

6/8/2026 11:33:46 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By T. Automation ,Deputy Clerk

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Nicolas P. Ahadzadeh (State Bar No. 365386)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 facsimile
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com /
npa@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Kazzandra Montoya

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

KAZZANDRA MONTOYA, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly situated
and the State of California under the Private
Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES,
INCORPORATED and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00029581-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Loren G. Freestone
Dept. 64

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF *AMENDED*
ORDER GRANTING APPROVAL OF PAGA
ACTION SETTLEMENT AND
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS AND
ENTERING JUDGMENT**

Action Filed: June 24, 2024

1 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE
2 TAKE NOTICE THAT:

- 3 1. On June 5, 2026, at 10:30 a.m. in this Department, the Court entered the *Amended* Order
4 Granting Approval of PAGA Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering
5 Judgment attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
6 2. The Judge confirmed the Court's Tentative Ruling attached hereto as Exhibit 2.
7 3. A conformed copy of this Notice will be submitted to the LWDA via its online electronic portal
8 in accordance with Labor Code § 2699(s)(3).
9 4. Notice of the Court's final ruling and entry of judgment is hereby provided.

10
11 Respectfully submitted,

12
13 Dated: June 8, 2026

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

14
15 

Nicholas J. Ferraro
Lauren N. Vega
Nicolas P. Ahadzadeh
Attorneys for Plaintiff Kazzandra Montoya

EXHIBIT 1

FILED
Clerk of the Superior Court

JUN 5 2026

By: J. Virissimo, Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

KAZZANDRA MONTOYA, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly situated
and the State of California under the Private
Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES,
INCORPORATED and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00029581-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Loren G. Freestone
Dept. 64

**AMENDED [~~PROPOSED~~] ORDER
GRANTING APPROVAL OF PAGA
ACTION SETTLEMENT AND
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS AND
ENTERING JUDGMENT**

Motion for PAGA Approval Hearing:

Date: June 5, 2026

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Action Filed: June 24, 2024

1 Plaintiff Kazzandra Montoya's ("Plaintiff") unopposed Motion for Approval of PAGA Action
2 Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs ("Motion") was scheduled for hearing before the Court on
3 June 5, 2026, at 10:30 a.m., before the Honorable Loren G. Freestone, in Department 64 of the above-
4 captioned Court. The Court having considered the Motion, the PAGA Settlement Agreement
5 ("Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement"), Declarations, and all other pleadings submitted in support
6 of the Motion, and for good cause appearing, now FINDS and ORDERS as follows:

7 Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs is
8 **GRANTED** and approved pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2). After the attorneys'
9 fees, Plaintiff's service payment, costs, and administrator's expenses are deducted from the Gross
10 Settlement Amount, the Net Settlement Amount is \$147,865.36, of which 75% (\$110,899.02) shall be
11 distributed to the LWDA and the remaining 25% (\$36,966.34) shall be distributed to the aggrieved
12 employees as their share of PAGA penalties.

13 Accordingly, the \$289,520 gross settlement shall be distributed as follows:

- 14 1. \$110,899.02 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for PAGA penalties;
- 15 2. \$36,966.34 to the PAGA Members;
- 16 3. \$10,000 to Plaintiff as a service payment;
- 17 4. \$96,497.02 to Plaintiff's counsel for attorneys' fees;
- 18 5. \$25,157.62 to Plaintiff's counsel for costs; and
- 19 6. *Up to* \$10,000 to the Settlement Administrator.

20 Plaintiff, Defendant, and the Settlement Administrator are ordered to carry out the terms of the
21 settlement in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **JUDGMENT**

2 Judgment shall be entered through the filing of this order and judgment. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §
3 668.5. Plaintiff shall take from the Operative Complaint only the relief set forth in the Settlement
4 Agreement and this order and judgment. The Court retains jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the
5 terms of the Settlement Agreement and the final order and judgment .
6

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 Date: 6/5/24



The Honorable Loren G. Freestone
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT 2

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL COURTHOUSE
TENTATIVE RULING**

HEARING DATE: 6/5/2026

JUDICIAL OFFICER: LOREN FREESTONE

CASE NO.: 37-2024-00029581-CU-OE-CTL

CASE TITLE: Montoya vs Child Development Associates Incorporated

The unopposed motion (ROA # 62) of Plaintiff KAZZANDRA MONTOYA for an order granting approval of PAGA action settlement, and for attorney fees and costs is GRANTED.

The settlement is “fair, reasonable, and adequate in view of PAGA’s purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones, and to maximize enforcement of state labor laws.” Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc. (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77.

The court approves the following settlement breakdown:

- Gross Settlement (Non-Revisionary) - \$289,520.00
- Attorney Fees - \$ \$96,497.02 (33.33% of Gross Settlement)
- Litigation Costs - \$25,157.62
- Service Award to PAGA Representative - \$10,000.00
- Settlement Administration Costs - \$10,000.00
- LWDA Payment – \$110,899.02 (75% of \$147,865.36 net settlement)
- Total Payment to Aggrieved Employees - \$36,966.34

There are approximately 343 aggrieved employees who worked 14,476 cumulative pay periods. This will result in an average individual payment to each aggrieved employee of \$107.77. Given the nature of the alleged violations, the PAGA payments will be sufficiently meaningful and not trivial. Therefore, the settlement is approved in full, and the settlement proceeds will be disbursed to the PAGA members.

The Court will execute the proposed order (ROA # 66) at the hearing.