

1 Lilit Tunyan (SBN 329351)

2 ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com

3 Artur Tunyan (SBN 349174)

4 atunyan@tunyanlaw.com

5 **TUNYAN LAW, APC**

6 535 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 285

7 Glendale, California 91203

8 Telephone: (323) 410-5050

9
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff JAVIER HERNANDEZ as an
11 individual and on behalf of all employees similarly
12 situated

13
14 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
15 **FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE**
16

17 JAVIER HERNANDEZ, as an individual and
18 on behalf of all employees similarly situated,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 PRECISE AEROSPACE MANUFACTURING,
22 INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1
23 through 50, inclusive,

24 Defendants.
25
26
27
28

Case No.: 30-2024-01400056-CU-OE-CXC

[Assigned for all purposes to Hon. Randall J.
Sherman, Department CX105]

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF COURT'S
RULING ON MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
AND PAGA ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Action Filed: May 15, 2024
Trial: Not Set

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD
HEREIN:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on August 7, 2025, Department CX103 of the above-captioned Court issued a ruling on preliminary approval of this class and PAGA representative action settlement approval and continued the hearing for preliminary approval of class and PAGA representative action settlement to October 13, 2025 at 1:30 p.m. in the same department to permit the parties to address and respond to the issues identified in the Court's ruling. The Court's tentative ruling issued on August 7, 2025, which became final on August 8, 2025, is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 8, 2025

TUNYAN LAW, APC


By: /s/ Lilit Tunyan

Lilit Tunyan

Artur Tunyan

Attorneys for Plaintiff JAVIER HERNANDEZ

Exhibit “A”

		
102	30-2024-01400056 Hernandez vs. Precise Aerospace Manufacturing, Inc.	The tentative ruling is to continue Plaintiff Javier Hernandez’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class and Representative Action Settlement to October 13, 2025 at 1:30 p.m. Counsel must file supplemental papers addressing the court’s concerns (not fully revised papers that would have to be reread) no later than two weeks before the next hearing date. Counsel must submit an amendment to the settlement agreement rather than any amended settlement agreement.

		Counsel also must provide a red-lined version of any revised papers. Counsel also should provide the court with an explanation of how the pending issues were resolved, with references to any corrections to the settlement agreement and the class notice, rather than with just a supplemental declaration or brief that simply asserts the issues have been resolved. The court is inclined to grant approval of an attorneys' fees request of only 30% of the gross settlement amount, which the court finds fair, adequate and reasonable for the settlement of this size. The parties may either reduce the attorneys' fees request by amendment to the settlement agreement and the class notice, or Plaintiff shall provide documentation and support for any request higher than this percentage at the final approval stage. The allocation of only 20% of the settlement payments for wages appears to be low. Either an increase to 33 1/3% or an explanation of why the figure is not at least 33 1/3% is required. Counsel should propose a realistic Final Approval Hearing date, bearing in mind that all papers in support of the Final Approval Hearing, including detailed hourly breakdowns of plaintiff's attorneys to support a lodestar cross-check, detailed plaintiff attorney cost breakdowns, an Administrator declaration and invoice, and plaintiff's declaration to support the enhancement request, must be filed at least 16 calendar days before the Final Approval Hearing date, to provide enough time for court review, and must be served in compliance with CCP notice of motion requirements. The proposed order and class notice must be amended to state the correct department number and judge. The objection form suggests that objections to the settlement must be in writing, but that requirement is overly restrictive and arguably inconsistent with CRC Rule 3.769(f). The objection form must be modified to reflect that either an objection may be in writing, or a class member may orally object or otherwise offer comments at the Final Approval Hearing. Plaintiff shall provide notice of this ruling to the LWDA and Defendant.
--	--	--

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

) ss

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 535 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 285, Glendale, California 91203. On August 8, 2025, I served the foregoing document described as:

On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF COURT'S RULING ON MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND PAGA ACTION SETTLEMENT** on the interested parties in this action by sending a true copy thereof to interested parties as follows and as stated on the attached service list:

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov

[✓] **BY ONLINE SUBMISSION:** I hereby certify that these documents were served from Glendale, California, by online submission to Labor & Workforce Development Agency portal using the link <https://dir.tfaforms.net/315>.

John T. Egley
jegley@calljensen.com
Madeleine K. Lee
mlee@calljensen.com
Connie Valles
cvalles@calljensen.com
Catherine Miller
cmiller@calljensen.com
Julie Sandoval
jsandoval@calljensen.com
Ellen Cohen
ecohen@calljensen.com
CALL & JENSEN

A Professional Corporation
610 Newport Center Drive, Suite 700
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Tel: (949) 717-3000

***Attorneys for Defendant PRECISE
AEROSPACE MANUFACTURING, INC.***

[✓] **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address or e-mail of record in this action.

[✓] **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** Based on a court order, Rule of Court, or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses listed above via electronic mail. I did not receive an error message.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on August 8, 2025, at Los Angeles, California.

Lilit Tunyan

/s/Lilit Tunyan

Name

Signature