

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)

shani@zakaylaw.com

Jennifer Gerstenzang (State Bar #279810)

jenny@zakaylaw.com

Eden Zakay (State Bar #339536)

eden@zakaylaw.com

Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)

jaclyn@zakaylaw.com

3110 Camino Del Rio S, Suite 308

San Diego, CA 92108

Telephone: (619) 255-9047

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)

jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600

San Diego, CA 92121

Telephone: (619) 599-8292

Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS

(Additional Attorneys on Next Page)

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

MICHAEL GONZALES and NICOLE
BURTON, individuals, on behalf of
themselves, and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MECHANICS BANK, a California
Corporation; RABOBANK, a Corporation; and
DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. C22-02261

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

Judge: Hon. Benjamin T Reyes, II

Dept.: 16

LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

Joseph Lavi, Esq.

jlavi@lelawfirm.com

Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

vgranberry@lelawfirm.com

Eve Howe, Esq.

ehowe@lelawfirm.com

8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200

Beverly Hills, CA 90211

T: 310-432-0000

F: 310-432-0001

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

///

1 This matter having come before the Honorable Benjamin T Reyes, II of the Superior Court of
2 the State of California, in and for the County of Contra Costa, with Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq., of
3 JCL Law Firm, APC, Shani O. Zakay, Esq. of Zakay Law Group, APLC, and Joseph Lavi of Lavi &
4 Ebrahimian, LLP as counsel for Plaintiffs MICHAEL GONZALES and Plaintiff NICOLE BURTON
5 (“Plaintiffs”), and Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, for Defendant MECHANICS BANK
6 (“Defendant”). The Court, having carefully considered the briefs and all the matters presented to the
7 Court, and good cause appearing, hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of
8 Class and PAGA Action Settlement.

9 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

10 1. The Court preliminarily approves the Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA
11 Claims and Release of Claims (“Settlement Agreement” or “Agreement”), a true and correct copy of
12 which is attached to the Declaration of Jean-Claude Lapuyade as Exhibit “1”. This is based on the
13 Court’s determination that the Settlement Agreement is within the range of possible final approval,
14 pursuant to the provisions of Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and California
15 Rules of Court, rule 3.769.

16 2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms
17 defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Agreement.

18 3. Subject to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Gross Settlement Amount that
19 Defendant shall pay is Three Million and Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$3,050,000.00). It
20 appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount and terms are fair, adequate, and
21 reasonable as to all Class Members and Aggrieved Employees when balanced against the probable
22 outcome of further litigation relating to certification, liability, and damages issues. It further appears
23 that investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties are able to
24 reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court that settlement at this time
25 will avoid substantial additional costs by all Parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be
26 presented by the further prosecution of the litigation. It further appears that the Settlement has been
27 reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive arms-length negotiations.

28 4. The Gross Settlement Amount is non-reversionary. Subject to final approval, the Gross

1 Settlement Amount includes a PAGA Payment of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents
2 (\$150,000.00), of which One Hundred Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents
3 (\$112,500.00) shall be paid to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and Thirty-Seven
4 Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$37,500.00) shall be distributed to Aggrieved
5 Employees. The Aggrieved Employees are all non-exempt employees who are or previously were
6 employed by Defendant and/or Rabobank, N.A. as direct employees and performed work in California
7 from March 7, 2023, through November 12, 2024. Settlement Administration Costs shall not exceed
8 Seventeen Thousand One Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$17,100.00). Defendant shall separately
9 pay its share of employer payroll taxes.

10 5. The Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement appears to be within the range of
11 reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. The Court
12 has reviewed the monetary recovery that is being granted as part of the Settlement and preliminarily
13 finds that the monetary settlement awards made available to the Class Members are fair, adequate, and
14 reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to certification,
15 liability, and damages issues.

16 6. Plaintiffs seek an award of Attorneys' Fees in the amount of up-to one-third of the Gross
17 Settlement Amount currently estimated at One Million Sixteen Thousand Six Hundred Sixty-Six
18 Dollars and Sixty-Seven Cents (\$1,016,666.67), as well as Attorneys' Expenses of up to Forty-Five
19 Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$45,000.00), and proposed Service Awards to the Class
20 Representatives, MICHAEL GONZALES and NICOLE BURTON, in an amount of not more than Ten
21 Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00) each, for a total of Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero
22 Cents (\$20,000.00). While these awards appear to be within the range of reasonableness, the Court will
23 not approve the Attorneys' Fees, Attorneys' Expenses, and Service Awards until the Final Approval
24 Hearing.

