

JS-6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

JOSE McDONALD, and individual, on
behalf of himself, the State of California in
Plaintiff's representative capacity as a
private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

v.

LINDE, INC. a Delaware Corporation: and
DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No. 25-CV-01795-DSF-(DFMx)

**ORDER APPROVAL INDIVIDUAL
PAGA SETTLEMENT AND
DISMISSAL OF THE ACTION**

ORDER

Having read and considered the Stipulation For Court Approval of Individual PAGA Settlement and Dismissal of the Action (“Stipulation”) of Plaintiff Jose McDonald (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Linde, Inc. (“Defendant”)(“Defendant” and, together with Plaintiff, the “Parties”), and **GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR**, it is **HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED** as follows:

1. The Parties’ Stipulation is **GRANTED**;
2. The Parties’ settlement of Plaintiff’s individual claim for penalties pursuant to Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) claim is **APPROVED** in accordance with the terms of the Stipulation;
3. Defendant shall timely make the settlement payment described in the Stipulation (and, upon receipt of the money allocated to the PAGA settlement, Plaintiff’s counsel shall cause such amount to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency in accordance with the terms of the Stipulation);
4. As of the date of this Order (and provided that Defendant satisfies its obligation to pay the settlement payment in accordance with the terms of the Stipulation), by operation of Plaintiff’s waiver and release set forth in the PAGA Settlement Agreement and Stipulation and pursuant to this Order, Plaintiff shall be deemed to have released Defendant and the “Released Parties” from all “Released Claims” (and, for purposes of this Order, the capitalized terms shall have the meanings set forth in the Stipulation and PAGA Settlement Agreement, which definitions are incorporated by reference herein);
5. In accordance with the Parties’ Stipulation, Plaintiff’s individual PAGA claim as an alleged PAGA “aggrieved employee” is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**;

6. The PAGA claims on behalf of all other allegedly “aggrieved employees” of Defendant (other than Plaintiff) are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**;

7. Except as set forth in the Parties’ Stipulation and the Parties’ PAGA Settlement Agreement, Plaintiff and Defendant shall bear their own attorneys’ fees and costs incurred in connection with the prosecution or defense of this action; and

8. Even though this entire action has been, and hereby is, dismissed, the Court shall retain jurisdiction to enforce the Parties’ Joint Stipulation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 12, 2026_



HON. DALE S. FISCHER

U.S. District Judge