

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lucy H. Nguyen (SBN 338783)
lucy.nguyen@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

TIANA GONZALES, individually, and on behalf
of all others similarly situated, and on behalf of
the State of California and other aggrieved
persons; ADAN GALAVIZ, individually, and on
behalf of the State of California and other
aggrieved persons,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SO CAL SANTA FE LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company; SO CAL GYMS LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; SO CAL
COMPTON LLC, a California
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STCV12882

*[Assigned for All Purposes to the Honorable
Bruce G. Iwasaki, Dept. 14]*

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Preliminary Approval Hearing:

Date: May 4, 2027

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept.: 11

Action Filed: May 22, 2024

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Having reviewed Plaintiffs Tiana Gonzales and Adan Galaviz's ("Plaintiffs") Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Motion"), the Declaration of John G. Yslas, Plaintiffs' Declarations, and the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement"), and good cause appearing, the Court finds and orders as follows:

1. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the Settlement Agreement appears to be fair, adequate, and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements for preliminary approval. The Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and the Settlement Class based on the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement between Plaintiffs and Defendants So Cal Santa Fe, LLC, So Cal Gyms, LLC, and So Cal Compton LLC ("Defendants"), attached to the Declaration of John G. Yslas in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement as **Exhibit 3**.

2. The Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which could ultimately be given final approval by this Court, and appears to be presumptively valid, subject only to any objections that may be raised at the Final Approval Hearing and final approval by this Court. The Court notes that Defendants have agreed to create a common fund of \$140,000.00 to cover (a) settlement payments to Class Members who do not validly opt out; (b) a \$7,000.00 allocation toward civil penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), 75% of which (\$5,250.00) will be paid to California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency and 25% of which (\$1,750.00) will be paid to Aggrieved Employees; (c) a Class Representative Service Payment of up to \$10,000.00 to each named Plaintiff (\$20,000.00 total); (d) Class Counsel's attorneys' fees, not to exceed one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (currently estimated to be \$46,666.67), and up to \$30,000.00 in costs for actual litigation expenses incurred by Class Counsel; and (e) Settlement Administration Costs of up to \$6,450.00.

3. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement appear to be within the range of possible approval, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and applicable law. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the Settlement amount is fair and reasonable to the Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to class

1 certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (2) significant informal discovery,
2 investigation, research, and litigation have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties at this
3 time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions; (3) settlement at this time will avoid
4 substantial costs, delay, and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the litigation;
5 and (4) the proposed Settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive
6 negotiations between the Parties with the assistance of a well-respected class action mediator.
7 Accordingly, the Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement Agreement was entered into in good
8 faith.

9 4. A final approval hearing on the question of whether the proposed Settlement,
10 attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, payment to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees for
11 their share of the settlement of claims for penalties under PAGA, and the Class Representative
12 Service Payment should be finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate as to the members of
13 the Class is hereby set in accordance with the Implementation Schedule set forth below.

14 5. The Court provisionally certifies for settlement purposes only the following class (the
15 "Gonzales Class"): "all persons who worked for Defendant So Cal Gyms, LLC and Defendant
16 So Cal Santa Fe, LLC in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time
17 during the Gonzales Class Period."

18 6. "Gonzales Class Period" means the period from March 18, 2021, through August 1,
19 2023.

20 7. "Gonzales Aggrieved Employees" means all persons who worked for Defendant
21 So Cal Gyms, LLC and Defendant So Cal Santa Fe, LLC in California as an hourly-paid or non-
22 exempt employee at any time during the Gonzales PAGA Period.

23 8. "Gonzales PAGA Period" means the period from March 29, 2023, through October
24 23, 2025.

25 9. "Galaviz Aggrieved Employees" means all persons who worked for Defendant So
26 Cal Compton LLC in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during
27 the Galaviz PAGA Period.

28 10. "Galaviz PAGA Period" means the period from April 4, 2024, through October 23,

2025.

11. The Court finds, for settlement purposes only, that the Settlement Class meets the requirements for certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 in that: (1) the Settlement Class Members are so numerous that joinder is impractical; (2) there are questions of law and fact that are common, or of general interest, to all Settlement Class Members, which predominate over individual issues; (3) Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class Members; (4) Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Settlement Class Members; and (5) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

12. The Court appoints as Class Representative, for settlement purposes only, Plaintiffs Tiana Gonzales and Adan Galaviz. The Court further preliminarily approves Plaintiffs' ability to request a Class Representative Service Award up to \$10,000.00 per named plaintiff.

13. The Court appoints, for settlement purposes only, John G. Yslas, Eugene Zinovyev, John Brown, Gabriella Solé, and Lucy H. Nguyen of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC, as Class Counsel. The Court further preliminarily approves Class Counsel's ability to request attorneys' fees of up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (currently estimated to be \$46,666.67), and costs not to exceed \$30,000.00.

14. The Court appoints ILYM Group, Inc. as the Settlement Administrator with reasonable administration costs not to exceed \$6,450.00.

15. The Court approves, as to form and content, the Class Notice (the "Class Notice") attached to the Settlement Agreement as **Exhibit A**. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the plan for distribution of the Class Notice to Settlement Class Members satisfies due process, provides the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

16. The Parties and the Administrator are ordered to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

17. Any Class Member who does not timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement may object to the Settlement Agreement.

18. The Court orders the following Implementation Schedule:

Event	Timing
Class Data: Last day for Defendant to provide Class Data to the Administrator	30 days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement
Class Notice: Last day for Administrator to mail the Class Notice to Class Members	14 days after receipt of the Class Data
Response Deadline: Last day for Class Members to submit Requests for Exclusion, Objections to the Settlement, and challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods	45 days after Class Notice is mailed out by the Administrator (with an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice was remailed)
Filing Deadline: Last day to file Motion for Final Approval, Request for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiffs	16 court days before the Final Approval Hearing
Final Approval Hearing	_____, 2026, at _____ a.m./p.m. in Dept. 14 of the above-referenced Court

19. The Court further ORDERS that, pending further order of this Court, all proceedings in this lawsuit, except those contemplated herein and in the settlement, are stayed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

HON. BRUCE G. IWASAKI
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT