

Tentative Rulings for October 13, 2026
Department 403

For any matter where an oral argument is requested and any party to the hearing desires a remote appearance, the remote appearance will be conducted through Zoom. Please provide the department's clerk a correct email address. (CRC 3.672, Fresno Sup.C. Local Rule 1.1.19.)

There are no tentative rulings for the following cases. The hearing will go forward on these matters. If a person is under a court order to appear, he/she must do so. Otherwise, parties should appear unless they have notified the court that they will submit the matter without an appearance. (See California Rules of Court, rule 3.1304(c).) *The above rule also applies to cases listed in this "must appear" section.*

25CECG03077 *Aranzasu v. Central Unified School District (Dept. 501.)*

The court has continued the following cases. The deadlines for opposition and reply papers will remain the same as for the original hearing date.

25CECG05067 *Castro v. Newrez LLC is continued to Tuesday, December 1, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 403.*

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

Tentative Rulings for Department 403

Begin at the next page

(03)

Tentative Ruling

Re: ***Huerta v. Batth Farms, Inc.***
Case No. 21CECG01833

Hearing Date: October 13, 2026 (Dept. 403)

Motion: Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class and PAGA Settlement

Tentative Ruling:

To grant plaintiffs' motion for preliminary approval of the class and PAGA settlement.

**If oral argument is timely requested, it will be entertained on
Thursday, October 15, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 403.**

Explanation:

1. Class Certification

a. Standards

"Class certification requires proof (1) of a sufficiently numerous, ascertainable class, (2) of a well-defined community of interest, and (3) that certification will provide substantial benefits to litigants and the courts, i.e., that proceeding as a class is superior to other methods. In turn, the community of interest requirement embodies three factors: (1) predominant common questions of law or fact; (2) class representatives with claims or defenses typical of the class; and (3) class representatives who can adequately represent the class." (*In re Tobacco II Cases* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 298, 313.)

b. Numerosity and Ascertainability

"Ascertainability is achieved by defining the class in terms of objective characteristics and common transactional facts making the ultimate identification of class members possible when that identification becomes necessary. While often it is said that class members are ascertainable where they may be readily identified without unreasonable expense or time by reference to official records, that statement must be considered in light of the purpose of the ascertainability requirement. Ascertainability is required in order to give notice to putative class members as to whom the judgment in the action will be res judicata." (*Nicodemus v. Saint Francis Memorial Hospital* (2016) 3 Cal.App.5th 1200, 1212, internal citations and quote marks omitted.)

Here, the class appears to be ascertainable, as defendant's personnel records should be sufficient to allow the parties to identify the class members. The class is also sufficiently numerous to justify certification, as plaintiff's counsel claims that there are approximately 569 class members who worked for defendant during the class period. Therefore, the court finds that the class is sufficiently numerous and ascertainable for certification.

c. Community of Interest

"[T]he 'community of interest requirement embodies three factors: (1) predominant common questions of law or fact; (2) class representatives with claims or defenses typical of the class; and (3) class representatives who can adequately represent the class.'" (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1021, internal citations omitted.)

Here, it does appear that there are common questions of law and fact, as all of the proposed class members worked for the same defendant and allegedly suffered the same type of Labor Code violations. Therefore, the proposed class involves common issues of law and fact.

With regard to the requirement of typicality of the class representative's claims, the named plaintiffs state that they did the same type of work and were subjected to the same types of violations as the other class members. In addition, they state that they do not have any conflicts of interest that might prevent them from being adequate class representatives. They also describe the work they did on the case. Therefore, the court finds that the named plaintiffs are adequate class representatives.

Plaintiffs' counsel have submitted declarations that establish that they are experienced and qualified to represent the class. Counsel's declarations discuss their background, education, and experience in class action litigation. Therefore, counsel have provided sufficient evidence to support their assertion that they are experienced and qualified to represent plaintiffs and the other class members here.

d. Superiority of Class Certification

The court finds that certifying the class would be superior to any other available means of resolving the disputes between the parties. Absent class certification, each employee of defendant would have to litigate their claims individually, which would result in wasted time and resources relitigating the same issues and presenting the same testimony and evidence. Class certification will allow the employees' claims to be resolved in a relatively efficient and fair manner. (*Sav-On Drugs Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319, 340.) Therefore, plaintiffs have shown that class certification is the superior means of resolving her claims.

Conclusion: The court intends to grant certification of the class for the purpose of settlement.

2. Settlement

a. Legal Standards

"[T]o protect the interests of absent class members, the court must independently and objectively analyze the evidence and circumstances before it in order to determine whether the settlement is in the best interests of those whose claims will be extinguished . . . [therefore] the factual record must be before the ... court must be sufficiently developed." (*Id.* at p. 130.) The court must be leery of a situation where "there was nothing before the court to establish the sufficiency of class counsel's investigation other than their assurance that they had seen what they needed to see." (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 116, 129.)

b. Fairness and Reasonableness of the Settlement

"In determining whether a class settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable, the trial court should consider relevant factors, such as 'the strength of plaintiffs' case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and views of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement.' The list of factors is not exclusive and the court is free to engage in a balancing and weighing of factors depending on the circumstances of each case." (*Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 244–245, internal citations omitted, disapproved of on other grounds by *Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 260.)

Here, plaintiffs' counsel has presented a sufficient discussion of the strength of the case if it went to trial, the risks, complexity, and duration of further litigation, and an explanation of why the settlement is fair and reasonable in light of the risks of taking the case to trial. Therefore, plaintiffs have shown that the settlement is fair, reasonable, or adequate in light of the unique facts and legal issues raised by the plaintiffs' case, and the court finds that the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

c. Proposed Class Notice

The proposed notice appears to be adequate. The notice will provide the class members with information regarding their time to opt out or object, the nature and amount of the settlement, the impact on class members if they do not opt out, the amount of attorney's fees and costs, and the service award to the named class representative. As a result, the court finds that the proposed class notice is adequate.

3. Attorney's Fees and Costs

Plaintiffs' counsel seeks attorney's fees of \$750,000, which is one-third of the gross settlement. Plaintiffs' attorneys have provided their declarations, which describe their education, skill, and experience. They also state the amount of fees incurred so far in the case, based on their hourly rates and the hours spent working on the case. They have also attached billing records to their declarations.

Considering the lengthy, complex, and hard-fought nature of the case, the request for \$750,000 in fees is fair and reasonable. The attorneys' declarations and billing records also support the requested fees. Therefore, the court intends to approve the request for \$750,000 in fees.

In addition, counsel also seeks an award of costs of up to \$100,000. Counsel has provided a summary of the costs incurred in the case, which are approximately \$100,000. Therefore, the court intends to approve the request for costs of \$100,000.

4. Payment to Class Representative

Plaintiff seeks preliminary approval of a \$10,000 service award to each of the named plaintiffs, including the now-deceased plaintiff Mr. Lopez. The plaintiffs have provided their declarations, which support the request for a service award, as they state that they worked closely with plaintiffs' counsel, provided documents, answered questions, and participated in meetings about the case with counsel. Mr. Lopez also did

substantial work on the case before he died, including answering discovery and sitting for his deposition, which was helpful to litigation of the case. Thus, plaintiffs have shown that they did substantial work on the case, which supports an award of \$10,000 per plaintiff. Therefore, the court intends to grant preliminary approval of the incentive award to the named plaintiffs.

5. Payment to Class Administrator

The class administrator will be ILYM Group, which will receive up to \$11,000 to administer the settlement. However, according to the declaration of ILYM Group's representative, the cost of administering the settlement will be only \$8,950 unless the class size increases or additional services are requested. (Mullins decl., ¶ 10.) It is unclear why plaintiffs are requesting approval of up to \$11,000 to administer the settlement when actual administration costs are under \$9,000. Still, under the terms of the settlement, any remaining amounts that are not paid to administer the settlement will be paid to the class, so it does not appear that the discrepancy is a major problem that would prevent approval of the settlement. Therefore, the court intends to grant preliminary approval of the class administrator payment.

6. PAGA Settlement

\$150,000 of the settlement will be allocated to the PAGA claims, with 75% of that amount being paid to the LWDA as required by law and the other 25% being paid out to the aggrieved employees. Plaintiff's counsel has also provided a discussion of the reasons why they chose to settle the PAGA claims for \$150,000, and what the claims were potentially worth.

In addition, plaintiff's counsel has given notice of the settlement to the LWDA before filing the motion for preliminary approval, and there is no evidence that the LWDA opposes the settlement. (See Labor Code, § 2699, subd. (s)(2).) As a result, the court intends to grant preliminary approval of the PAGA portion of the settlement.

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.1312(a), and Code of Civil Procedure section 1019.5, subdivision (a), no further written order is necessary. The minute order adopting this tentative ruling will serve as the order of the court and service by the clerk will constitute notice of the order.

Tentative Ruling

Issued By: SMC on October 12, 2026.
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(34)

Tentative Ruling

Re: ***Estate of Joe L. Faz v. Harman trucking, Inc., et al.***
Superior Court Case No. 20CECG03757

Hearing Date: October 13, 2026 (Dept. 403)

Motion: by Defendant California Department of Transportation for
Judgment on the Pleadings

Tentative Ruling:

To deny the motion for judgment on the pleadings as to the Estate of Stephanie Zulenka Faz. To grant the motion for judgment on the pleadings as to the Estate of Joe L. Faz, without leave to amend.

**If oral argument is timely requested, it will be entertained on
Thursday, October 15, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 403.**

Explanation:

Failure to present a timely government tort claim acts as a bar from a lawsuit against a government entity. (*Gong v. City of Rosemead* (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 363, 374.) Where a claim is deficient, the doctrine of substantial compliance may act to validate the claim. (*Connelly v. County of Fresno* (2006) 146 Cal.App.4th 29, 28.) Substantial compliance meets the purpose of the claims statute of giving the entity "timely notice of the nature of the claim" in order to investigate and potentially settle claims. (*Ibid.*) The test is whether the claim disclosed "sufficient information to enable the public entity to make an adequate investigation of the claim's merits and settle it without the expense of litigation." (*Ibid.*)

In *Nelson v. County of Los Angeles* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 783, 797-798 ("*Nelson*"), the appellate court considered whether there was substantial compliance where the lawsuit alleged survival and wrongful death claims, but the government claim focused on the wrongful death. There, the court noted that the estate did not file a claim and there was no mention of any damage incurred by the decedent before his death within in the claim suggesting it was filed in anything but the plaintiff's individual capacity. (*Id.* at p. 797.) The appellate court found the survivorship claims were properly resolved. (*Ibid.*) Where more than one person "suffer[s] separate and distinct injuries from the same act or omission, each person must submit a claim, and one cannot rely on a claim presented by another." (*Id.* at p. 796.)

Here, in contrast with the claim at issue in *Nelson*, the claim describes injuries sustained by Stephanie Faz before her death ten days following the accident. (*Nelson, supra*, 113 Cal.App.4th at p. 797 ["the damages described in the claim were for 'loss of a son' (with no mention of any damage incurred by Dwayne before his death) ..."].) The government claim form lists the physical injuries sustained in the accident and states the decedent died ten days after the accident in the hospital. The claim form provided the

information necessary to evaluate the claim for the value of both the survivorship action for injuries suffered in the accident and the wrongful death action. As a result, the motion for judgment on the pleadings as to the claim by the Estate of Stephanie Zulenka Faz is denied.

Plaintiffs concede there is no survivorship claim presented in the contents of their claims for Joe L. Faz. As such, the survivorship claim of the Estate of Joe L. Faz is subject to judgment on the pleadings. The court grants the motion as to the Estate of Joe L. Faz against the California Department of Transportation, without leave to amend.

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.1312(a), and Code of Civil Procedure section 1019.5, subdivision (a), no further written order is necessary. The minute order adopting this tentative ruling will serve as the order of the court and service by the clerk will constitute notice of the order.

Tentative Ruling

Issued By: SMC **on** October 12, 2026.
(Judge's initials) (Date)

(29)

Tentative Ruling

Re: ***In re: Ixchel Bojorquez-Rodriguez***
Superior Court Case No. 26CU03233

Hearing Date: October 13, 2026 (Dept. 403)

Motion: Petition to Compromise Minor's Claim

**If oral argument is timely requested, it will be entertained on
Thursday, October 15, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. in Department 403.**

Tentative Ruling:

To grant the petition and sign the proposed orders. No appearances necessary.

The court sets a status conference for Wednesday, December 30, 2026, in Department 403, for confirmation that the minor's funds have been invested as set forth in the petition. If petitioner files a declaration or documentation, at least five court days before the status conference, showing that the funds have been invested as ordered, the status conference will come off calendar.

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.1312(a), and Code of Civil Procedure section 1019.5, subdivision (a), no further written order is necessary. The minute order adopting this tentative ruling will serve as the order of the court and service by the clerk will constitute notice of the order.

Tentative Ruling

Issued By: SMC on October 12, 2026.
(Judge's initials) (Date)