

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

1 **[PROPOSED] ORDER**

2 WHEREAS, on July 9, 2024, at 8:30 a.m. Plaintiff Salvador Velez individually  
3 and on behalf of himself, the State of California as its designated proxy, and  
4 Aggrieved Employees (collectively, the “Plaintiffs”) in the above referenced action,  
5 via counsel, applied ex parte before this Court for an Order to Approve the parties’  
6 Private Attorneys General Act Settlement; and

7 WHEREAS, the Ex Parte Application was unopposed by Defendant.

8 After considering the papers filed in support of said application, and the Court  
9 record as a whole, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs’  
10 Application to Approve the parties’ PAGA Settlement.

11 The Court finds the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable for the  
12 Aggrieved Employees as defined in Exhibit 1 attached to the Declaration of Thomas  
13 D. Rutledge filed in support of the foregoing application.

- 14 • The settlement was reached through arm’s-length  
15 bargaining (not through fraud or collusion);  
16 • Plaintiffs’ Counsel’s investigations and discovery were  
17 sufficient to allow Plaintiffs’ Counsel and the Court to act  
18 intelligently;  
19 • Plaintiffs’ Counsel, Thomas D. Rutledge, is well  
20 experienced in employment representative action litigation  
21 and has adequately represented the State of California and  
22 the Aggrieved Employees in this action;  
23 • The case was complex and there was a certain amount of  
24 risk of appeals after lengthy litigation if the case did not  
25 resolve in the manner in which it resolved; and  
26 • The settlement amount represents a fair and reasonable  
27 settlement of the claims asserted in relationship to the  
28 potential risks of continuing to litigate the matter.

1 The Court further finds that the requested attorneys' fees, costs, and litigation  
2 expenses are reasonable.

3 Accordingly, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED as follows:

4 1. The Court approves the settlement of the above-captioned action as set  
5 forth in the Settlement Agreement and each of its releases and other terms, as fair,  
6 just, reasonable, and adequate.

7 2. The parties shall comply with all aspects of the Settlement Agreement, a  
8 copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein as reference as  
9 though set forth in full herein.

10 3. The Court further holds Plaintiff, the State of California, and the  
11 Aggrieved Employees shall be barred from pursuing any PAGA claims that are  
12 covered by the release of claims in this Settlement.

13 4. The Court approves the appointment of Phoenix Class Action Settlement  
14 Resolution, as the Settlement Administrator, to carry out the administration of the  
15 Settlement that is consistent with the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

16 5. The Court hereby enters a Judgment in this case in accordance with the  
17 terms of the Settlement Agreement and this case shall be closed within 60 days from  
18 the date of the filing of the entry of judgment.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20  
21 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
22 Hon. Gregory W. Pollack  
23 Judge of the Superior Court of California  
24 County of San Diego  
25  
26  
27  
28