

8/7/2025 5:07 PM

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC
Kashif Haque, State Bar No. 218672
Samuel A. Wong, State Bar No. 217104
Jessica L. Campbell, State Bar No. 280626
Carolyn M. Bell, State Bar No. 313435
9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: (949) 379-6250
Facsimile: (949) 379-6251
Email: cbell@aegislawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Luis Valenzuela Jr.,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN**

LUIS VALENZUELA JR., individually
and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MRC GLOBAL (US) INC.; and DOES 1
through 20, inclusive,

Defendant.

RAFGIL TUBIEROS, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MRC GLOBAL (US) INC., a Delaware
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
Inclusive

Defendants.

FILED

**KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
08/29/2025**

BY Fogerson, Vickie
DEPUTY

Case No. BCV-22-100597 BCB
Consolidated with Case No. BCV-22-102672

*Assigned for All Purposes to:
Hon. Bernard C. Barmann, Jr.
Division H*

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER AND JUDGMENT
GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Date: August 28, 2025
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Dept: H

KOKOZIAN LAW FIRM, APC

Bruce Kokozyan, Esq. (SBN 195723)

Brian Andrews, Esq. (SBN 234306)

10940 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1200

Los Angeles, CA 90024

Telephone: (323) 857-5900

Facsimile: (310) 275-6301

Email: bkokozyan@kokozyanlawfirm.com

bandrews@kokozyanlawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Rafgil Tubieros individually,
and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

BCV-22-100597

VALENZUELA JR. VS MRC GLOBAL (US) INC.

1 This matter came on for hearing on August 28, 2025, at 8:30 a.m., in Division H of the
2 above-captioned Court on the Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement pursuant to
3 California Rule of Court 3.769, this Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval, and the Class
4 Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice ("Settlement Agreement"), a copy of
5 which was filed in conjunction with the Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action
6 Settlement.

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

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

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

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

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

8 4. The Court has certified a Class, as that term is defined in and by the terms of the
9 Settlement Agreement as all non-exempt employees employed by MRC Global (US) Inc. at any
10 time from December 2, 2020 to September 15, 2024, and the Court deems this definition sufficient
11 for purposes of California Rule of Court 3.765(a).

12 5. The Court hereby confirms Aegis Law Firm, PC and Kokozyan Law Firm, APC as
13 Class Counsel.

14 6. The Court hereby confirms Plaintiff Luis Valenzuela Jr. and Rafgil Tubieros as
15 the Class Representatives in this Action.

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

25 8. The Court further finds and determines that the terms of the Settlement are fair,
26 reasonable and adequate to the Class and to each Participating Class Member and that the
27 Settlement is ordered finally approved, and that all terms and provisions of the Settlement should
28 be and hereby are ordered to be consummated.

1 9. The Court hereby approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$900,000.00.

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

6 11. The Court finds and determines that payment to the California Labor and
7 Workforce Development Agency of \$22,500.00 as its share of the settlement of civil penalties in
8 this case is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders
9 that the payment of that amount be paid in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

10 12. The Court finds and determines that the fees and expenses in administrating the
11 Settlement incurred by Phoenix Settlement Administrators in the amount of \$8,750.00, are fair
12 and reasonable. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders that the payment of that
13 amount in accordance with the Settlement.

14 13. The Court finds and determines the Class Representative Service Payments of
15 \$10,000.00 for each Plaintiff are fair and reasonable. The Court hereby orders the Administrator
16 to make this payment to the Plaintiffs in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

17 14. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, and the authorities, evidence and argument
18 submitted by Class Counsel, the Court hereby awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the sum of
19 \$300,000.00 and litigation costs of \$21,738.67. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and
20 reasonable. The Court hereby orders the Settlement Administrator to make these payments in
21 accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.


22 15. Nothing in this order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations
23 under the Settlement or under this order, including the requirement that Defendant make payments
24 to the Participating Class Members in accordance with the Settlement.

25 16. This Judgment is intended to be a final disposition in its entirety of the above
26 captioned action. Without affecting the finality of this judgment in any way, the Court retains
27 jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation,
28 effectuation, and enforcement of the Settlement pursuant to C.C.P. § 664.6.

1 17. The Parties will bear their own costs and attorneys' fees except as otherwise
2 provided by this Court's Order awarding Class Counsels' Award for attorneys' fees and litigation
3 costs.

4 18. The Court sets a Hearing Re: Distribution of Settlement Funds for July 27, 2026,
5 at 8:30 a.m. Class Counsel are ordered to file a Final Report Re: Distribution of the Settlement
6 Funds by the Administrator five court days prior.

7
8 DATED: August 29, 2025

 Signed: 8/29/2025 09:54 AM
Honorable Bernard C. Barmann, Jr.
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 BCV-22-100597
28 VALENZUELA JR. VS MRC GLOBAL (US) INC.