

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 19

24STCV01585

**LUKAS NOURI vs SUNSET ATHLETIC CLUB, LLC (A
CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY), et al.**

February 11, 2026

8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Doreen B. Boxer
Judicial Assistant: Jose Raul Cruz
Courtroom Assistant: J. Turriaga

CSR: None
ERM: None
Deputy Sheriff: None

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff(s): Amy S Ramsey via TEAMS

For Defendant(s): Jiaying Chen for Peter Choi via TEAMS

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: Hearing on Motion for Order Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement

The Court's tentative ruling is posted on the Court website for parties to review.

The case is called for hearing.

The Hearing on Motion for Order Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement is held and argued.

After argument, the Court rules as follows:

The Court adopts the Tentative Ruling as the Final Order of the Court.

RULING:

The Court grants the Motion and will sign and file the proposed Order received on January 14, 2026.

I. BACKGROUND

On January 22, 2024, LUKAS NOURI (Plaintiff) filed a Complaint against SUNSET ATHLETIC CLUB, LLC dba MONARCH ATHLETIC CLUB; RYAN GREENE; and MONARCH BRENTWOOD LLC (Defendants).

On April 15, 2024, Plaintiff filed the First Amended Complaint including PAGA claims. Allegedly, Defendants misclassified employees as independent contractors.

On January 28, 2025, Plaintiff filed an Amendment to the Complaint adding MONARCH BRENTWOOD, LLC as Defendant.

On January 14, 2026, Plaintiff filed the Motion to Approve PAGA Settlement, based upon a

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 19

24STCV01585

LUKAS NOURI vs SUNSET ATHLETIC CLUB, LLC (A
CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY), et al.

February 11, 2026

8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Doreen B. Boxer
Judicial Assistant: Jose Raul Cruz
Courtroom Assistant: J. Turriaga

CSR: None
ERM: None
Deputy Sheriff: None

Cause of Action not dismissed by the Request for Dismissal of some claims, filed on January 16, 2026.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

“The superior court shall review and approve any proposed [PAGA] settlement of alleged violations of the provisions of Division 5 (commencing with Section 6300) to ensure that the settlement provisions are at least as effective as the protections or remedies provided by state and federal law or regulation for the alleged violation. The provisions of the settlement relating to health and safety laws shall be submitted to the division at the same time that they are submitted to the court. This requirement shall be construed to authorize and permit the division to comment on those settlement provisions, and the court shall grant the division’s commentary the appropriate weight.” (Lab. Code § 2699.3, subd. (b)(4).)

“If parties in a PAGA lawsuit agree to settle, the ‘proposed settlement shall be submitted to the [LWDA],’ and the ‘court shall review and approve [the] settlement.’” ([Labor Code] § 2699, subd. (l)(2).) Although our Supreme Court has stated that this provision ensures that ‘any negotiated resolution is fair to those affected’ ..., California courts have not determined the standards by which a trial court reviews and approves a proposed settlement.” (*Starks v. Vortex Indus., Inc.* (2020) 53 Cal.App.5th 1113, 1124. Accord *Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 549 [“PAGA settlements are subject to trial court review and approval, ensuring that any negotiated resolution is fair to those affected.”].)

“There is no willful failure to pay wages if the employer and employee have a good faith dispute as to whether and when the wages were due.” (*Nordstrom Com. Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576, 584.)

III. ANALYSIS

Plaintiff requests the following Order provisions:

1. The stipulated PAGA settlement is approved.
2. Plaintiff’s Counsel shall be awarded \$15,150.
3. The remainder of the Gross Settlement Amount shall be used to pay administration costs, pay the LWDA, and then shall be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees with a Notice of PAGA Settlement, as provided for in the Settlement Agreement.

Plaintiff reports detailed discovery and mediation efforts, before reaching the settlement agreement. (Motion, Exhibit 1.) Defendants will pay \$50,500.00. Plaintiff settled for that amount, considering risks involved, including proof difficulties, issue disputes, and a risk of Defendants’ bankruptcy and inability to pay. Also, Plaintiff’s counsel agrees to seek fees and costs not to exceed 30% of that settlement amount (i.e., \$15,150.00).

Judges are to apply an appropriate standard of review of Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 19

24STCV01585

**LUKAS NOURI vs SUNSET ATHLETIC CLUB, LLC (A
CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY), et al.**

February 11, 2026

8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Doreen B. Boxer

Judicial Assistant: Jose Raul Cruz

Courtroom Assistant: J. Turriaga

CSR: None

ERM: None

Deputy Sheriff: None

case settlements, by inquiring whether settlements are “fair, adequate, and reasonable” and “meaningful and consistent with the purposes of PAGA...” (*Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 64.)

Here, the Court finds that the subject settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, meaningful and consistent with the purposes of the PAGA statute, as to all subject, affected employees.

Importantly, here, the Court takes into consideration the reported trial risks of being unable to obtain any better recovery.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Court grants the Motion.

On the Court's own motion, the Order to Show Cause Re: Dismissal (Settlement) scheduled for 02/20/2026 is advanced to this date and continued to 05/07/2026 at 08:30 AM in Department 19 at Stanley Mosk Courthouse.

The Clerk shall give notice.

Certificate of Mailing is attached.