

Electronically Received 07/25/2022 05:05 PM

LIDMAN LAW, APC
Scott M. Lidman (SBN 199433)
slidman@lidmanlaw.com
Elizabeth Nguyen (SBN 238571)
enguyen@lidmanlaw.com
Milan Moore (SBN 308095)
mmoore@lidmanlaw.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 150
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 322-4772
Fax: (424) 322-4775

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ARTURO RODRIGUEZ

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC
Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
phaines@haineslawgroup.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 292-2350
Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ARTURO RODRIGUEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

ARTURO RODRIGUEZ, as an individual
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GREEN SET, INC., a California limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 21STCV30141

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Carolyn
B. Kuhl, SSC-12]*

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Date: August 23, 2022
Time: 10:30 a.m.
Dept.: SSC-12

Action filed: August 16, 2021
Trial Date: None set

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

08/23/2022

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: L. McGreené Deputy

1 The Motion of Plaintiff Arturo Rodriguez (“Plaintiff”) for Preliminary Approval of Class Action
2 Settlement will come on regularly for hearing before this Court on August 23, 2022 at 10:30 a.m. The
3 Court, having considered the proposed Stipulation of Settlement (the “Settlement”), attached as Exhibit
4 2 to the Declaration of Elizabeth Nguyen filed concurrently with the Motion; having considered
5 Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, Memorandum of Points and
6 Authorities in support thereof, and supporting declarations filed therewith; and good cause appearing,
7 HEREBY ORDERS THE FOLLOWING:

8 1. The Court GRANTS preliminary approval of the class action settlement as set forth in
9 the Settlement and finds its terms to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement that ultimately
10 could be granted approval by the Court at a Final Fairness Hearing. For purposes of the Settlement,
11 the Court finds that the proposed Settlement Class is ascertainable and that there are a sufficiently well-
12 defined community of interest among the members of the Settlement Class in questions of law and fact.
13 Therefore, for settlement purposes only, the Court grants conditional certification of the following
14 Settlement Class:

15 All current and former non-exempt, hourly employees of Defendant Green
16 Set, Inc. who worked in California at any time between August 16, 2017
17 and the date of preliminary approval, or the date on which the workweeks
worked by the Class Members reaches 17,602, whichever is earlier.

18 2. For purposes of the Settlement, the Court designates named Plaintiff Arturo Rodriguez
19 as Class Representative, and Scott M. Lidman, Elizabeth Nguyen, and Milan Moore of Lidman Law,
20 APC and Paul Haines of Haines Law Group, APC as Class Counsel.

21 4. The Court designates Simpluris as the third-party Settlement Administrator for mailing
22 notices.

23 5. The Court approves, as to form and content, the Class Notice (which is comprised of the
24 Notice of Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement and Notice of Individual Settlement
25 Award) which is attached to the Settlement as Exhibit A.

26 6. The Court finds that the form of notice to the Settlement Class regarding the pendency of
27 the action and of the Settlement, and the methods of giving notice to members of the Settlement Class,
28 constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constitute valid, due, and sufficient

notice to all members of the Settlement Class. The form and method of giving notice complies fully with the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Civil Code section 1781, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, and other applicable law.

7. The Court further approves the procedures for Settlement Class Members to opt out of or object to the Settlement, as set forth in the Class Notice.

8. The procedures and requirements for filing objections in connection with the Final Fairness Hearing are intended to ensure the efficient administration of justice and the orderly presentation of any Settlement Class Member's objection to the Settlement, in accordance with the due process rights of all Settlement Class Members.

9. The Court directs the Settlement Administrator to mail the Notice Packet to the members of the Settlement Class in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

10. The Class Notice shall provide at least 60 calendar days' notice for members of the Settlement Class to opt out of, or object to, the Settlement.

11. The Final Fairness Hearing on the question of whether the Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate is scheduled in Department SSC-12 of this Court, located at 312 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012 on Jan. 18, 2022 at 10:30 am a.m. / p.m.

12. At the Final Fairness Hearing, the Court will consider: (a) whether the Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate for the Settlement Class; (b) whether a judgment granting final approval of the Settlement should be entered; and (c) whether Plaintiff's application for reasonable attorneys' fees, reimbursement of litigation expenses, service award to Plaintiff, and payment to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") for penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") should be granted.

13. Counsel for the parties shall file memoranda, declarations, or other statements and materials in support of their request for final approval of the Settlement, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, Plaintiff's service award, settlement administration costs, and payment to the LWDA for PAGA penalties prior to the Final Fairness Hearing according to the time limits set by the Code of Civil

Procedure and the California Rules of Court.

14. An implementation schedule is below:

Event	Date
Defendant to provide Class Data to Settlement Administrator	20 calendar days after issuance of the preliminary approval order
Settlement Administrator to mail Notice Packets to Class Members	10 business days after receiving Class Information from Defendant
Deadline for Class Members to request exclusion from, submit disputes, or object to, the Settlement	60 calendar days after mailing of the Notice by the Settlement Administrator
Deadline for Plaintiff to file Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement:	
Final Fairness Hearing:	Jan. 18, 2022 at 10:30 am.

15. Pending the Final Fairness Hearing, all proceedings in this action, other than proceedings necessary to carry out or enforce the terms and conditions of the Settlement and this Order, are stayed.

16. Counsel for the parties are hereby authorized to utilize all reasonable procedures in connection with the administration of the Settlement which are not materially inconsistent with either this Order or the terms of the Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 08/23/2022, 2022



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Carolyn B. Kuhl".

Carolyn B. Kuhl / Judge

Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge of the Superior Court