

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Samantha A. Smith (SBN 233331)
samantha.smith@wilshirelawfirm.com
Jeffrey C. Bils (SBN 301629)
jeffrey.bils@wilshirelawfirm.com
Aram Boyadjian (SBN 334009)
aram.boyadjian@wilshirelawfirm.com
Andrew Sandoval (SBN 346996)
andrew.sandoval@wilshirelawfirm.com
Bradford Smith (SBN 345879)
bradford.smith@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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

MICHAEL A. HASER, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNIVERSAL CHAIN OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
a California corporation; and DOES 1 through
10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2022-00332268-CU-OE-GDS

CLASS ACTION

*[Assigned for all purposes to: Hon. Jill J.
Talley, Dept. 23]*

**~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER GRANTING
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AND
ENTERING JUDGMENT**

FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

Date: March 21, 2025
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: 23

Complaint filed: December 30, 2022
Trial date: Not set

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Sacramento
03/21/2025
T. Shaddix, Deputy

1 This matter came on for hearing on March 21, 2025 at 9:00 a.m., in Department 23 of
2 the above-referenced Court on the Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA
3 Settlement pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769, this Court's October 18, 2024
4 Order Granting Preliminary Approval, and the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement
5 ("Settlement"), a copy of which was attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of John G. Yslas
6 in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

7 Having received and considered the Settlement, the supporting papers filed by the
8 Parties, and the evidence and argument in conjunction with the Motion for Preliminary Approval
9 of Class Action Settlement granted October 18, 2024, and the instant Motion for Final Approval
10 of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, the Court grants final approval of the Settlement and
11 HEREBY ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS:

12 1. Pursuant to the Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of
13 Class Action Settlement, the Class Notice was sent to each Class Member by First Class mail.
14 These papers informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive an
15 Individual Settlement Payment, and their right to: (a) comment on or object to the Settlement;
16 (b) request exclusion from the Settlement and pursue their own remedies; (c) dispute the
17 calculation of their Individual Settlement Payment; and (d) appear at the final approval hearing.
18 No Class Member has objected to the proposed Settlement, and only one Class Member has
19 requested exclusion.

20 2. The Court finds and determines that this notice procedure afforded adequate
21 protections to Class Members and provides the basis for the Court to make an informed decision
22 regarding approval of the Settlement based on the responses of the Class. The Court finds and
23 determines that the notice provided in this case was the best notice practicable, which satisfied
24 the requirements of law and due process.

25 3. With respect to the Class and for purposes of approving this Settlement only, this
26 Court finds and concludes that: (a) the members of the Class are ascertainable and so numerous
27 that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common the
28 class and a well-defined community of interest among members of the Class with respect to the

1 subject matter of the action; (c) the claims of Class Representative Michael A. Haser are typical
2 of the claims of the Class Members; (d) the Class Representative has fairly and adequately
3 protected the interests of the Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for
4 an efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) counsel of record for the Class
5 Representative are qualified to serve as Class Counsel.

6 4. The Court has certified a Class for settlement purposes only, defined as all current
7 and former non-exempt employees of Defendant that have worked for Defendant in the State of
8 California at any time from December 30, 2018, up to September 20, 2023. The Court deems
9 this definition sufficient for purposes of California Rules of Court, Rule 3.765(a).

10 5. The Court hereby confirms John G. Yslas, Samantha A. Smith, Jeffrey C. Bils,
11 Aram Boyadjian, and Andrew Sandoval of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC as Class Counsel.

12 6. The Court hereby confirms Plaintiff Michael A. Haser as the Class
13 Representative.

14 7. The Court finds and determines that the terms of the Settlement are fair,
15 reasonable, and adequate, and directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its
16 terms, having found that the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and non-collusive
17 arm's length negotiations facilitated by a neutral mediator. The Court finds that the Parties
18 conducted adequate investigation, research, and discovery, and that their attorneys were able to
19 reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that the Settlement will
20 enable the Parties to avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay
21 and risks if the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. The Court has reviewed the
22 monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement and recognizes the significant value
23 accorded to the Class.

24 8. The Court hereby approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$725,000.00.

25 9. The Court finds and determines that the Individual Settlement Payments to be
26 paid to Participating Class Members as provided for by the Settlement are fair and reasonable.
27 The Court hereby grants final approval to and orders the payment of those amounts to be made
28 to the Participating Class Members in accordance with the Settlement.

1 10. The Court finds and determines that payment of \$25,000.00 in civil penalties
2 under PAGA is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Labor and Workforce Development
3 Agency will receive 75% (\$18,750.00), and the remaining 25% (\$6,250.00) will be distributed
4 to Aggrieved Employees (defined as all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant
5 that have worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period
6 from December 30, 2021 to September 30, 2023). The Court hereby grants final approval to
7 and orders the payment of that amount in accordance with the Settlement.

8 11. The Court finds and determines that the fees and expenses in administering the
9 Settlement incurred by ILYM Group, Inc. in the amount of \$13,550.00 are fair and reasonable.
10 The Court hereby grants final approval to and orders the payment of that amount in accordance
11 with the Settlement.

12 12. The Court finds and determines that the Class Representative Service Payment of
13 \$10,000.00 to Plaintiff Michael A. Haser is fair and reasonable. The Court hereby grants final
14 approval to and orders the payment of that amount in accordance with the Settlement.

15 13. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, and the authorities, evidence, and
16 argument submitted by Class Counsel, the Court hereby awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees
17 in the amount of \$241,666.67 and litigation costs in the amount of \$22,000.00. The Court
18 hereby grants final approval to and orders the payment of those amounts in accordance with the
19 Settlement.

20 14. Without affecting the finality of this order or the entry of judgment in any way,
21 the Court retains jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration,
22 implementation, effectuation, and enforcement of this order and the Settlement.

23 15. Defendant Universal Chain of California, Inc. shall not have any further liability
24 for costs, expenses, interest, attorneys' fees, or for any other charge, expense, or liability, except
25 as provided for by the Settlement.

26 16. Neither the making of this Settlement nor the entry into the Settlement constitutes
27 an admission by Defendant Universal Chain of California, Inc., nor is this order a finding of the
28 validity of any claims in this case or of any other wrongdoing. Further, the Settlement is not a

1 concession, and shall not be used as an admission of any wrongdoing, fault, or omission of any
2 entity or persons, nor may any action taken to carry out the terms of the Settlement be construed
3 as an admission or concession by or against Defendant Universal Chain of California, Inc.

4 17. Nothing in this order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations
5 under the Settlement or under this order.

6 18. Upon completion of administration of the Settlement, the Settlement
7 Administrator will provide written certification of such completion to the Court, which shall be
8 filed with the Court ¹⁵~~seven~~ days before the non-appearance compliance hearing set for **October**
9 **24, 2025 at 09:00 a.m.** [or _____ at _____ a.m./p.m.] in
10 Department 23.

11 19. Class Counsel shall also file an amended judgment pursuant to California Code
12 of Civil Procedure § 384 seven days before the non-appearance compliance hearing.

13 20. The Court hereby enters final judgment in accordance with the terms of the
14 Settlement, the Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action
15 Settlement, and this Order.

16 21. The Parties will bear their own costs and attorneys' fees except as otherwise
17 provided by this Court's Order awarding Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and litigation costs.

18
19
20 Dated: 03/21/2025



Jill Talley

Honorable Jill J. Talley
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT