

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Jeffrey C. Bils (SBN 301629)
jeffrey.bils@wilshirelawfirm.com
Shealene P. Mancuso (SBN 331740)
shealene.mancuso@wilshirelawfirm.com
Mohamed Bholat (SBN 361439)
mohamed.bholat@wilshirelawfirm.com
Courtney M. Miller (SBN 327850)
courtney.miller@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

MIA ZARAGOZA, individually, and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

WE DO DOUGH RIVERBANK, INC., a
California corporation, CRUMBLE COOKIES
EAST RIVERSIDE LLC, a California limited
liability company; CRUMBL COOKIES –
EAST RIVERSIDE LLC, a California limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CV-23-001653

*[Assigned for All Purposes to the Hon. Clifford
Tong, Dept. 23]*

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

Preliminary Approval Hearing:

Date: December 17, 2026

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Dept.: 23

Action Filed: March 3, 2023

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Having reviewed Plaintiff Mia Zaragoza's ("Plaintiff") Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Motion"), the Declaration of John G. Yslas, Plaintiff's Declaration, and the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement"), and good cause appearing, the Court finds and orders as follows:

1. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the Settlement Agreement appears to be fair, adequate, and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements for preliminary approval. The Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and the Settlement Class based on the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement between Plaintiff and Defendant We Do Dough Riverbank, Inc. ("Defendant"), attached to the Declaration of John G. Yslas in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement as **Exhibit 2**.

2. The Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which could ultimately be given final approval by this Court, and appears to be presumptively valid, subject only to any objections that may be raised at the Final Approval Hearing and final approval by this Court. The Court notes that Defendant has agreed to create a common fund of \$100,000.00 to cover (a) settlement payments to Class Members who do not validly opt out; (b) a \$10,000.00 allocation toward civil penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), 75% of which (\$7,500.00) will be paid to California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency and 25% of which (\$2,500.00) will be paid to Aggrieved Employees; (c) a Class Representative Service Payment of up to \$5,000.00 to Plaintiff; (d) Class Counsel's attorneys' fees, not to exceed one third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (currently estimated to be \$33,333.33), and up to \$25,000.00 in costs for actual litigation expenses incurred by Class Counsel; and (e) Settlement Administration Costs of up to \$5,550.00.

3. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement appear to be within the range of possible approval, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and applicable law. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the Settlement amount is fair and reasonable to the Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (2) significant informal discovery,

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

8 4. A final approval hearing on the question of whether the proposed Settlement,
9 attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, payment to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees for
10 their share of the settlement of claims for penalties under PAGA, and the Class Representative
11 Service Payment should be finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate as to the members of
12 the Class is hereby set in accordance with the Implementation Schedule set forth below.

13 5. The Court provisionally certifies for settlement purposes only the following class (the
14 "Class"): "all persons who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt
15 employee at any time during the Class Period."

16 6. "Class Period" means the period from October 3, 2018, through November 9, 2025.

17 7. "Aggrieved Employees" means all persons who worked for Defendant in
18 California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period.

19 8. "PAGA Period" means the period from April 5, 2022, through November 9, 2025.

20 9. 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 of law
23 and fact that are common, or of general interest, to all Settlement Class Members, which predominate
24 over individual issues; (3) Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class
25 Members; (4) Plaintiff and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the
26 Settlement Class Members; and (5) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
27 and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

28 ///

10. The Court appoints as Class Representative, for settlement purposes only, Plaintiff Mia Zaragoza. The Court further preliminarily approves Plaintiff's ability to request a Class Representative Service Award up to \$5,000.00.

11. The Court appoints, for settlement purposes only, John G. Yslas, Jeffrey C. Bils, Shealene P. Mancuso, Mohamed Bholat, and Courtney M. Miller of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC, as Class Counsel. The Court further preliminarily approves Class Counsel's ability to request attorneys' fees of up to one third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (currently estimated to be \$33,333.33), and costs not to exceed \$25,000.00.

12. The Court appoints Apex Class Action as the Settlement Administrator with reasonable administration costs not to exceed \$5,550.00.

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

14. The Parties and the Administrator are ordered to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

15. Any Class Member who does not timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement may object to the Settlement Agreement.

16. The Court orders the following Implementation Schedule:

Event	Timing
Class Data: Last day for Defendant to provide Class Data to the Administrator	10 days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement
Class Notice: Last day for Administrator to mail the Class Notice to Class Members	14 days after receipt of the Class Data

Response Deadline: Last day for Class Members to submit Requests for Exclusion, Objections to the Settlement, and challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods	45 days after Class Notice is mailed out by the Administrator (with an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice was remailed)
Filing Deadline: Last day to file Motion for Final Approval, Request for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff	16 court days before the Final Approval Hearing
Final Approval Hearing	May 6, 2027, at 8:30 a.m., or a date and time more convenient for the Court: _____, at 8:30 a.m., in Dept. 23 of the above-referenced Court

17. 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.

DATED: _____

HON. CLIFFORD TONG
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT