

Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175)
lwlee@diversitylaw.com
DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.
515 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1250
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 488-6555
(213) 488-6554 facsimile

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class
(Additional Counsel on Next Page)

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

BARRETT ROBENOLT, as an individual
and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PERFORMANCE FOOD GROUP, INC., a
Colorado corporation; CORE-MARK
INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV002011

[Consolidated with Alameda County Superior
Court Case No. 23CV039807, Los Angeles County
Superior Court Case No. 24STCV00195, and
Riverside County Superior Court Case Nos.
CVRI2304160 and CVRI2305632]

*Assigned to Hon. Peter K. Southworth in
Department 8B*

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT
THEREON**

Date: October 2, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: 8B

HEARING SET BY COURT

JOSEPH SEWELL, as an individual and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORE-MARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
a Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

1 ARJENIS E. CORONA as an aggrieved employee,
2 and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees
3 under the Labor Code Private Attorneys' General
Act of 2004,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

6 CORE-MARK INTERNATIONAL, INC. a
7 Delaware corporation; CHRIS WALSH, an
8 individual; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

9 Defendants.
10

11 ARJENIS E. CORONA, an individual and on
12 behalf of all others similarly situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15
16 CORE-MARK INTERNATIONAL, INC. a
17 Delaware corporation; CHRIS WALSH, an
individual; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

18 Defendants.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ADDITIONAL COUNSEL

Dennis S. Hyun (State Bar No. 224240)

HYUN LEGAL, APC

515 S. Figueroa St., Suite 1250

Los Angeles, CA 90071

(213) 488-6555

(213) 488-6554 facsimile

dhyun@hyunlegal.com

Edward W. Choi, Esq. SBN 211334

edward.choi@choiandassociates.com

LAW OFFICES OF CHOI & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

515 S. Figueroa St., Suite 1250

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Telephone: (213) 381-1515

Facsimile: (213) 465-4885

Kelsey A. Webber, State Bar No. 303721

Kelsey.Webber@webberlawgroup.com

Shaelyn A. Stewart, State Bar No. 335149

Shaelyn.Stewart@webberlawgroup.com

WEBBER & EGBERT EMPLOYMENT LAW, P.C.

1610 R Street, Suite 300

Sacramento, CA 95811

Telephone: (916) 588-0683

William L. Marder (SBN 170131)

bill@polarislawgroup.com

POLARIS LAW GROUP

501 San Benito Street, Suite 200

Hollister, CA 95023

Tel: (831) 531-4214

Fax: (831) 634-0333

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)

david@tomorrowlaw.com

Vedang J. Patel (SBN 328647)

vedang@tomorrowlaw.com

1460 Westwood Boulevard

Los Angeles, California 90024

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

1 Plaintiffs Barrett Robenolt, Joseph Sewell III, Darrius Vance, and Arjenis E. Corona's
2 ("Plaintiffs") Motion for an Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement came
3 regularly for hearing on October 2, 2026. The Court has read, heard, and considered all the
4 pleadings and documents submitted, and the presentations made in connection with the Motion.

5 **I. BACKGROUND**

6 **A. Class Members**

7 The Class Period is November 1, 2020 through December 31, 2024 ("Class Period"). For
8 settlement purposes only, the Court certifies the following Settlement Class: "all current and
9 former non-exempt warehouse employees in California employed directly by Defendants who
10 worked at any time during the Class Period."

11 **B. Operation of the Settlement.**

12 Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order dated April 24, 2026, this Court
13 conditionally certified the Class and granted preliminary approval to the Settlement. The
14 Preliminary Approval Order also approved of the proposed class notice. The Court entered the
15 Preliminary Approval Order after review and consideration of all of the pleadings filed in
16 connection herewith.

17 In compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order, the Class Notice was sent to all
18 Class Members via first class mail. The notice process was timely completed.

19 This Court finds that the Settlement appears to be the product of serious, informed, non-
20 collusive negotiations, has no obvious deficiencies, and does not improperly grant preferential
21 treatment to any individuals. The Court further finds that the Settlement is fair, reasonable and
22 adequate, that due and adequate notice was provided to Class Members, and that Plaintiffs have
23 satisfied the standards for final approval of a class action settlement under California law. Under
24 the provisions of California *Code of Civil Procedure* section 382 as set forth in *Vasquez v.*
25 *Superior Court*, 4 Cal.3d 800, 821 (1971), the trial court has discretion to certify a class where:

26 [Q]uestions of law or fact common to the members of the class
27 predominate over any questions affecting only individual
28 members, and that a class action is superior to the available
methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy
... Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 23.

1 Certification of a settlement class is the appropriate judicial device under these circumstances.

2 Good cause appearing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDICATED** as follows:

3 1. For purposes of this Order, the Court adopts all defined terms as set forth in the
4 First Amended Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Settlement Agreement"
5 or "Settlement").

6 2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the litigation, the Class
7 Representatives, Class Members, and Defendants.

8 3. The Court finds that the dissemination of the Class Notice to the Class Members
9 by the appointed Settlement Administrator, Phoenix Settlement Administrators, constituted the
10 best notice practicable under the circumstances to all Class Members, and fully met the
11 requirements of California law and due process.

12 4. The Court approves the settlement of the above-captioned action, as set forth in
13 the Agreement, as fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Parties and Class Members. The Parties
14 are directed to perform in accordance with the terms set forth in the Agreement.

15 5. The Court hereby certifies the following Class for settlement purposes only: all
16 current and former non-exempt warehouse employees in California employed directly by
17 Defendants who worked at any time during the Class Period.

18 6. With respect to the Class and for purposes of approving the settlement only and
19 for no other purpose, this Court finds and concludes that: (a) the members of the Class are
20 ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are
21 questions of law or fact common to the Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest
22 among members of the Class with respect to the subject matter of the non-exempt claims in the
23 Action; (c) the claims of the Class Representatives are typical of the claims of Class Members;
24 (d) the Class Representatives have fairly and adequately protected the interests of the Class
25 Members; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of
26 this controversy; and (f) the counsel of record for the Class Representatives, i.e., Class Counsel,
27 are qualified to serve as counsel for Plaintiffs in their individual and representative capacity and
28 for the Class Members.

1 7. Within twenty-one (21) days after the Effective Date, Defendants shall deposit the
2 Gross Settlement Amount of One Million, Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents
3 (\$1,700,000.00), plus their share of payroll taxes, with the Settlement Administrator.

4 8. From the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator shall pay:

- 5 1. to Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the amount of \$566,666.67 and
6 reimbursement of costs in an amount not to exceed \$28,126.25;
- 7 2. to Class Representatives Barrett Robenolt, Joseph Sewell III, Darrius
8 Vance, and Arjenis E. Corona for their services to the Class, and as
9 consideration for the execution of a general release, the amount of
10 \$10,000.00 each, for a total of \$40,000.00;
- 11 3. to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency the amount
12 of \$75,000.00 for its 75% share of the \$100,000.00 PAGA Payment, with
13 the remaining 25%, or \$25,000.00, to be distributed to the Aggrieved
14 Employees; and
- 15 4. to Phoenix Settlement Administrators the amount of \$18,395.00 for its
16 fees and costs in administering the settlement.

17 9. The Court finds that these amounts are fair and reasonable. The Administrator is
18 directed to make such payments in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.

19 10. The Court approves the Individual Settlement Amounts, which shall be
20 distributed by the Administrator pursuant to the terms of the Agreement from the Net Settlement
21 Amount, after payment of those amounts set forth in Paragraph 8.

22 11. Settlement checks will remain valid for a period of 180 calendar days after they
23 issue. Any check not cashed within 180 calendar days will be distributed to the State of
24 California Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member.

25 12. The Court finds that there was one (1) request for exclusion from _____
26 and zero (0) objections to the Settlement. All Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees shall be
27 bound by the Released Class Claims and Released PAGA Claims provided in the Agreement.
28 _____ will not be bound by the Released Class Claims. The Class Representatives shall be

1 bound by the additional general releases in the Agreement.

2 13. The Court hereby enters final judgment in this case in accordance with the terms
3 of the Settlement, Preliminary Approval Order, and this Order. Without affecting the finality of
4 the Settlement or Judgment entered, this Court shall retain exclusive and continuing jurisdiction
5 over the action and the Parties, including all Class Members, for purposes of enforcing and
6 interpreting this Order and the Settlement.

7 14. The Court sets a compliance hearing for _____, 2027 at 10:30 a.m.
8 At least fifteen (15) days before, the Parties shall file the Administrator's Declaration and an
9 amended judgment in compliance with Code of Civil Procedure section 384(b).

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.**

11
12 Dated: _____, 2026

13 Honorable Peter K. Southworth
14 Judge of the Superior Court
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28