Jonathan M. Genish (State Bar No. 259031) igenish@blackstonepc.com 2 Miriam L. Schimmel (State Bar No. 185089) mschimmel@blackstonepc.com APR 18 2025 3 Joana Fang (State Bar No. 309623) Clerk of the Superior Court ifang@blackstonepc.com Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407) By: K. Sorianosos, Deputy 5 arose@blackstonepc.com **BLACKSTONE LAW, APC** 6 8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745 Beverly Hills, California 90211 7 Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff Rigoberto Tecaliz 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 11 RIGOBERTO TECALIZ, individually and on Case No.: 37-2023-00046906-CU-OE-CTL 12 behalf of others similarly situated and on Honorable Matthew C. Braner behalf of other aggrieved employees, 13 Department C-60 Plaintiff, PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING 14 PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS 15 VS. **ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT** 16 NATIONAL RESTAURANT INC. DBA Date: April 18, 2025 BLACK BEAR DINER, a California 9:00 a.m. Time: 17 corporation; and DOES 1 through 25, C-60 Dept.: inclusive, 18 Complaint Filed: October 27, 2023 Defendants. 19 FAC Filed: November 27, 2023 Trial Date: Not Set 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

28

## PROPOSED ORDER

On April 18, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department C-60 of the above-captioned Court located at 330 West Broadway San Diego, California 92101, Plaintiff Rigoberto Tecaliz's ("Plaintiff") Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, came on for hearing before the Honorable Matthew C. Braner. Blackstone Law, APC appeared on behalf of Plaintiff and O'Hagan Meyer LLP appeared on behalf of Defendant National Restaurant Inc. dba Black Bear Diner ("Defendant").

The Court, having carefully considered the papers, argument of counsel, and all matters presented to the Court, and good cause appearing, hereby **GRANTS** Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement.

## IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The Court preliminarily approves the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement") attached as Exhibit 3 to the Declaration of Jonathan M. Genish in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement. This is based on the Court's determination that the Settlement falls within the range of possible approval as fair, adequate, and reasonable.
- 2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Settlement Agreement, and all capitalized terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 3. It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable. It appears to the Court that extensive investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court that the Settlement, at this time, will avoid substantial additional costs by all parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the case. It further appears that the Settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive, arms-length negotiations, and was entered into in good faith.
- 4. The Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement, including the allocations for the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payment, LWDA Payment, Settlement Administration Costs, and payments to the Settlement Class Members and PAGA Employees provided for in the

///

Settlement Agreement, appear to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. Indeed, the Court has reviewed the monetary recovery that is being granted as part of the Settlement and preliminarily finds that the monetary settlement awards made available to the Class Members and PAGA Employees are fair, adequate, and reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to certification, liability, and damages issues and are consistent with the requirements of California Labor Code § 2699(1).

- 5. The Court concludes that, for settlement purposes only, the proposed Class meets the requirements for certification under section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure in that: (a) the Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable; (b) common questions of law and fact predominate, and there is a well-defined community of interest amongst the members of the Class with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c) Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class; (d) Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the efficient adjudication of the controversy; and (f) Class Counsel is qualified to act as counsel for Plaintiff in his individual capacity and as the representative of the Class.
- 6. The Court conditionally certifies, for settlement purposes only, the Class, defined as follows:

All current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the Class Period (or if any such person is incompetent, deceased, or unavailable due to military service, the person's legal representative or successor in interest evidenced by reasonable verification).

(The Class Period is defined as the period from October 27, 2019 through November 25, 2024.)

- 7. The Court provisionally appoints Jonathan M. Genish, Miriam L. Schimmel, Joana Fang, and Alexandra Rose of Blackstone Law, APC as counsel for the Class ("Class Counsel").
- 8. The Court provisionally appoints Plaintiff Rigoberto Tecaliz as the representative of the Class ("Class Representative").
- 9. The Court provisionally appoints ILYM Group, Inc. to handle the administration of the Settlement ("Settlement Administrator").

- 10. Within fourteen (14) calendar days after entry of this order, Defendant will provide a list in a formatted readable Microsoft Office Excel spreadsheet to the Settlement Administrator containing the following information for each Class Member: (1) full name; (2) last known mailing address; (3) Social Security number; (4) dates worked for Defendant during the Class Period; and (8) such other information as is necessary for the Settlement Administrator to calculate Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (collectively referred to as the "Class List") in conformity with the Settlement Agreement.
- ("Class Notice") attached hereto as Exhibit 1. The Class Notice shall be provided to Class Members in the manner set forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds that the Class Notice appears to fully and accurately inform the Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement, of Class Members' right to be excluded from the Class Settlement by submitting a Request for Exclusion, of Class Members' right to dispute the Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods credited to each of them by submitting a Dispute, and of each Settlement Class Member's right and opportunity to object to the Class Settlement by submitting a Notice of Objection to the Settlement Administrator. The Court further finds that distribution of the Class Notice substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Settlement Agreement and this Order, and that all other dates set forth in the Settlement Agreement and this Order, meet the requirements of due process and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court further orders the Settlement Administrator to mail the Class Notice in English and Spanish by First-Class U.S. Mail to all Class Members within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of the Class List, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 12. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure, set forth in the Settlement Agreement, for seeking exclusion from the Class Settlement. Any Class Member may choose to be excluded from the Class Settlement by submitting a Request for Exclusion in conformity with the requirements set forth in the Class Notice, to the Settlement Administrator, postmarked on or before the date that is forty-five (45) calendar days from the initial mailing of the Class Notice by the Settlement Administrator to Class Members ("Response Deadline"), or, in the case of a re-mailed Class Notice, the Response Deadline shall be extended fifteen (15) calendar days from the original

**IPROPOSEDI ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL** 

- 16. In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, or the Settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, canceled, or fails to become effective for any reason, this Order shall be rendered null and void, shall be vacated, and the parties shall revert back to their respective positions as of before entering into the Settlement Agreement. The fact that the Court certified the Class for settlement purposes shall not be admissible or have any bearing on the issue of whether any class should be certified in a non-settlement context.
- 17. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the Final Approval Hearing and any dates provided for in the Settlement Agreement without further notice to the Class Members and retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/18/25

Honorable Matthew C. Braner Judge of the Superior Court