

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
H. Scott Leviant (SBN 200834)
Sandy Pham (SBN 352753)
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125
E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: hsleviant@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: spham@moonlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, ANGELICA MENDOZA

Nazo Koulloukian (SBN 263809)
Hilary Silvia (SBN 237993)
KOUL LAW FIRM
3435 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1710
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Telephone: (213) 761-5484
Facsimile: (818) 561-3938
E-mail: nazo@koullaw.com
E-mail: hilary@koullaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, HEIDI BIBIANO

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ORANGE

ANGELICA MENDOZA and HEIDI BIBIANO,
individually, and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

JDC FOOD SERVICES, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2023-01330193-CU-OE-CXC

CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

[Hon. David A. Hoffer]

CLASS ACTION

**AMENDED ~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER
GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

RESERVATION NO.: **74472310**

Date: May 23, 2025
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Courtroom: CX-103
Judge: Hon. David A. Hoffer

Action Filed: May 30, 2023
Trial Date: Not Set

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

Plaintiffs ANGELICA MENDOZA and HEIDI BIBIANO filed a Motion for Preliminary Approval of the proposed settlement of this action on the terms set forth in the CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND CLASS NOTICE (the “Agreement”). (See Declaration of H. Scott Leviant in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class and Representative Action Settlement [“Leviant Decl.”], at Exh. 1.) The matter came on for hearing.

After reviewing the Agreement, the Notice, and the entire record of this action, having heard the argument of Counsel for respective Parties, and good cause appearing, the Court Orders as follows:

1. To the extent defined in the Agreement, the terms in this Order shall have the meanings set forth therein.

2. The Court finds that the Settlement has been reached as a result of intensive, serious and non-collusive arms-length negotiations. The Court further finds that the Parties have conducted thorough investigation and research, and the attorneys for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that settlement at this time will avoid additional substantial costs, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the action. The Court finds that the risks of further prosecution are substantial.

3. Under the terms of the Settlement, the proposed monetary terms are as follows:

GSA AND ESTIMATED DEDUCTIONS	AMOUNT
Gross Settlement Amount (“GSA”)	\$565,000.00 (employer-side taxes separate)
Settlement Administration (not to exceed)	\$20,000.00
Requested Attorney’s Fees (30% of GSA)	\$169,500.00
Requested Costs (not to exceed)	\$20,000.00
PAGA Penalty Allocation	\$50,000.00
Requested Enhancements (Total)	\$10,000.00
Estimated Net Settlement Amount	\$295,500.00

1 The Court is not approving any proposed deductions or awards out of the GSA at this time.

2 4. The Parties' Settlement is granted preliminary approval as it meets the criteria for
3 preliminary settlement approval. In granting preliminary approval of the class action settlement the
4 Court has considered the factors identified in *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794 (1996), as
5 approved in *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 224 (2001) and *In re Microsoft IV*
6 *Cases*, 135 Cal. App. 4th 706 (2006). The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the proposed class
7 action Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The
8 Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness and appears to be presumptively valid, subject only
9 to any objections that may be raised at the final fairness hearing.

10 5. The Class meets the requirements for conditional certification for settlement purposes
11 only under Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The Court finds that it is appropriate to notify the members
12 of the proposed settlement Class of the terms of the proposed settlement.

13 6. The Parties' proposed notice plan is constitutionally sound because individual notices
14 will be mailed to all Class Members whose identities are known to the Parties, and such notice is the
15 best notice practicable. The Parties' proposed Class Notice, attached to the Settlement as Exhibit A, is
16 sufficient to inform Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, their rights under the settlement,
17 their rights to object to the Settlement, their right to receive a payment under the settlement or elect not
18 to participate in the settlement, and the processes for doing so, and the date and location of the final
19 approval hearing and are therefore approved.

20 7. The following persons are certified as Class Members solely for the purpose of entering
21 a settlement in this matter:

22 All persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as hourly, non-exempt
23 employees who worked for Defendant during the Class Period (the "Class Period" is the
24 period from May 30, 2019, to the earlier of 180 days after August 21, 2024, or the date
25 of preliminary approval of the Settlement). "Participating Class Member" means a
26 Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the
27 Class portion of the Settlement.

28 (Settlement, ¶¶ 1.5, 1.9, 1.12, 1.34)

8. Plaintiffs ANGELICA MENDOZA and HEIDI BIBIANO are appointed as the Class
Representatives.

9. The Court finds counsel for Plaintiffs Mendoza and Bibiano are adequate, as they are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation and have no conflicts of interest with absent Class Members, and that they adequately represented the interests of absent class members in the Litigation. Kane Moon, H. Scott Leviant, and Mariam Ghazaryan, of Moon Law Group, PC, and Nazo Koulloukian and Hilary Silvia, of Koul Law Firm, are appointed Class Counsel.

10. The Court appoints Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions to act as the Settlement Administrator, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.

11. Defendant is directed to provide the Settlement Administrator the names and most recent known mailing addresses of Class Members and any other information required in accordance with the Agreement, adhering to the following dates and deadlines:

EVENT	DATE OR DEADLINE
Class data delivered to Administrator	No later than 21 days after preliminary approval
Notice mailed to Class Members	No later than 14 days after receiving the Class data
Response Deadline	60 days after notice issues
Extended Response deadline for re-mails	60 days after notice issues plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed
Deadline to file Motion for Final Approval	16 Court days before Final Approval
Final Approval Hearing	January 26, 2026, at 1:30 p.m., in Dept. CX-103.

