

Tyler J. Woods, Esq. (SBN 232464)
tyler.woods@wilshirelawfirm.com
James Yoo, Esq. (SBN 310680)
james.yoo@wilshirelawfirm.com
Heriberto Ponce, Esq. (SBN 339713)
eddie.ponce@wilshirelawfirm.com
Ruby Carrera, Esq. (SBN 343745)
ruby.carrera@wilshirelawfirm.com
Alan Wilcox, Esq. (SBN 287476)
alan.wilcox@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, CA 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**

YOVANNI JIMENEZ, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,
v.

L.B. JOHNSON HARDWARE CO., INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24STCV18708

CLASS & REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

[Assigned for all purposes to: Hon. Carolyn B.
Kuhl, Dept. 12]

**NOTICE OF RULING RE: ORDER
GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Complaint filed: July 29, 2024
Trial date: Not set

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on June 23, 2026, the Court issued an Order Granting
3 Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of the Class Action Settlement. A true and correct
4 copy of that judgment and order are attached as Exhibit 1.

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 Dated: June 23, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

7
8 By: 
9 Alan A. Wilcox

EXHIBIT 1

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
Tyler J. Woods, Esq. (SBN 232464)
tyler.woods@wilshirelawfirm.com
James Yoo, Esq. (SBN 310680)
james.yoo@wilshirelawfirm.com
Heriberto Ponce, Esq. (SBN 339713)
eddie.ponce@wilshirelawfirm.com
Ruby Carrera, Esq. (SBN 343745)
ruby.carrera@wilshirelawfirm.com
Alan Wilcox, Esq. (SBN 287476)
alan.wilcox@wilshirelawfirm.com
Conor Gomez, Esq. (SBN 337395)
conor.gomez@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**

YOVANNI JIMENEZ, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

L.B. JOHNSON HARDWARE CO., INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
06/23/2026

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: A. Rosas Deputy

Case No.: 24STCV18708
Assigned to Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, Dept. 12

Complaint filed: July 29, 2024
Trial date: Not set

CLASS & REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING

Date: June 23, 2026
Time: 10:30 a.m.
Dept: 12

1 The Court has before it Plaintiff Yovanni Jimenez’s (“Plaintiff” or “Class
2 Representative”) Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (the “Motion”).
3 Having reviewed the Motion along with the accompanying papers, the Class Action and PAGA
4 Settlement Agreement (which is referred to here as the “Settlement” or “Settlement
5 Agreement”), and good cause appearing, the Court hereby finds and orders as follows:

6 1. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the Settlement Agreement appears to
7 be fair, just, adequate, and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements for preliminary
8 approval. The Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and the Class (as defined
9 below) based upon the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement between Plaintiff and
10 Defendant L. B. Johnson Hardware Co., Inc. (“Defendant,” and together with Plaintiff, the
11 “Parties”). A true and correct copy of the Settlement Agreement is attached to the Declaration
12 of Conor J.D. Gomez in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action
13 Settlement submitted to the Court as **Exhibit 1**.

14 2. For settlement purposes, the Court provisionally certifies the Class defined as all
15 individuals who are or were employed by Defendant as non-exempt employees in California
16 during the Class Period (each “Class Member” collectively the “Class”). The Class Period is the
17 period from July 29, 2020, through December 31, 2025 (the “Settlement Class Period”).

18 3. 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 common fund of
22 \$114,000.00 (the “Gross Settlement Amount”) to cover (a) settlement payments to Class
23 Members who do not validly opt out; (b) a \$5,700.00 payment for penalties under the Private
24 Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), with 65% of which (\$3,705.00) being paid to the LWDA (the
25 “LWDA PAGA Payment”) and 35% (\$1,995.00) being paid to eligible Aggrieved Employee
26 (the “Individual PAGA Payment”) (as defined in the Settlement Agreement); (c) an
27 enhancement award of up to \$5,000.00 for Plaintiff (the “Class Representative Service
28 Payment”); (d) Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees not to exceed \$38,000.00 (one-third of the Gross

1 Settlement Amount) (the “Class Counsel Fees Payment”), and up to \$5,000.00 in costs for actual
2 litigation expenses incurred by Class Counsel (the “Class Counsel Litigation Expenses
3 Payment”); and (e) a payment to Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions (the
4 “Administrator”) of up to \$4,355.00 (the “Administration Costs”).

