

HEATHER DAVIS, SBN 239372
heather@protectionlawgroup.com
RYAN CHUMAN, SBN 300695
ryanc@protectionlawgroup.com
ARNEL O. TAN, SBN 242728
arnel@protectionlawgroup.com
JOSEPH MARSHALL, SBN 354066
joe@protectionlawgroup.com
CHRISTINE V. REYES, SBN 346719
christine@protectionlawgroup.com
PROTECTION LAW GROUP, LLP
149 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, California 90245
Telephone: (424) 290-3095
Facsimile: (866) 264-7880

Attorneys for Plaintiff
SERGIO A. RENTERIA

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

SERGIO A. RENTERIA, as an aggrieved
employee and Private Attorney General,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PARAMOUNT EXPORT COMPANY, a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through
50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV028255

*Assigned for All Purposes to: Hon. Michael
Markman, Dept. 23*

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER
GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR ORDER APPROVING
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
SETTLEMENT AND ENTERING
JUDGMENT**

Complaint Filed: February 22, 2023
Trial Date: None Set

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on February 25, 2025, The Honorable Michael Markman,
3 in Department 23 of the above-entitled Court, located at Rene C. Davidson Courthouse, 1221 Oak
4 Street Oakland, CA 94612, issued a Minute Order and executed the Order granting Plaintiff's
5 Motion For Order Approving California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act Settlement
6 And Entering Judgment.

7 Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the Signed Order granting
8 Plaintiff's Motion For Order Approving California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act
9 Settlement And Entering Judgment, which was executed and filed on February 25 2025. Attached
10 hereto as **Exhibit B** is a true and correct copy of the Minute Order granting Plaintiff's Motion For
11 Order Approving California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act Settlement And Entering
12 Judgment, which was issued and filed on February 25, 2025.

13
14 Dated: February 25, 2025

PROTECTION LAW GROUP, LLP

15
16 By:



17 Ryan Chuman
18 Arnel Tan
19 Joseph Marshall
20 Christine V. Reyes
21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit A

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse

Sergio A. Renteria
Plaintiff/Petitioner(s)
VS.
Paramount Export Company
Defendant/Respondent
(s)

No. 23CV028255

Date: 02/25/2025

Time: 10:00 AM

Dept: 23

Judge: Michael Markman

ORDER re: Hearing on Motion for
Order Approving PAGA
Settlement and Entering
Judgment; Case
Management Conference
filed by Sergio A. Renteria
(Plaintiff) on

The Motion for Order NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT SETTLEMENT AND ENTERING JUDGMENT filed by Sergio A. Renteria on 12/20/2024 is Granted.

BACKGROUND FACTS

This is a PAGA representative action based on alleged violations of the Labor Code. Plaintiff Sergio A. Renteria, on behalf of the California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), and Defendant Paramount Export Company have agreed to settle the claims for a gross settlement of \$75,000.00, which includes \$25,000.00 in attorney's fees; \$4,536.29 in litigation costs; a \$2,500.00 service award for the representative plaintiff; and \$2,500.00 in settlement administration costs. The remaining settlement amount would go to PAGA civil penalties (75% to LWDA and 25% to aggrieved employees on a pro rata basis). Plaintiff estimates, based on Defendant's records, that there are 66 aggrieved employees. (Davis Decl., ¶ 40.) Plaintiff notified the LWDA of the proposed settlement. (See Davis Decl. ¶¶ 25, 103, Ex. C.)

LEGAL STANDARD

Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (PAGA), an employee aggrieved by his or her employer's alleged Labor Code violations may be authorized to act as an agent of the Labor Workforce and Development Agency (LWDA) to bring a civil action to recover civil

ORDER re: Hearing on Motion for Order Approving PAGA Settlement and
Entering Judgment; Case Management Conference filed by
Sergio A. Renteria (Plaintiff) on

Page 1 of 3

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse

penalties. Once an aggrieved employee files a PAGA lawsuit, the statutory scheme recognizes that the employee may settle that lawsuit on behalf of the state. (See Lab. Code, § 2699, subds. (a) & (1)(2).) “The superior court shall review and approve any settlement,” and the “proposed settlement shall be submitted to the [LWDA] at the same time that it is submitted to the court.” (*Id.*, § 2699, subd. (1)(2).) A “trial court should evaluate a PAGA settlement to determine whether it is fair, reasonable, and adequate in view of PAGA’s purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones, and to maximize enforcement of state labor laws.” (*Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77.) Although PAGA cases and class actions are different, the analysis for settlement approval is similar and involves many of the same factors, “including the strength of the plaintiff’s case, the risk, the stage of the proceeding, the complexity and likely duration of further litigation, and the settlement amount.” (*Ibid.*)

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff investigated and took discovery, and the parties settled after participating in an Early Settlement Conference in Department 301. (See Davis Decl., ¶¶ 11, 50–55, 38–39.) The court gives “considerable weight to the competency and integrity of counsel and the involvement of a neutral mediator in assuring itself that a settlement agreement represents an arm’s length transaction entered without self-dealing or other potential misconduct.” (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129 [class action context].) Plaintiff’s counsel cites extensive experience and attests to an investigation sufficient to allow both sides to evaluate the case. (Davis Decl., ¶ 11, 50–81.) At the court’s request, the parties revised the scope of the PAGA release and identified a beneficiary for unclaimed funds in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 384. The court is satisfied that the PAGA settlement is “fair to those affected.” (*Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 549.)

The court’s benchmark for attorney’s fees in PAGA cases is 30%, but the court will approve the 33% award requested in this case, as it more closely approximates the value of the legal work performed. (See *Robbins v. Alibrandi*, 127 Cal.App.4th 438, 452.) Ten percent of the attorney’s fee award must be held by the settlement administrator until completion of the distribution process and court approval of a final accounting.

ORDER

Plaintiff’s motion for approval of PAGA settlement is GRANTED. A compliance hearing for final accounting is set for May 22, 2025 at 10:00 am in Department 23.

Compliance Hearing is scheduled for 05/22/2025 at 10:00 AM in Department 23 at Rene C. Davidson Courthouse.

The Case Management Conference scheduled for 02/25/2025 is vacated .

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse

Dated : 02/25/2025

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Markman".

Michael Markman / Judge

Exhibit B

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse, Department 23

JUDICIAL OFFICER: HONORABLE MICHAEL MARKMAN

Courtroom Clerk: Ana Liza Tumonong

CSR: None

23CV028255

February 25, 2025

10:00 AM

RENTENA

vs

PARAMOUNT EXPORT COMPANY

MINUTES

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: Hearing on Motion for Order Approving PAGA Settlement and Entering Judgment; Case Management Conference filed by Sergio A. Renteria (Plaintiff) on

The Motion for Order NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT SETTLEMENT AND ENTERING JUDGMENT filed by Sergio A. Renteria on 12/20/2024 is Granted.

BACKGROUND FACTS

This is a PAGA representative action based on alleged violations of the Labor Code. Plaintiff Sergio A. Renteria, on behalf of the California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), and Defendant Paramount Export Company have agreed to settle the claims for a gross settlement of \$75,000.00, which includes \$25,000.00 in attorney's fees; \$4,536.29 in litigation costs; a \$2,500.00 service award for the representative plaintiff; and \$2,500.00 in settlement administration costs. The remaining settlement amount would go to PAGA civil penalties (75% to LWDA and 25% to aggrieved employees on a pro rata basis). Plaintiff estimates, based on Defendant's records, that there are 66 aggrieved employees. (Davis Decl., ¶ 40.) Plaintiff notified the LWDA of the proposed settlement. (See Davis Decl. ¶¶ 25, 103, Ex. C.)

LEGAL STANDARD

Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (PAGA), an employee aggrieved by his or her employer's alleged Labor Code violations may be authorized to act as an agent of the Labor Workforce and Development Agency (LWDA) to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties. Once an aggrieved employee files a PAGA lawsuit, the statutory scheme recognizes that the employee may settle that lawsuit on behalf of the state. (See Lab. Code, § 2699, subds. (a) & (1)(2).) "The superior court shall review and approve any settlement," and the "proposed settlement shall be submitted to the [LWDA] at the same time that it is submitted to the court." (*Id.*, § 2699, subd. (1)(2).) A "trial court should evaluate a PAGA settlement to determine

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

whether it is fair, reasonable, and adequate in view of PAGA's purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones, and to maximize enforcement of state labor laws." (*Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77.) Although PAGA cases and class actions are different, the analysis for settlement approval is similar and involves many of the same factors, "including the strength of the plaintiff's case, the risk, the stage of the proceeding, the complexity and likely duration of further litigation, and the settlement amount." (*Ibid.*)

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff investigated and took discovery, and the parties settled after participating in an Early Settlement Conference in Department 301. (See Davis Decl., ¶¶ 11, 50–55, 38–39.) The court gives "considerable weight to the competency and integrity of counsel and the involvement of a neutral mediator in assuring itself that a settlement agreement represents an arm's length transaction entered without self-dealing or other potential misconduct." (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129 [class action context].) Plaintiff's counsel cites extensive experience and attests to an investigation sufficient to allow both sides to evaluate the case. (Davis Decl., ¶ 11, 50–81.) At the court's request, the parties revised the scope of the PAGA release and identified a beneficiary for unclaimed funds in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 384. The court is satisfied that the PAGA settlement is "fair to those affected." (*Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 549.)

The court's benchmark for attorney's fees in PAGA cases is 30%, but the court will approve the 33% award requested in this case, as it more closely approximates the value of the legal work performed. (See *Robbins v. Alibrandi*, 127 Cal.App.4th 438, 452.) Ten percent of the attorney's fee award must be held by the settlement administrator until completion of the distribution process and court approval of a final accounting.

ORDER

Plaintiff's motion for approval of PAGA settlement is GRANTED. A compliance hearing for final accounting is set for May 22, 2025 at 10:00 am in Department 23.

Compliance Hearing is scheduled for 05/22/2025 at 10:00 AM in Department 23 at Rene C. Davidson Courthouse.

The Case Management Conference scheduled for 02/25/2025 is vacated .



By: A. Tumonong, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Minutes of: 02/25/2025

Entered on: 02/25/2025

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

PROOF OF SERVICE

Renteria v. Paramount Export Company. Case No.: 23CV028255

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 149 Sheldon Street, El Segundo, CA 90245.

On February 25, 2025, I served the following documents described as:

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER
APPROVING CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT SETTLEMENT AND ENTERING JUDGMENT**

BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the document(s) to be sent from jessicav@protectionlawgroup.com to the person(s) at the e-mail address(es) listed.

HANSON BRIDGETT

Gilbert J. Tsai, Esq.

Josue Aparicio, Esq.

Teresa E. Villicaña

425 Market Street, 26th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94105

T: (415) 777-3200

F: (415) 541-9366

E: gtsai@hansonbridgett.com; japaricio@hansonbridgett.com; tvillicana@hansonbridgett.com; jleong@hansonbridgett.com;

(Attorneys for Defendant, PARAMOUNT EXPORT COMPANY)

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

Executed on February 25, 2025, at El Segundo, California.

Jessica Villarreal
Jessica Villarreal