25 reviewed the monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement and recognizes the significant
26 value accorded to the Class.

27 8. The Court further finds and determines that the terms of the Settlement are fair,
28 reasonable and adequate to the Settlement Class and to each Settlement Class Member and that

1 the Settlement is ordered finally approved, and that all terms and provisions of the Settlement
2 should be and hereby are ordered to be consummated.

3 9. The Court hereby approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$2,500,000.00

4 10. The Court finds and determines that the Individual Settlement Payments to be paid
5 to participating Settlement Class Members as provided for by the Settlement are fair and
6 reasonable. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders the payment of those amounts
7 be made to the participating Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Settlement
8 Agreement.

9 11. The Court finds and determines that payment in the amount of ~~\$150,000.00~~ ^{\$200,000} as
10 settlement of civil PAGA penalties in this case is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court
11 hereby gives final approval to and orders that the payment of that amount be paid in accordance
12 with the Settlement Agreement.

13 12. The Court finds and determines that the fees and expenses in administering the
14 Settlement incurred by Phoenix Settlement Administrators, Inc., in the amount of \$10,500.00, are
15 fair and reasonable. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders that the payment of that
16 amount in accordance with the Settlement.

17 13. The Court finds and determines the Class Representative Enhancement Award
18 of \$10,000.00 for each Plaintiff is fair and reasonable. The Court hereby orders the
19 Administrator to make this payment to the Plaintiffs/Class Representatives in accordance with
20 the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

21 14. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, and the authorities, evidence and
22 argument submitted by Class Counsel, the Court hereby awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees
23 in the sum of ~~\$875,000.00~~ ^{\$750,000} and litigation costs of \$25,511.98. The Court finds such amounts to
24 be fair and reasonable. The Court hereby orders the Settlement Administrator to make these
25 payments in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

26 15. Without affecting the finality of this order or the entry of judgment in any way,
27 the Court retains jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration,
28 implementation, effectuation, and enforcement of this order and the Settlement.

1 16. Neither Defendant nor any related persons or entities shall have any further
2 liability for costs, expenses, interest, attorneys' fees, or for any other charge, expense, or liability,
3 except as provided for by the Settlement Agreement.

4 17. Neither the making of the Settlement Agreement nor the entry into the Settlement
5 Agreement constitutes an admission by Defendant, nor is this order a finding of the validity of
6 any claims in this case or of any other wrongdoing. Further, the Settlement Agreement is not a
7 concession, and shall not be used as an admission of any wrongdoing, fault, or omission of any
8 entity or persons; nor may any action taken to carry out the terms of the Settlement Agreement
9 be construed as an admission or concession by or against Defendant or any related person or
10 entity.

11 18. Nothing in this order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations
12 under the Settlement or under this order, including the requirement that Defendant makes
13 payment to the participating Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Settlement.

14 19. Upon completion of administration of the Settlement, the Settlement
15 Administrator will provide written certification of such completion to the Court and counsel for
16 the Parties which shall be filed with the Court five (5) court days before the non-appearance
17 compliance hearing set for December ²⁰18, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. ~~for~~ _____ at _____
18 ~~a.m.~~ in Dept. ²²28. LAURI A. DAMRELL

19 20. The Court hereby enters final judgment in accordance with the terms of the
20 Settlement Agreement, the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement,
21 and this Order.

22 21. The Parties will bear their own costs and attorneys' fees except as otherwise
23 provided by this Court's Order awarding Class Counsels' Award for attorneys' fees and litigation
24 costs.

25 DATED: 4/12/24



26 Honorable Lauri A. Damrell
27 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
28