5 4. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement appear to be within
6 the range of possible approval, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and
7 applicable law. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the Gross Settlement Amount is
8 fair, just, reasonable, and adequate to the Class when balanced against the probable outcome of
9 further litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential
10 appeals; (2) significant informal discovery, investigation, research, and litigation have been
11 conducted such that counsel for the Parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their
12 respective positions; (3) settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks that
13 would be presented by the further prosecution of the litigation; and (4) the proposed Settlement
14 has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive negotiations between the
15 Parties with the assistance of a well-respected class action mediator. Accordingly, the Court
16 preliminarily finds that the Settlement Agreement was entered into in good faith.

17 5. A final fairness hearing on the question of whether the proposed Settlement, Class
18 Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, the PAGA Penalties
19 Payment for its share of the settlement of claims for penalties under the PAGA, and the Class
20 Representative Service Payment should be finally approved as fair, just, reasonable and
21 adequate as to the Class is hereby set in accordance with the implementation schedule set forth
22 below.

23 6. The Court finds, for settlement purposes only, that the Class meets the
24 requirements for certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 in that: (1) the
25 Class Members are so numerous that joinder is impractical; (2) there are questions of law and
26 fact that are common, or of general interest, to all Class Members, which predominate over
27 individual issues; (3) Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of the Class Members; (4)
28 Plaintiff and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class Members;

and (5) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

7. The Court appoints Plaintiff as Class Representative, for settlement purposes only. The Court further preliminarily approves Plaintiff's ability to request the Class Representative Service Payment.

8. The Court appoints, for settlement purposes only, Tyler Woods, James Yoo, Heriberto Ponce, Ruby Carrera, Alan Wilcox, and Conor J.D. Gomez of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC as "Class Counsel". The Court further preliminarily approves Class Counsel's ability to request the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment.

9. The Court appoints Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as the "Administrator" with the Administration Costs estimated not to exceed \$4,355.00.

10. The Court approves, as to form and content the class notice, attached as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement (the "Class Notice"). A true and correct copy of the Class Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. 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.

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

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

13. The Court orders the following implementation schedule:

Defendant to provide Class List to the Settlement Administrator	Within 7 business days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement
Settlement Administrator to mail the Class Notice	Within 14 days after receipt of the Class List from the Defendant
Response Deadline	45 days after Class Notice is mailed out by

	the Settlement Administrator 14 days additional days for any notices that were resent
Deadline to file Motion for Final Approval, Request for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Service Award to Plaintiffs	16 court days before hearing on Motion for Final Approval
Final Approval Hearing	November 3, 2026, at 10:30 a.m., or first available date thereafter, in Department 12. The hearing may be continued to another date without further notice to the Class Members.

14. 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.

15. _____

_____.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: 06/23/2026



Carolyn B. Kuhl

Carolyn B. Kuhl / Judge

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl
Los Angeles County Superior Court

PROOF OF SERVICE (2015.5 C.C.P.)

Jimenez v. L.B. Johnson Hardware Co., Inc et. al
Case No. 24STCV18708

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, Pablo Villalobos state that 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: 660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby, Los Angeles, CA 90017. My electronic service address is pablo.villalobos@wilshirelawfirm.com.

On June 23, 2026, I served on the parties of record in this action the foregoing document described as **NOTICE OF RULING RE: ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT** on the interested parties as addressed and by one of the methods of service set forth below.

Ankit H. Bhakta (SBN 312607)
ankit.bhakta@bhaktalawfirm.com
BHAKTA LAW FIRM, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
1100 W. La Habra Blvd., Suite A
La Habra, California 90631
Telephone: (909) 858-6565
Facsimile: (909) 858-6566

Attorneys for Defendant

☒ **BY UPLOAD:** I hereby certify that the documents were uploaded by my office to the State of California Labor & Workforce Development Agency Online Filing Site.

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC MAIL (E-MAIL):** I caused said DOCUMENT(s) to be delivered electronically to the addressee(s) identified above with an e-mail address pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(g).

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

Executed on June 23, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

Pablo Villalobos
Pablo Villalobos