

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF IMPERIAL**

BRIANA AGUIRRE, in a Representative
capacity, and on behalf of other members
of the general public similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MMPR EL CENTRO CAFÉ LLC, a
California Limited Liability Company;
and DOES 1-10, inclusive

Defendants

CASE NO. ECU004348

**[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING PAGA
SETTLEMENT & ENTRY OF JUDGMENT**

Date: July 9, 2026

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Jeffrey B. Jones

Dept: 5

TO ALL PARTIES HEREIN AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Plaintiff BRIANA AGUIRRE's Unopposed Motion for PAGA Settlement Approval was
heard in Department 5 of the above-entitled Court on July 9, 2026, at 8:30 a.m.

Having read and considered the application filed by Plaintiff's Counsel, any opposition thereto,
and the arguments of the parties, the Court finds there are sufficient grounds to grant Plaintiff's
Motion. Accordingly, good cause appearing therefore,

1 **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

2 The Court has reviewed and approves the terms of the parties settlement pursuant to the Private
3 Attorneys General Act (PAGA);

- 4 1) The Court approves the parties proposed allocations set forth in the moving papers.
5 Specifically, the Court approves the Gross Settlement Amount of **\$45,000.00** which is
6 broken down as follows:

7 * **\$15,000.00** Attorneys' Fees (1/3 % of total settlement value);

8 * **\$3,115.59** PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment

9 * **\$3,200.39** Settlement Administrator Fees

10 * **\$15,000.00** Plaintiff's Enhancement Award

11 * **\$8,684.02** Total PAGA Penalty. 65% shall be assigned and transmitted to
12 the LWDA as penalties. The remaining 35% shall be allocated
13 to the PAGA employees in accordance with the settlement
14 terms.

- 15 2) In all other respects, Judgment is entered in accordance with the terms of the parties'
16 PAGA Settlement Agreement, which was attached to the declaration of Cody D.
17 Archer that was filed with the Court on July 9, 2026.

- 18 3) As noted in the Settlement Agreement, a judgment in this representative action brought
19 by an aggrieved employee under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004
20 is binding not only on the named plaintiff but also on government agencies and any
21 aggrieved employee not a party to this proceeding.

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

4) The Court will retain jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

HONORABLE JEFFREY B. JONES
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT