

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

Benjamin H. Haber (SBN 315664)
benjamin.haber@wilshirelawfirm.com
Talar DerOhannessian (SBN 311687)
talar.derohannessian@wilshirelawfirm.com
Kareen Shatikian (SBN 346554)
kareen.shatikian@wilshirelawfirm.com
Giancarlo A. Recinos (SBN 282836)
giancarlo.recinos@wilshirelawfirm.com
660 South Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

JAQUELINE SPEASE, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated, the State of
California, and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRETHREN HILLCREST HOMES, a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No. 24STCV15915

Assigned to Hon. Timothy Patrick Dillon,
Dept. 15

Complaint filed: June 25, 2024

FAC filed: November 5, 2024

Trial date: Not Set

CLASS & PAGA ACTION

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE
CLASS ACTION AND PAGA
SETTLEMENT**

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING

Date: September 8, 2026

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept: 15

1 The Court has before it Plaintiff Jaqueline Spease's ("Plaintiff" or "Class
2 Representative") Motion for Preliminary Approval of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement
3 (the "Motion"). Having reviewed the Motion and related records, the Class Action and PAGA
4 Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement"), and good cause appearing, the Court hereby finds and
5 orders as follows:

6 1. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement appear to be within
7 the range of possible approval, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and applicable
8 law. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the Settlement is fair, just, reasonable, and
9 adequate to the Class when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating
10 to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (2) significant informal
11 discovery, investigation, research, and litigation have been conducted such that counsel for the
12 Parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions; (3) settlement at
13 this time will avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks that would be presented by the further
14 prosecution of the litigation; and (4) the proposed Settlement has been reached as the result of
15 intensive, serious, and non-collusive negotiations between the Parties with the assistance of a
16 well-respected class action mediator. Accordingly, the Court preliminarily finds that the
17 Settlement was entered into in good faith. The Court grants preliminary approval of the
18 Settlement and the Class (as defined below) based upon the terms set forth in the Settlement
19 Agreement between Plaintiff and Defendant Brethren Hillcrest Homes ("Defendant," and
20 together with Plaintiff, the "Parties"). A true and correct copy of the revised Settlement
21 Agreement is attached as **Exhibit 1** to the Declaration of Giancarlo A. Recinos filed in support
22 of Plaintiff's Motion.

23 2. For settlement purposes, the Court provisionally certifies the Class, which is
24 defined as: all persons who have been employed by Defendant in California as hourly-paid or
25 non-exempt employees at any point during the Class Period, including current and former
26 employees (with each such person referred to individually as a "Class Member(s)" and
27 collectively the "Class"). The "Class Period" is the period from August 1, 2020, through April
28 18, 2026, subject to Paragraph 8 of the Settlement Agreement ("Class Period").

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

9 4. The Court appoints Plaintiff as Class Representative, for settlement purposes
10 only. The Court further preliminarily permits Plaintiff to seek a service enhancement payment
11 in the final approval motion.

12 5. The Court appoints, for settlement purposes only, Benjamin H. Haber, Talar
13 DerOhannessian, Kareen Shatikian, and Giancarlo A. Recinos of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC as
14 "Class Counsel". The Court further preliminarily permits Class Counsel to request their
15 attorneys' fees and costs incurred in the final approval motion.

16 6. The Court appoints ILYM Group, Inc. as the "Administrator" and permits
17 Plaintiff to seek the Administration Expenses Payment listed below for the Administrator.

18 7. The Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which
19 could ultimately be given final approval by this Court, and appears to be presumptively valid,
20 subject only to any objections that may be raised at the final approval hearing and final approval
21 by this Court. The Court notes that Defendant has agreed to create a non-reversionary common
22 fund of \$500,000.00 (the "Gross Settlement Amount") to cover payments to Class Members
23 who do not validly opt out and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA")
24 pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") as follows:

Gross Settlement Amount:	\$500,000.00
Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff:	Not to exceed \$7,500.00

Payment to the LWDA (65%):	\$16,250.00
Payment to Aggrieved Employees (35%):	\$8,750.00
Class Counsel Fees Payment (one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount):	Currently estimated at \$166,667.00
Class Counsel's Litigation Expenses Payment:	Not to exceed \$30,000.00
Administration Expenses Payment to the Administrator:	Not to exceed \$10,550.00
Estimated Net Settlement Amount to the Class:	\$257,783.00

8. The Court approves, as to form and content the class notice, attached as **Exhibit A** to the Settlement Agreement (the "Class Notice"). The Court finds on a preliminary basis that plan for distribution of the Class Notice to 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.

9. The Parties are ordered to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

10. The Court hereby orders the Parties to comply with the following implementation schedule:

Defendant to Provide Class Data to the Administrator:	Not later than 14 days after the date of this Order
Administrator to Mail the Class Notice to the Class:	No later than 14 days after receipt of the Class Data from the Defendant
Response Deadline:	60 days after Class Notice is mailed out by the Administrator, plus 14 additional days for any returned and re-mailed notices
Deadline to File the Motion for Final	16 court days before the Final Approval

Approval:	Hearing
Final Approval Hearing:	January 28, 2027, at 10:00 a.m., in the above-entitled Court and Department. The Court may reschedule the hearing.

11. The Court further orders that, pending further order of this Court, all proceedings in this action, except those contemplated herein and in the Settlement, are stayed.

12. Without affecting the finality of this Order in any way, and in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, this shall Court retain continuing jurisdiction over the implementation, interpretation, and enforcement of the Settlement with respect to all Parties to this action, their counsel, and the Administrator.

13. _____

 _____.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE:

 Hon. Timothy Patrick Dillon
 Judge of the Superior Court