

Justin F. Marquez (SBN 262417)
justin.marquez@wilshirelawfirm.com
Arsiné Grigoryan (SBN 319517)
arsine.grigoryan@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

SYLVIA CARPENTER, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRECISION STAMPINGS SOLUTIONS, INC.,
a corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CVRI2205196

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION**

[Assigned for all purposes to: Hon. Harold W.
Hopp, Dept. 1]

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

[Filed with Notice of Motion and Motion,
Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the
Declaration of Justin F. Marquez, and the
Declaration of Sylvia Carpenter]

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING

Date: December 5, 2024

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Dept: 1

Reservation ID: 668825467698

Complaint filed: November 29, 2022

FAC filed: May 2, 2023

Trial date: Not set

1 The Court has before it Plaintiff Sylvia Carpenter’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion for Preliminary
2 Approval of Class Action Settlement. Having reviewed the Motion for Preliminary Approval
3 of Class Action Settlement, the Declaration of Justin F. Marquez, the Class Action and PAGA
4 Settlement Agreement and Class Notice (which is referred to here as the “Settlement
5 Agreement”), and good cause appearing, the Court hereby finds and orders as follows:

6 1. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the Settlement Agreement appears to
7 be fair, adequate, and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements for preliminary approval.
8 The Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and the Settlement Class based upon
9 the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement between Plaintiff Sylvia Carpenter and
10 Defendant Precision Stampings Solutions, Inc. (“Defendant”), attached to the Declaration of
11 Justin F. Marquez in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action
12 Settlement as Exhibit 1.

13 2. The Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which
14 could ultimately be given final approval by this Court, and appears to be presumptively valid,
15 subject only to any objections that may be raised at the Final Approval Hearing and final
16 approval by this Court. The Court notes that Defendants have agreed to create a common fund
17 of \$785,000.00 to cover (a) settlement payments to class members who do not validly opt out;
18 (b) a \$25,000.00 payment to the State of California, Labor & Workforce Development Agency
19 for its share of the settlement of claims for penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act,
20 with 75% of which (\$18,750.00) will be paid to the LWDA and 25% (\$6,250.00) will be paid
21 to eligible Aggrieved Employees; (c) Class Representative service payment of up to \$10,000.00
22 for Plaintiff Sylvia Carpenter; (d) Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees, not to exceed 33 1/3% of the
23 Gross Settlement Amount (\$261,666.67), and up to \$10,000.00 in costs for actual litigation
24 expenses incurred by Class Counsel; and (e) Settlement Administration Costs of up to
25 \$10,000.00.

26 3. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement appear to be within
27 the range of possible approval, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and
28 applicable law. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the settlement amount is fair

1 and reasonable to the class members when balanced against the probable outcome of further
2 litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (2)
3 significant informal discovery, investigation, research, and litigation have been conducted such
4 that counsel for the parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions;
5 (3) settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks that would be presented
6 by the further prosecution of the litigation; and (4) the proposed settlement has been reached as
7 the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive negotiations between the Parties with the
8 assistance of a well-respected class action mediator. Accordingly, the Court preliminarily finds
9 that the Settlement Agreement was entered into in good faith.

10 4. A final fairness hearing on the question of whether the proposed settlement,
11 attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, payment to the State of California, Labor &
12 Workforce Development Agency for its share of the settlement of claims for penalties under the
13 Private Attorneys General Act, and the class representative's enhancement award should be
14 finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate as to the members of the class is hereby set in
15 accordance with the Implementation Schedule set forth below.

16 5. The Court provisionally certifies for settlement purposes only the following class
17 (the "Settlement Class"): "all persons employed by Defendant as non-exempt, hourly-paid
18 employee in the State of California who worked for Defendant during the Class Period."

19 6. "Class Period" means the period from October 1, 2019 to December 23, 2023.

20 7. The Court finds, for settlement purposes only, that the Settlement Class meets the
21 requirements for certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 in that: (1) the
22 Settlement Class Members are so numerous that joinder is impractical; (2) there are questions
23 of law and fact that are common, or of general interest, to all Settlement Class Members, which
24 predominate over individual issues; (3) Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the
25 Settlement Class Members; (4) Plaintiff and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect
26 the interests of the Settlement Class Members; and (5) a class action is superior to other
27 available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

28 ///

1 8. The Court appoints as Class Representative, for settlement purposes only,
2 Plaintiff Sylvia Carpenter. The Court further preliminarily approves Plaintiff's ability to
3 request an incentive award up to \$10,000.00.

4 9. The Court appoints, for settlement purposes only, Justin F. Marquez and Arsiné
5 Grigoryan of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC as Class Counsel. The Court further preliminarily
6 approves Class Counsel's ability to request attorneys' fees of up to one-third of the Total
7 Settlement Amount (\$261,666.67), and costs not to exceed \$10,000.00.

8 10. The Court appoints ILYM Group, Inc., as the Settlement Administrator with
9 reasonable administration costs estimated not to exceed \$10,000.00.

10 11. The Court approves, as to form and content the Class Notice, attached to the
11 Settlement Agreement. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that plan for distribution of the
12 Notice to Settlement Class Members satisfies due process, provides the best notice practicable
13 under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled
14 thereto.

15 12. The parties are ordered to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the
16 Settlement Agreement.

17 13. Any class member who does not timely and validly request exclusion from the
18 settlement may object to the Settlement Agreement.

19 14. The Court orders the following Implementation Schedule:

21 Defendants to provide Class List to the 22 Settlement Administrator	14 days after notice of entry of the Court's order granting Motion for Preliminary Approval
24 Settlement Administrator to mail the Notice 25 Packets	14 days after receipt of the Class List from the Defendant
26 Response Deadline	60 days after Notice is mailed out by the Settlement Administrator

Deadline to Provide Written Objections, if any	60 days after Notice is mailed out by the Settlement Administrator
Deadline to file Motion for Final Approval, Request for Attorney's Fees and Costs, and Service Award to Plaintiff	16 court days before hearing on Motion for Final Approval, which is _____;
Final Approval Hearing	_____ at _____ a.m./p.m., or first available date thereafter, in Department 28. The hearing may be continued to another date without further notice to the Class Members.

15. The Court further ORDERS that, pending further order of this Court, all proceedings in this lawsuit, except those contemplated herein and in the settlement, are stayed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE:

Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Riverside County Superior Court

Sylvia Carpenter v. Precision Stampings Solutions, Inc.
CVRI2205196

[illegible]

On October 10, 2024, I served the foregoing **[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**, on the interested parties by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope by following one of the methods of service as follows:

Cynthia M. Germano (SBN 151360)
cynthia.germano@bbklaw.com
 Cecilia Martin (SBN 301027)
Cecilia.Martin@bbklaw.com
 Kieran D. Hartley (SBN 301947)
Kieran.Hartley@bbklaw.com
 Lisa Ruiz-Cambio
lisa.ruiz-cambio@bbklaw.com
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
 3390 University Avenue, 5th Floor
 Riverside, California 92502
 Telephone: (951) 686-1450
 Facsimile: (951) 686-3083

Attorneys for Defendant

(X) **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known email address or e-mail of record in this action.

(X) **BY UPLOAD:** I hereby certify that the documents were uploaded by my office to the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency Online Filing Site.

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

Executed on October 10, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.


Sandy Sespene