25 7. The Court recognizes that Plaintiffs and Defendant stipulate and agree to certification of
26 a class for settlement purposes only. This stipulation will not be deemed admissible in this, or any other
27 proceeding should this Settlement not become final. For settlement purposes only, the Court
28 conditionally certifies the following Class:

1 All non-exempt employees who are or previously were employed by
2 Defendant Mechanics Bank and/or Rabobank, N.A. as direct employees and
3 performed work in California during the period from October 20, 2018, to
4 November 12, 2024 (the “Class Period”). The Class excludes any non-
5 exempt employees who previously entered into settlement or severance
6 agreements with Defendant and/or Rabobank, N.A. that covers the entirety
7 of the Class Period.

8 8. The Court concludes that, for settlement purposes only, the Class meets the requirements
9 for certification under section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure in that: (a) the Class is
10 ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable; (b) common
11 questions of law and fact predominate, and there is a well-defined community of interest amongst the
12 Class Members with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c) the claims of the Class
13 Representatives are typical of the claims of the Class Members; (d) the Class Representatives will fairly
14 and adequately protect the interests of the Class Members; (e) a class action is superior to other
15 available methods for the efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) Class Counsel are qualified
16 to act as counsel for the Class Representatives in their individual capacities and as the representatives
17 of the Class Members.

18 9. The Court provisionally appoints Plaintiffs MICHAEL GONZALES and NICOLE
19 BURTON as the representatives of the Class.

20 10. The Court provisionally appoints Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq., of the JCL Law Firm,
21 APC, Shani Zakay, Esq. of Zakay Law Group, APLC, and Joseph Lavi of Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP as
22 Class Counsel for the Class Members.

23 11. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the Notice of Proposed Class and
24 Representative Action Settlement and Final Hearing Date (“Notice Packet”) attached to the Agreement
25 as Exhibit “A”. The Court finds that the notice appears to fully and accurately inform the Class
26 Members and Aggrieved Employees of all material elements of the proposed Settlement, including the
27 right of any Class Member to be excluded from the Class by submitting a written request for exclusion,
28 and of each Class Member’s right and opportunity to object to the Settlement. The Court further finds

1 that the distribution of the notices substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Agreement and
2 this Order meets the requirements of due process, is the most reasonable notice under the circumstances,
3 and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court orders the mailing
4 of the notices by first class mail, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.

5 12. The Court hereby appoints Apex Class Action LLC as Settlement Administrator. No later
6 than thirty (30) calendar days following notice by Plaintiffs or the Court to Defendant of the Preliminary
7 Approval Order, Defendant shall provide the Settlement Administrator with the Class Data, including
8 information regarding Class Members that Defendant will in good faith compile from its records,
9 including each Class Member's full name; last known mailing address; Social Security Number;
10 workweeks worked during the Class Period; and pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. No later
11 than fifteen (15) calendar days after receipt of the Class Data, the Settlement Administrator shall mail
12 copies of the Notice Packet to all Class Members via first class U.S. Mail.

13 13. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure for exclusion from the
14 Settlement. Any Class Member may individually choose to opt out of and be excluded from the
15 Settlement as provided in the Notice Packet by following the instructions for requesting exclusion from
16 the Settlement that are set forth in the Notice Packet. All Requests for Exclusion must be postmarked
17 by the Response Deadline which is forty-five (45) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator
18 mails the Notice Packets to Class Members or, in the case of re-mailed Notice Packet, the Response
19 Deadline is extended fifteen (15) days from the original Response Deadline. Any Class Member who
20 chooses to opt out of and be excluded from the Settlement will not be entitled to an Individual
21 Settlement Payment under the Settlement and will not be bound by the Release by Settlement Class
22 Members, or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. However, any Class Member that
23 submits a timely and valid Request for Exclusion that is also an Aggrieved Employee will still receive
24 his/her pro rata share of the Aggrieved Employee Payment and will still be bound by the terms of the
25 PAGA portion of the Settlement, including the Release by the Aggrieved Employees. Class Members
26 who do not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion by the Response Deadline will be deemed
27 a Settlement Class Member and bound by all terms of the Settlement and any final judgment entered
28 in this Action.

1 14. Any Class Member who has not opted out may submit to the Settlement Administrator a
2 written statement of objection (“Notice of Objection”) by the Response Deadline. The Notice of
3 Objection must be in writing signed by the Class Member and contain the information described in the
4 Notice Packet. Class Members who fail to submit a timely and valid written Notice of Objection in
5 the manner specified in the Notice Packet may still make their objections orally at the Final Approval
6 Hearing with the Court’s permission. Class Members who fail to submit a timely and valid objection
7 in the manners specified above shall be deemed to have waived any objections and shall be foreclosed
8 from making any objection (whether by appeal or otherwise) to the Settlement.

9 15. A hearing on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA
10 Settlement and Plaintiffs’ Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Attorneys’ Expenses, and Class Representative
11 Service Award shall be held before this Court on **December 2, 2026, at 8:30am** in Department 16 of
12 the Contra Costa County Superior Court to determine all necessary matters concerning the Settlement,
13 including: whether the proposed settlement of the Action on the terms and conditions provided for in
14 the Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable and should be finally approved by the Court; whether
15 an Order Granting Final Approval should be entered herein; whether the plan of allocation contained
16 in the Agreement should be approved as fair, adequate and reasonable to the Class; and to finally
17 approve the award of Attorneys’ Fees, Attorneys’ Expenses, Class Representative Service Awards, and
18 the Settlement Administration Costs. All papers in support of the motion for final approval and the
19 motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Attorneys’ Expenses, and Class Representative Service Awards shall be
20 filed with the Court and served on all counsel within twenty-eight (28) days following the expiration
21 of the Response Deadline, or by any earlier date required by the Court.

22 16. In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the
23 Agreement, or the Settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, canceled, or fails to become
24 effective for any reason, the Settlement Agreement shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated,
25 and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement. In
26 such an event, the Court’s orders regarding the Settlement, including this Preliminary Approval Order,
27 shall not be used or referred to in litigation for any purpose. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to
28 alter the terms of the Settlement Agreement with respect to the effect of the Settlement Agreement if it

1 is not approved.

2 17. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the final approval hearing
3 and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to Class Members and retains
4 jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement.

5 18. The Final Approval Order and Judgment shall set a compliance hearing to occur after the
6 Settlement has been completely implemented. No later than one week before the compliance hearing,
7 Plaintiffs' counsel shall file a compliance statement addressing the matters required by Code of Civil
8 Procedure section 384, subdivision (b), and demonstrating full compliance with the Final Approval
9 Order and Judgment.

10 19. Notwithstanding any contrary provision in the Settlement Agreement, the Settlement
11 Administrator shall withhold five percent (5%) of any Attorneys' Fees awarded by the Court. The
12 withheld amount shall not be released unless and until authorized by the Court following its review of
13 Plaintiffs' compliance statement demonstrating full compliance with the Final Approval Order and
14 Judgment.

15 20. The Court may authorize release of the withheld Attorneys' Fees by an unreported minute
16 order without a hearing.

17 21. A true and correct copy of the Court's July 15, 2026 tentative ruling, which became the
18 ruling of the Court, is attached to this Order as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

19
20 Dated: 8/4/2026



Hon. Benjamin T. Reyes II

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

EXHIBIT A

5. 9:00 AM CASE NUMBER: C22-02161
CASE NAME: LAKEITHIA JOHNSTON VS. GEORGIA-PACIFIC GYPSUM LLC
HEARING ON MOTION IN RE: COMPLIANCE HEARING OF CLASS SETTLEMENT SET BY THE COURTROOM
FILED BY:

TENTATIVE RULING:
Summary

This Compliance Hearing was set by the Court to determine compliance with the Court's Order re Final Approval of Class Action settlement filed on August 12, 2025.

Upon review of the declaration filed by Madely Nava of Apex Class Action certifying disbursement filed on June 30, 2026, the Court determines that Plaintiff has complied with the Court's order.

Good cause appearing, the Court makes the following orders:

1. The Court orders the release of the 5% retention of attorney's fees in the amount of \$15,833.30 to Plaintiff's Counsel. The Class Action Administrator shall release said fees no later than ten (10) days from the date of this Order.
2. The Court orders Plaintiff's Counsel to prepare final judgment and Notice of Entry of Judgment of this matter.
3. No appearance is required at the hearing on July 15, 2026.

6. 9:00 AM CASE NUMBER: C22-02261
CASE NAME: MICHAEL GONZALES VS. MECHANICS BANK
HEARING ON MOTION IN RE: PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT
FILED BY: GONZALES, MICHAEL

TENTATIVE RULING:
Summary

Plaintiffs Michael Gonzales and Nicole Burton ("Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and all persons similarly situated, filed a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement with Defendant Mechanics Bank ("Defendant"). The motion is unopposed and is **granted** as set forth herein. No appearance is required at the hearing on July 15, 2026, provided counsel complies with the orders herein.

Background

Plaintiffs request that the Court grant preliminary approval of the Settlement and conditionally certify the Settlement Class pursuant to the terms set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims. The Settlement Class is defined as all non-exempt employees who are or previously were employed by Defendant Mechanics Bank and/or Rabobank, N.A. as direct employees and performed work in California during the period from October 20, 2018, to November 12, 2024. The Class excludes any non-exempt employees who previously entered into settlement or severance agreements with Defendant and/or Rabobank, N.A. that cover the entirety of the Class Period. The Class consists of approximately 2,280 Class Members. Plaintiffs request that the

Court confirm Michael Gonzales and Nicole Burton as the Class Representatives and appoint JCL Law Firm, APC, Zakay Law Group, APLC, and Ebrahimian & Lavi, LLP as Class Counsel.

The proposed total Gross Settlement Amount is Three Million Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$3,050,000.00), which is non-reversionary. From this amount, the following deductions shall be made prior to distribution to Settlement Class Members:

- (a) Attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, currently estimated at One Million Sixteen Thousand Six Hundred Sixty-Six Dollars and Sixty-Seven Cents (\$1,016,666.67);
- (b) Litigation costs and expenses not to exceed Forty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$45,000.00);
- (c) Class Representative service awards of not more than Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00) to each Plaintiff, for a total not to exceed Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$20,000.00);
- (d) PAGA Payment of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$150,000.00); and
- (e) Settlement Administration Costs not to exceed Seventeen Thousand One Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$17,100.00). Defendant shall separately pay its share of employer payroll taxes.

Plaintiffs request that the Court preliminarily approve Class Representative service awards of not more than Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00) each to Plaintiffs Michael Gonzales and Nicole Burton, for a total not to exceed Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$20,000.00), in recognition of their efforts and risks in assisting with the prosecution of this action. These awards represent fair compensation for the time, effort, and risk undertaken by the Class Representatives in pursuing this litigation on behalf of the Class.

Plaintiffs request that the Court award Class Counsel attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, currently estimated at One Million Sixteen Thousand Six Hundred Sixty-Six Dollars and Sixty-Seven Cents (\$1,016,666.67), and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses not to exceed Forty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$45,000.00), both to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Plaintiffs request that the Court find that the fee request, representing one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, falls within the range of reasonableness for common fund class actions, subject to final approval following review of the lodestar cross-check and any objections.

Plaintiffs request that the Court approve a PAGA Payment of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$150,000.00) to be allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount for settlement of claims for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the PAGA Payment (\$112,500.00) shall be paid to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and twenty-five percent (25%) of the PAGA Payment (\$37,500.00) shall be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees. The Aggrieved Employees are defined as all non-exempt employees who are or previously were employed by Defendant and/or Rabobank, N.A. as direct employees and performed work in California during the PAGA Period from March 7, 2023, to November 12, 2024. Plaintiffs request that the Court appoint Apex Class Action LLC as the Settlement Administrator and approve administration costs not to exceed Seventeen Thousand One Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$17,100.00).

The Net Settlement Amount of approximately One Million Eight Hundred One Thousand Two Hundred Thirty-Three Dollars and Thirty-Three Cents (\$1,801,233.33) shall be allocated to all Settlement Class Members on a pro-rata basis according to the number of workweeks each Settlement Class Member worked during the Class Period, resulting in an estimated average Individual Settlement Payment of Seven Hundred Ninety Dollars and One Cent (\$790.01). Defendant shall fund the Gross Settlement Amount in one lump sum payment within thirty (30) calendar days after the Effective Date. Within fifteen (15) calendar days after the funding date, the Settlement Administrator shall pay all Individual Settlement Payments, the PAGA Payment, the Settlement Administration Costs, Attorneys' Fees, Attorneys' Expenses, and the Class Representative Service Awards, as determined by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing.

Participating Class Members shall release Defendant from all claims asserted in the operative complaints and any claims that could have been asserted based on the facts alleged therein, including claims for failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods; failure to reimburse employees for all necessary business expenses; failure to pay for all hours worked; improper calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime, sick pay, and meal period premiums; failure to pay minimum wages and overtime wages; failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; failure to pay wages when due; and violations of Business and Professions Code section 17200. This stipulation to certification is for settlement purposes only and shall not be deemed admissible in this or any other proceeding should this Settlement not become final.

A Final Approval Hearing shall be held to determine whether the Settlement, Class Counsel's fee application, and the Class Representative service awards should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. Class Members may participate in the Settlement, submit requests for exclusion, or file objections as provided in the Notice of Settlement. Pending final approval, Plaintiffs request that the Court enjoin Class Members from prosecuting any released claims, unless they have submitted valid requests for exclusion.

Analysis

The primary determination is whether the proposed settlement is "fair, reasonable, and adequate" under *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801. The factors include "the strength of plaintiffs' case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the state of the proceedings, the experience and views of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction ... to the proposed settlement." (See also, *Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Mgmt., LLC* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 521.)

California law provides guidance concerning judicial approval of class action settlements. First, public policy favors settlement (*Neary v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* (1992) 3 Cal.4th 273), but the court must not approve an agreement contrary to law or public policy (*Bechtel Corp. v. Superior Court* (1973) 33 Cal.App.3d 405, 412; *Timney v. Lin* (2003) 106 Cal.App.4th 1121, 1127). Moreover, "[t]he court cannot surrender its duty to see that the judgment to be entered is a just one, nor is the court to act as a mere puppet in the matter." (*Cal. State Auto. Assn. Inter-Ins. Bureau v. Superior Court* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 658, 664.) Consequently, courts have noted that *Neary* does not apply where public rights are implicated, because "w]here the rights of the public are implicated, the additional safeguard of judicial review, though more cumbersome to the settlement process, serves a salutary purpose."

(*Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. v. Kintetsu Enterprises of America* (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 48, 63.)

Attorneys' Fees

Plaintiffs seek attorneys' fees of \$1,016,666.67 representing one-third of the total settlement amount, relying on the common fund doctrine. Even under the common fund theory, however, the fee award should be reviewed through a lodestar cross-check. In *Lafitte v. Robert Half International* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503, the Supreme Court endorsed the *Lodestar* cross-check as a method to determine whether the percentage allocated is reasonable. The Court stated: "If the multiplier calculated by means of a *Lodestar* cross-check is extraordinarily high or low, the trial court should consider whether the percentage used should be adjusted so as to bring the imputed multiplier within a justifiable range, but the court is not necessarily required to make such an adjustment." (Id. at p. 505.) Following typical practice, however, the Court will not consider the fee award at this preliminary approval stage, but reserves review for final approval.

Similarly, litigation costs in the amount of \$45,000.00 and the requested service payment of \$10,000.00 for each named plaintiff and class representative will be reviewed at the time of final approval. Criteria for evaluating representative payment requests are discussed in *Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804-807.

The Settlement appears to be fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class and falls within the range of reasonableness, subject only to objections that may be raised at the Final Approval Hearing. Good cause appearing, the Court makes the following orders and ruling.

Ruling

1. The settlement is sufficiently fair, reasonable, and adequate to justify preliminary approval. The motion is **granted**.
2. Counsel are directed to prepare an order reflecting this ruling, the other findings in the previously submitted proposed order lodged October 6, 2025, attaching a copy of this ruling.
3. Counsel are ordered to obtain a hearing date for the motion for final approval from the Department clerk. Other dates in the scheduled notice process should track as appropriate to the hearing date. The ultimate judgment must provide for a compliance hearing after the settlement has been completely implemented. Plaintiffs' counsel are ordered to submit a compliance statement one week before the compliance hearing date, which shall include the matters necessary to comply with Code of Civil Procedure section 384, subdivision (b).
4. Notwithstanding any contrary provision in the settlement agreement, 5% of the attorneys' fees are to be withheld by the administrator until released by the Court after review of the compliance statement.
5. The Court may issue a release of attorneys' fees through an unreported minute order without hearing upon review of the compliance statement representing full compliance with the Court's Final Order Approving Settlement.
6. No appearance is required at the hearing on July 15, 2026.