

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
 Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
 Eric J. Naessig, Esq. (SBN 343081)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
 8889 W Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
 Beverly Hills, California 90211
 Telephone: (310) 432-0000
 Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
 Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
 vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
 enaessig@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff IVONNE SANCHEZ,
 on behalf of herself and others similarly situated.

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

11/20/2025

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: A. Rosas Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

IVONNE SANCHEZ, on behalf of herself and
 others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

INNOVATIVE WAREHOUSING
 SOLUTIONS, LLC; and DOES 1 to 100,
 inclusive,

Defendants.

IVONNE SANCHEZ, on behalf of herself and
 current and former aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

INNOVATIVE WAREHOUSING
 SOLUTIONS, LLC; and DOES 1 to 100,
 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23STCV14380
 PAGA Case No.: 23STCV20736

CLASS/PAGA ACTION

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Carolyn
 B. Kuhl, Dept. 12]*

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

*[Filed concurrently with the Declaration of
 Eric J. Naessig in Support; and Plaintiff's
 Notice of Motion and Motion for Final
 Approval of Class Action Settlement and
 Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees and
 Costs]*

Hearing Information:
 Date: November 20, 2025
 Time: 10:30 a.m.
 Department: 12

1 The above captioned action is a putative class action and representative lawsuit brought by
2 Plaintiff Ivonne Sanchez (“Plaintiff”) against Defendant Innovative Warehousing Solutions, LLC
3 (“Defendant”). In the lawsuit, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay wages for all hours worked
4 at minimum wage, failed to pay overtime wages for daily overtime worked, failed to authorize or
5 permit meal periods, failed to authorize or permit rest, failed to produce request employment records,
6 failed to provide complete and accurate wage statements, failed to timely pay all earned wages and
7 final paychecks due at time of separation of employment, and that these actions violated the Labor
8 Code and Business and Professions Code and gave rise to additional civil penalties pursuant to the
9 PAGA.

10 Defendant denies all alleged wrongdoing, denies any liability to the Plaintiff, to members of
11 the putative class, and to allegedly aggrieved employees, and denies that Plaintiff’s claims are
12 appropriate for class or representative treatment.

13 On June 4, 2025, this Court signed the order granting preliminary approval of the class action
14 settlement, resulting in preliminary certification of the following class for settlement purposes only:
15 any person employed by Defendant in California and classified as an hourly, nonexempt employee
16 who worked for Defendant during the Class Period (“Class” or “Class Members”). The “Class Period”
17 is the period from June 21, 2019, through January 6, 2025.

18 The Court further directed the Plaintiff to provide notice to the class, which informed absent
19 class members about information about the settlement, including: (a) the proposed settlement, and the
20 settlement’s key terms; (b) the date, time and location of the Final Approval Hearing; (c) the right of
21 any Class Member to object to the proposed settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to
22 exercise that right; (d) the right of any class member to exclude themselves from the proposed
23 settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to exercise that right; and (e) an explanation of the
24 procedures for class members to participate in the proposed settlement.

25 The Court, upon notice having been given as required in the preliminary approval ruling, and
26 having considered the proposed settlement agreement as well as all papers filed, hereby **ORDERS**
27 **AND ENTERS JUDGMENT AS FOLLOWS:**

1 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action and over the Parties,
2 including all members of the settlement class.

3 2. The Court finds that the class is properly certified as a class for settlement purposes
4 only.

5 3. The notice provided to the class members conforms with the requirements of
6 California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Civil Code section 1781, California Rules
7 of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, the Court's order granting
8 preliminary approval, and any other applicable law, and constitutes the best notice practicable under
9 the circumstances, by providing individual notice to all class members who could be identified
10 through reasonable effort, and by providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the
11 matters set forth therein to the other class members. The notice was adequate, fully satisfied the
12 requirements of due process, and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

13 4. The Court finds the settlement was entered into in good faith, that the settlement is
14 fair, reasonable and adequate, and that the settlement satisfies the standards and applicable
15 requirements for final approval of this class action settlement under California law, including the
16 provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, Rule
17 3.769.

18 5. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendant, or by any other released
19 party, nor is this Order and Judgment a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing
20 by Defendant or any other released party. Neither this Order and Judgment, the Settlement
21 Agreement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement
22 Agreement, may be construed as, or may be used as, an admission of any fault, wrongdoing, omission,
23 concession, or liability whatsoever by or against Defendant or any of the other released parties.

24 6. No Class Members have objected to the terms of the Settlement.

25 7. No Class Members have requested to be excluded from the Settlement.

26 8. Defendant shall fund the gross settlement amount of Three Hundred Fifty Thousand
27 Dollars and Zero Cents (\$350,000.00), plus the amount necessary to pay Defendant's share of payroll
28 taxes, all within 60 days of the Court entering the Final Approval Order/Judgment.

1 8. In addition to any recovery that Plaintiff may receive under the Settlement, and in
2 recognition of the Plaintiff's efforts on behalf of the settlement class, the Court hereby approves the
3 payment of an incentive award to the Plaintiff in the amount of ~~\$10,000.00~~ ^{\$7,500.00}, payable from the gross
4 settlement amount pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

5 9. The Court approves the payment of attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the sum of
6 \$116,666.67, and the reimbursement of litigation expenses in the sum of \$20,000.00, both payable
7 from the gross settlement amount and pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreement. Both are
8 reasonable amounts. The reasonableness of the fee award is determined based on a reasonable
9 percentage of a common fund obtained for the class. The court also has considered the lodestar
10 amount. Awarding fees on a percentage basis encourages efficient litigation practices and reflects the
11 actual benefit obtained for the class.

12 10. The Court approves the payment of \$35,000.00 to civil penalties pursuant to the
13 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, payable from the gross settlement amount. Seventy-five
14 percent of this amount, \$26,250.00, will be paid to the Labor Workforce Development Agency and
15 twenty-five percent, \$8,750.00, will be paid to the Aggrieved Employees as defined in and pursuant
16 to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

17 11. The Court approves and orders payment in the amount of \$5,950.00 to ILYM Group,
18 Inc. for performance of settlement administration services pursuant to the terms of the settlement
19 agreement. This amount will be payable from the gross settlement amount and pursuant to the terms
20 of the Settlement Agreement.

21 12. The Court approves and orders funding of the settlement in compliance with the terms
22 of the settlement agreement, including the payment and disbursement schedule.

23 13. Following 180 days after the settlement administrator mails the individual settlement
24 payments to the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees; any monies and interest remaining from
25 uncashed checks shall be sent to the Controller of the State of California to be held in the class
26 member's name until claimed pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law, Code Civ. Proc. §§1500.

27 14. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(g), the Court grants final approval of the
28 Settlement Agreement and declares, that the Settlement Agreement binding on Plaintiff, all Class

Members who have not opted out, and all Aggrieved Employees, all of whom will release the Released Parties from the released claims as set forth by the approved Settlement Agreement.

15. This Court shall retain jurisdiction over all matters related to the administration and consummation of the terms of this Settlement, over the enforcement, construction and interpretation of the Settlement Agreement, over the enforcement, construction, and interpretation of the Final Judgment, including, but not limited to, the provisions therein enjoining any further litigation of Released Claims, and over the Representative Plaintiff and all Class Members (and their attorneys and law firms) in connection therewith.

16. The Plaintiff shall file a report for the settlement administrator by Sept. 28, 2026, confirming the distribution of funds, indicating the total amount paid to the class members and confirming the distribution of funds, indicating the total amount paid to the class members and confirming that all funds, including uncashed funds, have been disbursed.

17. A non-appearance case review re Compliance with the Distribution is set for Sept. 30, 2026 at _____ a.m./p.m. in this department.

18. The Court hereby enters Judgment in the case, which will be res judicata as to the released claims of Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees.

IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.

Dated: 11/20/2025



Carolyn B. Kuhl

Carolyn B. Kuhl / Judge

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge of the Superior Court