12. The Settlement Administrator is directed to mail the approved Class Notice by first-class mail to the Class Members in accordance with the Agreement. Before mailing, the Settlement Administrator or Class Counsel shall include the appropriate dates in the Class Notice and insert the correct time and place for the Final Approval Hearing.

13. Class Members will be bound by the Agreement unless they submit a timely and valid written request to be excluded from the Settlement, postmarked by the response deadline. Any request for exclusion shall be submitted to the Settlement Administrator rather than filed with the Court. Class members are not required to send copies of their exclusion request to counsel. The Settlement Administrator shall file, or provide to Counsel for filing, a declaration stating the number of Requests

1 for Exclusions and identifying all individuals who timely requested exclusion from the proposed Class,
2 among other information to be provided, as set forth in the Agreement.

3 14. Written objections by Class Members must be timely sent to the Administrator in
4 accordance with the Agreement. Written objections must be attached to the Administrator's declaration
5 and authenticated by the Administrator.

6 15. Upon completion of the Notice process, the Settlement Administrator shall provide a
7 report of the results of that process to Counsel for all Parties.

8 16. A final approval hearing will be held on **January 26, 2026**, at **1:30 p.m.**, in Department
9 CX-103, to determine whether the settlement should be granted final approval as fair, reasonable, and
10 adequate as to the Class Members. At that time, the Court will hear all evidence and arguments
11 necessary to evaluate the Settlement. Class Members and their counsel may support or oppose the
12 Settlement, if they so desire, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Class Notice and this
13 Order.

14 17. As set forth in the Notice, any Class Member may appear at the final approval hearing
15 in person (which "in person" appearance may be through remote appearance technology) or by his or
16 her own attorney and show cause why the Court should not approve the settlement.

17 18. The Court reserves the right to continue the date of the final approval hearing without
18 further notice to Class Members.


19 19. Class Counsel shall give notice to any objecting party of any continuance of the hearing
20 of the motion for final approval.

21 20. In the event that the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms
22 of the Agreement, then this Preliminary Approval Order shall be rendered null and void to the extent
23 provided by and in accordance with the Agreement and shall be vacated, and, in such event, all orders
24 entered and releases delivered in connection herewith shall be null and void to the extent provided by and
25 in accordance with the Agreement, and each party shall retain his or its rights to proceed with litigation
26 of the Action.

27 21. The Court retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or in
28 connection with the settlement.

1 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

2
3 **Date: September 30, 2025**

4 

5 _____
6 Hon. David A. Hoffer
7 ORANGE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE
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

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within suit; my business address is 725 S. Figueroa St., Suite 3100, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **AMENDED [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT** on the interested parties in this action by sending ☐ the original [or] ☒ a true copy thereof ☒ to interested parties as follows [or] ☐ as stated on the attached service list:

Ian B. Wieland, Esq.
David G. Litman, Esq.
SAGASER, WATKINS & WIELAND, PC
5260 North Palm Avenue, Suite 400
Fresno, California 93704
Telephone: (559) 421-7000
Facsimile: (559) 473-1483
Email: ian@sw2law.com
Email: david@sw2law.com

Nazo Koulloukian, Esq. (SBN 263809)
Hilary Silvia, Esq. (SBN 237993)
KOUL LAW FIRM
217 South Kenwood Street
Glendale, CA 91205
T: (213) 325-3023
E-mail: nazo@koullaw.com
E-mail: hilary@koullaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff, Heidi Bibiano

Counsel for Defendant, JDC Food Services, Inc.

☒ **BY MAIL (ENCLOSED IN A SEALED ENVELOPE):** I deposited the envelope(s) for mailing in the ordinary course of business at Los Angeles, California. I am “readily familiar” with this firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, sealed envelopes are deposited with the U.S. Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California.

☒ **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 e-mail address or e-mail of record in this action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this **October 1, 2025** at Los Angeles, California.

Jill Eaton
Type or Print Name

/s/ Jill Eaton
Signature

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

Civil Complex Center
751 W. Santa Ana Blvd
Santa Ana, CA 92701

SHORT TITLE: Mendoza vs. JDC Food Services, Inc.

**CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC
SERVICE**

CASE NUMBER:
30-2023-01330193-CU-OE-CXC

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that that the following document(s), Order Granting dated 09/30/25, was transmitted electronically by an Orange County Superior Court email server on October 3, 2025, at 3:09:26 PM PDT. The business mailing address is Orange County Superior Court, 700 Civic Center Dr. W, Santa Ana, California 92701. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013b, I electronically served the document(s) on the persons identified at the email addresses listed below:

KOUL LAW FIRM, APC
HILARY@KOULLAW.COM

KOUL LAW FIRM, APC
NAZO@KOULLAW.COM

MOON LAW GROUP, PC
HSLEVANT@MOONLAWGROUP.COM

MOON LAW GROUP, PC
KMOON@MOONLAWGROUP.COM

MOON LAW GROUP, PC
SPHAM@MOONLAWGROUP.COM

SAGASER, WATKINS & WIELAND, PC
DAVID@SW2LAW.COM

Clerk of the Court, by:



_____, Deputy

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE