

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY NAME: Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479) FIRM NAME: LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC STREET ADDRESS: 450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900 CITY: Glendale STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 91203 TELEPHONE NO.: 818.265.1020 FAX NO.: 818.265.1021 EMAIL ADDRESS: Joanna@calljustice.com ATTORNEY FOR (name): Plaintiff Perrin Lee SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Sacramento STREET ADDRESS: 720 9th Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Sacramento, 95814 BRANCH NAME: Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse	FOR COURT USE ONLY
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Perrin Lee DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Horne LLP	
NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OR ORDER (Check one): ☒ UNLIMITED CASE (Amount demanded exceeded \$35,000) ☐ LIMITED CASE (Amount demanded was \$35,000 or less)	CASE NUMBER: 34-2022-00320725 / Dept. 23

TO ALL PARTIES :

1. A judgment, decree, or order was entered in this action on (date): January 28, 2025
2. A copy of the judgment, decree, or order is attached to this notice.

**Exhibit 1 - Order and Judgment Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of
Class Action and PAGA Settlement**

Exhibit 2 - Minute Order

Date: February 05, 2025

Joanna Ghosh

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF ☒ ATTORNEY ☐ PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY)

(SIGNATURE)

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Perrin Lee
 DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Horne LLP

CASE NUMBER:
 34-2022-00320725 / Dept. 23

**PROOF OF SERVICE BY FIRST-CLASS MAIL
 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OR ORDER**

(NOTE: You cannot serve the Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order if you are a party in the action. The person who served the notice must complete this proof of service.)

1. I am at least 18 years old and **not a party to this action**. I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing took place, and my residence or business address is (*specify*):

****PLEASE SEE ATTACHED PROOF OF SERVICE****

2. I served a copy of the *Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order* by enclosing it in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid and (*check one*):
- a. ☐ deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service.
 - b. ☐ placed the sealed envelope for collection and processing for mailing, following this business's usual practices, with which I am readily familiar. On the same day correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service.

3. The *Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order* was mailed:

- a. on (*date*):
- b. from (*city and state*):

4. The envelope was addressed and mailed as follows:

- a. Name of person served:

Street address:

City:

State and zip code:

- b. Name of person served:

Street address:

City:

State and zip code:

- c. Name of person served:

Street address:

City:

State and zip code:

- d. Name of person served:

Street address:

City:

State and zip code:

☐ Names and addresses of additional persons served are attached. (*You may use form POS-030(P).*)

5. Number of pages attached:

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: February 05, 2025

Deven Launchbaugh

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT)



Deven Launchbaugh

(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)

EXHIBIT 1

Electronically Received 12/20/2024 02:49 PM

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Sacramento
01/28/2025
T. Shaddix, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

PERRIN LEE, individually, and on behalf of
other members of the general public
similarly situated;

Plaintiffs,

v.

HORNE LLP, an unknown business entity;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No. 34-2022-00320725-CU-OE-GDS,
consolidated with Case No. 34-2022-00320699-
CU-OE-GDS

Assigned To: Honorable Jill H. Talley, Dept. 23

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER AND JUDGMENT
GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND
PAGA SETTLEMENT

Hearing Date: January 17, 2025

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 23

Action Filed: May 27, 2022

[PROPOSED] ORDER

The Motion of Plaintiff Perrin Lee (“Plaintiff”) for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Motion”) came on regularly for hearings before this Court on January 17, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. Defendant does not oppose the Motion. Consistent with the Court’s Order granting preliminary approval of the settlement, entered August 23, 2024, the Settlement Agreement (“Settlement”), due and adequate notice having been given to all Class Members and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency as required in the preliminary approval Order, and the Court having considered all papers filed and proceedings herein, and otherwise being fully informed and good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

1. All terms used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in the Settlement. The term “Class Members” means all current and former non-exempt, hourly and/or non-exempt salaried employees of Defendant in California at any time during the period from May 27, 2018 to August 23, 2024.

2. The term “Released Parties” means Defendant and any of its past, present, and future parents, subsidiaries, divisions, and/or affiliated companies and entities, and each of its/their past, present, and future owners, officers, directors, members, managers, employees, consultants, partners, subsidiaries, shareholders, attorneys, insurers, joint venturers, agents, successors, assigns, legal representatives, and/or any other persons acting on its/their behalf.

3. This Court has continuing jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Action and over all Parties to this Action, including Participating Class Members, until the Settlement is fully administered. Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(h).

4. All Participating Class Members and all Released Claims are covered by and included within the Settlement and this Final Order.

5. The Court hereby finds that the Settlement was entered into in good faith pursuant to and within the meaning of Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6. The Court further finds that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and that Plaintiff has satisfied the standards and applicable requirements for final approval of this class action settlement under California law, including Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 382 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, approved for use by the California state courts in

1 *Vasquez v. Superior Court* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 800, 821.

2 6. The Court finds that the Settlement has been reached because of considerable, serious,
3 and non-collusive arm's length negotiations. The Court further finds that the parties have conducted
4 extensive and costly investigation and research, and counsel for the parties are able to reasonably
5 evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that Settlement at this time will avoid
6 additional substantial costs, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the
7 further prosecution of the Action. The Court reviewed the benefits granted as part of the Settlement
8 and recognizes the significant value to the Participating Class Members.

9 7. The Court finds that this Action is properly certified as a Class Action for settlement
10 purposes only and the Settlement Class is properly certified as a class for settlement purposes only,
11 and orders that this Action and the Settlement Class be finally certified for settlement purposes only
12 pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 382.

13 8. Distribution of the Settlement Notice directed to the Class Members as set forth in
14 the Settlement has been completed in conformity with the Preliminary Approval Order, including
15 individual notices to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and the
16 best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Settlement Notice provided due and adequate
17 notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement, to
18 all persons entitled to the Settlement Notice, and the Settlement Notice and its distribution fully
19 satisfied the requirements of due process.

20 9. The Court finds that no Class Members have objected to the Settlement, no Class
21 Members have disputed their workweeks, and only two Class Members have requested exclusion
22 from the Settlement.

23 10. Upon completion of administration of the Settlement, the Settlement Administrator
24 will provide written certification of such completion to the Court and counsel for the parties.

25 11. The Court hereby approves the Settlement as final and its terms as fair, reasonable,
26 and adequate, and directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its terms.

27 12. As of the date of entry of this Final Order, every Released Claim of every respective
28 Participating Class Member is and shall be deemed conclusively released against the Released

1 Parties. As of the date of entry of this Final Order, Plaintiff and every Class Member who have not
2 submitted a valid Request for Exclusion is hereby released and forever barred and enjoined from
3 prosecuting the Released Claims, except as to such rights or claims as may be created by the
4 Settlement, against Defendant and the Released Parties.

5 13. The Parties entered the Settlement to resolve the dispute that has arisen between them
6 and to avoid the burden, expense, and risk of continued litigation. In entering the Settlement,
7 Defendant does not admit, and specifically denies, it has violated any state, federal, or local law;
8 violated any regulations or guidelines promulgated pursuant to any statute or any other applicable
9 laws, regulations, or legal requirements; or engaged in any other unlawful conduct with respect to
10 its employees. Neither this Final Order, the Settlement, nor any document referred to herein, nor
11 any action taken to carry out the Settlement, shall be construed as an admission or concession by
12 Defendant of any such violations or failures to comply with any applicable law. Except as necessary
13 in a proceeding to enforce the terms of the Settlement, the Settlement and its terms and provisions
14 shall not be offered or received as evidence in any action or proceeding to establish any liability or
15 admission on the part of Defendant or to establish the existence of any condition constituting a
16 violation of, or a noncompliance with, state, federal, local, or other applicable law.

17 14. The Court hereby finds the Individual Settlement Payment provided for under the
18 Settlement and Settlement Notice to be fair and reasonable considering all the circumstances. The
19 Court, therefore, orders the calculations and payments to be made and administered in accordance
20 with the terms of the Settlement and the Settlement Notice.

21 15. The Court hereby confirms Plaintiff Perrin Lee as Class Representative, and
22 Schneider Wallace Cottrell Konecky LLP and Lawyers *for* Justice, PC as Class Counsel.

23 16. Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), Cal. Lab. Code
24 §§ 2699(l)(2), (s)(2), the Labor Workforce and Development Agency (“LWDA”) has been given
25 notice of the Settlement. On May 23, 2024, Plaintiff submitted to the LWDA a copy of the
26 Settlement and a copy of the motion seeking final approval of the Settlement. The Court finds and
27 determines that this notice of the Settlement complied with the statutory requirements of PAGA.

28 17. The Court finds and determines that the PAGA Allocation of \$20,000.00 for civil

penalties in this case is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders that the PAGA Allocation of that amount, inclusive of the PAGA Payment to the LWDA, be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with the Settlement. (75% of which will be paid to the LWDA and 25% of which will be paid to Aggrieved Employees).

18. The Court finally approves Apex Class Action LLC (“Apex”) as the Settlement Administrator and finally approved payment to Phoenix in the amount of \$7,450.00 for settlement administration costs.

19. The Court finally approves Plaintiff’s application for reasonable attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$313,500.00 or 33% of the Gross Settlement Amount.

20. The Court finally approves Plaintiff’s application for reimbursement of actual litigation expenses currently in the amount of \$14,033.86; however additional costs and expenses will be incurred as the settlement is administered. Therefore, the Court approved an award of litigation expenses in the amount of \$16,000.00.

21. The Court finally approves Plaintiff’s application for Service Award in the amount of \$15,000.00.

22. The Court approves the implementation schedule set forth in the Settlement and Plaintiffs’ Notice and Motion for Final Approval.

23. The Court orders that, pending further order of this Court, all proceedings in the above-captioned Action, except those contemplated herein and in the Settlement, are stayed, and all deadlines are vacated.

24. The parties shall bear their own respective attorneys’ fees and costs except as otherwise provided in the Settlement.

25. The parties are hereby ordered to comply with the terms of the Settlement, including but not limited to the following deadlines:

EVENT	DEADLINE
Effective Date of the Settlement (Settlement ¶ 1.18)	The date by when both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment on its Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement; and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) the day immediately after the last day by

	which a Notice of Appeal of Judgment may be timely filed with the California Court of Appeal (i.e., the sixty-first calendar day following entry of Final Order and Judgment), and no such appeal being filed; or (b) if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.
Defendant to deposit Gross Settlement Amount into QSF (Settlement, ¶ 4.2)	Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than 14 days after the Effective Date.
Settlement Administrator to mail Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment. (Settlement, ¶ 4.3)	Within 14 days after Defendant funds the Gross Settlement Amount.
Settlement Administrator to provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing disbursements or all payments (Settlement, ¶ 7.8.6)	Within 10 days after the Administrator disburses all funds in the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing its disbursements by employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least 15 days before any deadline set by the Court, the Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration in Court.
Expiration of Individual Settlement Payment checks (Settlement, ¶ 4.3.1)	The face of each check shall prominently state the date (not less than 180 days after the date of mailing) when the check will be voided.

IT IS SO ORDERED. LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: 01/28/2025



Jill Talley

HON. JILL H. TALLEY
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

EXHIBIT 2

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Gordon D. Schaber Superior Court, Department 23

JUDICIAL OFFICER: HONORABLE JILL H. TALLEY

Courtroom Clerk: T. Shaddix
Court Attendant: C. Carrillo

CSR: Nancy Presant #9906

34-2022-00320725-CU-OE-GDS

January 24, 2025
9:00 AM

Perrin Lee vs. Horne LLP

MINUTES

APPEARANCES:

Plaintiff Perrin Lee represented by Joanna Ghosh & Ori Edelstein, appearing for Carolyn Hunt Cottrell.

Plaintiff on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated represented by Joanna Ghosh & Ori Edelstein, appearing for Carolyn Hunt Cottrell.

Defendant Horne LLP represented by Kate Juvinall, appearing for Julie E Totten.

Defendant Horne LLP represented by Kate Juvinall, appearing for Julie E Totten.

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: Hearing on Motion for Final Approval of Settlement

The above-entitled matter came before this Court for a motion for final approval of class action settlement with the above-named counsel present and appearing remotely via Zoom.

There being no objections from any parties the court affirms the tentative ruling.

TENTATIVE AFFIRMED

Plaintiff Perrin Lee's ("Plaintiff") motion for final approval of class action and Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") settlement is UNOPPOSED and TENTATIVELY GRANTED pending the final fairness hearing. (Code Civ. Proc., § 382, Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 3.769.)

Overview

This is a consolidated wage and hour class and representative action brought by Plaintiff against Defendant Horne, LLP ("Defendant"). Plaintiff's class action complaint alleges the following causes of action: (1) unpaid overtime, (2) unpaid meal period premiums, (3) unpaid rest period premiums, (4) unpaid minimum wages, (5) final wages not timely paid, (6) wages not timely paid during employment, (7) non-compliant wage statements, (8) failure to keep requisite payroll records, (9) unreimbursed business expenses, and (10) unfair business practices. Plaintiff's

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

representative action compliant (Case No. 34-2022-00320699) alleges a single cause of action for violation of PAGA based on the same Labor Code violations alleged in the class action complaint.

The Parties engaged in formal and informal discovery. (Ghosh Decl. ¶ 6.) The Parties thereafter agreed to participate in private mediation. (Cottrell Decl. in Support of Preliminary Approval at ¶ 14.) In advance of the mediation, Defendant produced time and pay records for a random sample of Class members. (*Ibid.*) Plaintiff's counsel also conducted interviews with Class Members. (*Id.* at ¶ 16.) On May 11, 2023, the Parties participated in a private mediation with Hon. David Buckley (Ret.). (*Id.* at ¶ 13.) The case did not settle at the mediation and the Parties continued with litigation and settlement discussions. (*Id.* at ¶ 17.) In October of 2023, the Parties resumed settlement discussions with the mediator's assistance. (*Id.* at ¶ 18.) On January 3, 2024, the Parties' counsel held a conference call with the mediator wherein the mediator made a proposal and both Parties accepted. (*Id.* at ¶ 19.) Subsequently, the Parties entered into a written settlement agreement. (*Id.* at Ex. 1 ("Agreement").) On August 23, 2024, the Court granted preliminary settlement approval. Plaintiff now seeks final approval of this class and representative action settlement. This ruling incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement and all capitalized terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this ruling as set forth in the Agreement.

Settlement Class Certification

The Court preliminarily certified the following settlement class: all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as hourly, non-exempt employees to whom Defendant issued wage statements (but excluding any persons hired by a third party and assigned to work on an assignment for Defendant in California) during the period from May 27, 2018, to the date of preliminary approval. (Agreement ¶¶ 1.5 & 1.12.) On September 25, 2024, the Class Notice was mailed to all 249 Class Members. (Nava Decl. ¶ 7.) Ultimately, three notices were undeliverable after the settlement administrator performed a skip trace to locate updated addresses. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 8-10.) The deadline to respond to the Class Notice was November 25, 2024. As of December 19, 2024, there were two requests for exclusion, no submitted objections, and no workweek disputes. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 11-13.) The participation rate is 99.20%. The Court finds there has been no material change since the Court granted preliminary approval. Therefore, the Court intends to certify the proposed settlement class.

Aggrieved Employees

Aggrieved Employees are defined in the Agreement as all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as hourly, non-exempt employees to whom Defendant issued wage statements (but excluding any persons hired by a third party and assigned to work on an

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

assignment for Defendant in California) during the period from March 22, 2021, to the date of preliminary approval. (Agreement ¶¶ 1.4 & 1.31.) Aggrieved Employees will receive their share of the PAGA penalty regardless of whether they opt out of the Class portion of the settlement. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.5.4 & Ex. A (“Class Notice”).) Counsel submitted notice of the settlement to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”). (Cottrell Decl. in Support of Preliminary Approval ¶ 30.)

Class Representative

The Court intends to appoint Plaintiff as Class Representative for settlement purposes only.

Class Counsel

The Court intends to appoint Schneider Wallace Cottrell Konecky LLP and Lawyers *for* Justice, PC as Class Counsel for settlement purposes only.

Fair, Adequate and Reasonable Settlement

The Court must find a settlement is “fair, adequate, and reasonable” before approving a class action settlement. (*Wershba v. Apple Computer* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 244-245.) The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether a proposed settlement in a class action is fair, adequate, and reasonable. (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801.) “[A] presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached through arm’s-length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small.” (*Id.* at 1802.) In making its fairness determination, the Court considers the strength of the Plaintiffs’ case, the risk, expenses, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the state of the proceedings, and the experience and views of counsel. (*Id.* at 1801.) In approving a class action settlement, the Court must “satisfy itself that the class settlement is within the ‘ballpark’ of reasonableness.” (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133.)

This is a non-reversionary, opt-out settlement. Defendant will pay the Gross Settlement Amount (“GSA”) of \$950,000 and will separately pay employer-side payroll taxes. (Agreement ¶ 3.1.) The following will be paid out of the GSA: (1) a service payment in the amount of \$15,000 to the Class Representative; (2) attorney’s fees equaling 33% (\$313,500) and litigation costs in the amount of \$14,033.86 to Class Counsel; (3) administration costs in the amount of \$7,450; (4) individual Class member payments; and (5) a PAGA Penalty in the amount of \$20,000 (75% of which will be paid to the LWDA and 25% of which will be paid to Aggrieved Employees). (*Id.*

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

at ¶¶ 3.2.1-3.2.5; Nava Decl. ¶ 19; Ghosh Decl. ¶¶ 8-13, 19 & Exs. A-B; Cottrell Decl. ¶ 7 & Exs. A-B.)

For tax purposes, individual settlement payments will be allocated as follows: 20% will be treated as wages and 80% will be treated as penalties and interest. (Agreement ¶ 3.2.4.1.) PAGA Payments will be treated entirely as penalties. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.5.2) Any funds from checks that are uncashed after 180 days will be sent to the California Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the payee. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 4.3.1 & 4.3.3.) The average individual class member payment is estimated to be \$2,332.19. (Nava Decl. ¶ 16.) The average estimated PAGA Payment is \$21.46. (*Id.* at ¶ 18.)

Disposition

The Court tentatively finds that the settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate in light of all of the circumstances presented in the moving papers. Provided that no objection is asserted by any class member at the hearing on this matter, the Court anticipates signing the proposed order and judgment. The Court also intends to award attorney's fees, costs, and enhancement award in the amounts requested.

The Court sets a settlement compliance hearing for October 3, 2025 at 10:30 a.m. in this department. At least **15** days prior to the hearing, counsel shall file a declaration regarding the status of the distribution of the settlement funds. If the Court is satisfied that the settlement funds have been fully distributed, no appearance will be required.

The Court orders the parties to appear. **The parties may and are encouraged to appear by Zoom with the links below:**

To join by Zoom Link - <https://saccourt-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/my/sscdept23>

To join by phone dial (833) 568-8864 ID 16108301121

Parties requesting services of a court reporter will need to arrange for private court reporter services at their own expense, pursuant to Government code section 68086 and California Rules of Court, Rule 2.956. Requirements for requesting a court reporter are listed in the Policy for Official Reporter Pro Tempore available on the Sacramento Superior Court website at <https://www.saccourt.ca.gov/court-reporters/docs/crtrp-6a.pdf>. Parties may contact Court-Approved Official Reporters Pro Tempore by utilizing the list of Court Approved Official Reporters Pro Tempore available at <https://www.saccourt.ca.gov/court-reporters/docs/crtrp-13.Pdf>

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

A Stipulation and Appointment of Official Reporter Pro Tempore (CV/E-206) is required to be signed by each party, the private court reporter, and the Judge prior to the hearing, if not using a reporter from the Court's Approved Official Reporter Pro Tempore list. Once the form is signed it must be filed with the clerk.

If a litigant has been granted a fee waiver and requests a court reporter, the party must submit a Request for Court Reporter by a Party with a Fee Waiver (CV/E-211) and it must be filed with the clerk at least 10 days prior to the hearing or at the time the proceeding is scheduled if less than 10 days away. Once approved, the clerk will be forward the form to the Court Reporter's Office and an official reporter will be provided.

Counsel for Plaintiff is directed to notice all parties of this order.

Status Conference regarding settlement compliance is scheduled for 10/03/2025 at 10:30 AM in Department 23 at Gordon D. Schaber Superior Court.

By: */s/ T. Shaddix*
T. Shaddix, Deputy Clerk
Minutes of: 01/24/2025
Entered on: 01/24/2025

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900, Glendale, California 91203.

On February 05, 2025, I served the foregoing document(s) described as: **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OR ORDER** on interested parties in this action by Electronic Service as follows:

Carolyn H. Cottrell (ccottrell@schneiderwallace.com)
Ori Edelstein (loedelstein@schneiderwallace.com)
SCHNEIDER WALLACE
COTTRELL KONECKY LLP
2000 Powell Street, Suite 1400
Emeryville, California 94608

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class

Julie A. Totten (jatotten@orrick.com)
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
400 Capital Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Kate Juvinal (kjuvinall@orrick.com)
Alice Reichman Hoesterey (ahoesterey@orrick.com)
Helena E. Bursik (hbursik@orrick.com)
Janette Lillian Ponce (jponce@orrick.com)
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
355 S Grand Ave, Ste 2700,
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Attorneys for Defendant Horne LLP

[X] BY E-MAIL

The above-referenced document(s) was transmitted to the person(s) at the e-mail address(es) listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address or e-mail of record in this action. I did not receive, within reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

State of California, Labor & Workforce Development Agency Web URL:
<http://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

[X] BY ONLINE SUBMISSION

The foregoing documents were transmitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency through the online system established for the submission of notices

1 and documents, in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(l). I did not
2 receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other
3 indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

4 **[X] STATE**

5 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above
6 is true and correct.

7 Executed on February 05, 2025, at Glendale, California.

8 

9 _____
10 Deven Launchbaugh
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28