

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

MARCELINO ORTUNO and JOSE BRIAN
DE LA ROSA, both in a Representative
capacity only, and on behalf of other
members of the general public similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DUNN-EDWARDS CORPORATION, a
Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1-10,
inclusive

Defendants

CASE NO.37-2023-00046612-CU-OE-CTL

**[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING PAGA
SETTLEMENT & ENTRY OF JUDGMENT**

Date: September 19, 2025
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Dept.: C-74
Judge: Hon. Blaine K. Bowman

1 TO ALL PARTIES HEREIN AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 Plaintiffs MARCELINO ORTUNO and BRIAN DE LA ROSA's Unopposed Motion for
3 PAGA Settlement Approval was heard in Department C-74 of the above-entitled Court on September
4 19, 2025, at 8:30 a.m.

5 Having read and considered the application filed by Plaintiff's Counsel, any opposition thereto,
6 and the arguments of the parties, the Court finds there are sufficient grounds to grant Plaintiff's
7 Motion. Accordingly, good cause appearing therefore,

8 **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

9 The Court has reviewed and approves the terms of the parties settlement pursuant to the Private
10 Attorneys General Act (PAGA);

- 11 1) The Court approves the parties proposed allocations set forth in the moving papers.
12 Specifically, the Court approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$1,250,000.00 which
13 is broken down as follows:

14	*	\$416,666.66	Attorneys' Fees (33% of total settlement value);
15	*	\$21,000.00	PAGA Counsel Expenses Payment
16	*	\$7,600.00	Settlement Administrator Fees
17	*	\$20,000.00	Plaintiffs' Enhancement Award
18	*	\$784,733.34	Total PAGA Penalty. 75% shall be assigned and transmitted to
19			the LWDA as penalties. The remaining 25% shall be allocated
20			to the PAGA employees.

- 21 2) In all other respects, Judgment is entered in accordance with the terms of the parties'
22 PAGA Settlement Agreement, which was attached to the declaration of Ryan T. Kuhn
23 that was filed with the Court on August 14, 2025.

- 24 3) As noted in the Settlement Agreement, a judgment in this representative action brought
25 by an aggrieved employee under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004
26 is binding not only on the named plaintiff but also on government agencies and any
27 aggrieved employee not a party to this proceeding.

- 28 4) The Court will retain jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the settlement until

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

performance in full of the terms of the settlement pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
section 664.6.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

HONORABLE BLAINE K. BOWMAN
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT