1 2 3 4 5 6	BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMI DE BLOUW LLP Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687) Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975) Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066) 2255 Calle Clara La Jolla, CA 92037 Telephone: (858)551-1223 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232 Email: Kyle@bamlawca.com Website: www.bamlawca.com	FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 02/02/2024 David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Co. By: A. He Deputy
8 9 10 11 12 13	LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776) Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483) 8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200 Beverly Hills, California 90211 Telephone: (310) 432-0000 Facsimile: (310) 432-0001 Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
14 15	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
16 17 18 19	LOLA MARCUM and JOSE G. IRIZARRY, on behalf of the State of California as private attorneys general, and as individuals, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,	CASE NO.: 22STCV03845 [Consolidated with Case No. 22STCV22712] [REVISED PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER
202122232425	Plaintiffs, vs. HUNTSMAN ADVANCED MATERIALS AMERICAS LLC, a Limited Liability Company; HUNTSMAN INTERNATIONAL LLC, a Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, Defendants.	Hearing Date: February 2, 2024 Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m. Judge: Hon. Stuart M. Rice Dept: SS-1 Date Filed: January 31, 2022 Trial Date: Not set
262728	PRFI IMINARY A	PPROVAL ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

1. The Court preliminarily approves the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") attached as Exhibit #1 to the Declaration of Kyle Nordrehaug in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. This is based on the Court's determination that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is within the range of possible final approval, pursuant to the provisions of Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and California Rules of Court, rule 3.769.

This matter came before the Honorable Stuart M. Rice of the Superior Court of the State of

California, in and for the County Los Angeles, on February 2, 2024, for hearing on the unopposed

motion by Plaintiffs Lola Marcum and Jose G. Irizarry ("Plaintiffs") for preliminary approval of

the Settlement with Defendants Huntsman International LLC and Huntsman Advanced Materials

Americas LLC ("Defendants"). The Court, having considered the briefs, argument of counsel and

all matters presented to the Court and good cause appearing, hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion

- 2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Agreement.
- 3. The Gross Settlement Amount that Defendants shall pay is Four Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$480,000). It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount and terms are fair, adequate and reasonable as to all potential Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability and damages issues. It further appears that investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court that the Settlement 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 Action. It further appears that the Settlement has been reached as the result of serious and non-collusive, arm's-length negotiations.

- 4. The Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement appears to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. 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 are fair, adequate, and reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability, and damages issues.
- 5. The Agreement specifies for an attorneys' fees award not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, an award of litigation expenses incurred, not to exceed \$21,000, and proposed Class Representative Service Payments to the Plaintiffs in an amount not to exceed \$10,000 each. The Court will not approve the amount of attorneys' fees and costs, nor the amount of any service award, until the Final Approval Hearing. Plaintiffs will be required to present evidence supporting these requests, including lodestar, prior to final approval.
- 6. The Court recognizes that Plaintiffs and Defendants stipulate and agree to representative treatment and certification of a class for settlement purposes only. This stipulation will not be deemed admissible in this or any other proceeding should this Settlement not become final. For settlement purposes only, the Court conditionally certifies the Class which consists of "all individuals who were employed by Defendants Huntsman International LLC and Huntsman Advanced Materials Americas LLC in California and classified as a hourly non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period." The "Class Period" is January 31, 2018 and continuing through February 17, 2023.
- 7. The Court concludes that, for settlement purposes only, the 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) the claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the members of the Class; (d) the Plaintiffs 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 this controversy; and (f) counsel for the Class is qualified to act as counsel for the Class and the Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class.

- 8. The Court provisionally appoints Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class. The Court provisionally appoints Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, and Aparajit Bhowmik of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP and Joseph Lavi and Vincent Granberry of Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP as Class Counsel for the Class.
- 9. The Agreement provides for PAGA Penalties out of the Gross Settlement Amount of \$7,500, which shall be allocated \$5,625 to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") as the LWDA's 75% share of the settlement of civil penalties paid under this Agreement pursuant to the PAGA and \$1,875 to the Aggrieved Employees. "Aggrieved Employees" are all individuals who were employed by Defendants in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period (November 19, 2020 through February 17, 2023). Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (l)(2), the LWDA will be provided notice of the Agreement and these settlement terms. The Court finds the PAGA Penalties to be reasonable.
- 10. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the Class Notice attached to the Agreement as Exhibit A. The Court finds that the Class Notice appears to fully and accurately inform the Class of all material elements of the proposed Settlement, of the Class Members' right to be excluded from the Class by submitting a written opt-out request, and of each member's right and opportunity to object to the Settlement. The Court further finds that the distribution of the Class Notice substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Agreement and this Order meets the requirements of due process, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court orders the mailing of the Class Notice by first class mail pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement. If a Class Notice Packet is returned because of an incorrect address, the Administrator will promptly search for a more current address for the Class Member and re-mail the Class Notice Packet to any new

Class Notice.

11. The Court hereby appoints ILYM Group as the Administrator. The Agreement

address for the Class Member no later than seven (7) days after the receipt of the undelivered

- provides for an Administration Expenses Payment to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount in an amount not to exceed \$8,750 except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. No later than fifteen (15) days after this Order, Defendants will provide the Class Data to the Administrator. The Administrator will perform address updates and verifications as necessary prior to the first mailing. Using best efforts to mail it as soon as possible, and in no event later than fourteen (14) days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will mail the Class Notice Packet to all Class Members via first-class regular U.S. Mail to their last known address.
- 12. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure for exclusion from the Settlement. Any Class Member may individually choose to opt out of and be excluded from the Class as provided in the Class Notice by following the instructions for requesting exclusion from the Class that are set forth in the Class Notice. All requests for exclusion must be postmarked or received no later than sixty (60) calendar days after the date of the mailing of the Class Notice ("Response Deadline"). If a Class Notice Packet is re-mailed, the Response Deadline for requests for exclusion will be extended an additional fourteen (14) days. A Request for Exclusion may also be faxed or emailed to the Administrator as indicated in the Class Notice. Any such person who chooses to opt out of and be excluded from the Class will not be entitled to any recovery under the Class Settlement and will not be bound by the Class Settlement or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. Class Members who have not requested exclusion shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Agreement and the Judgment. A request for exclusion may only opt out that particular individual, and any attempt to effect an opt-out of a group, class, or subclass of individuals is not permitted and will be deemed invalid.
- 13. Any Class Member who has not opted out may appear at the final approval hearing and may object or express the Member's views regarding the Settlement, and may present evidence and file briefs or other papers that may be proper and relevant to the issues to be heard

- at FERNEAUT in Department 1 at the Spring Street Courthouse of the Los

 Angeles County Superior Court to hear the motion for final approval and the motion for attorneys' fees and costs, and to determine all necessary matters concerning the Settlement, including: whether the proposed settlement of the Action on the terms and conditions provided for in the Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable and should be finally approved by the Court; whether the Final Approval Order and Judgment should be entered herein; whether the plan of allocation contained in the Agreement should be approved as fair, adequate and reasonable to the Class Members; and to finally approve attorneys' fees and costs, service award, and the fees and expenses of the Administrator. All papers in support of the motion for final approval and the motion for attorneys' fees, costs and service award shall be filed with the Court and served on all counsel no later than sixteen (16) court days before the hearing and both motions shall be heard at this final approval hearing.
- 15. Neither the Settlement nor any exhibit, document, or instrument delivered thereunder shall be construed as a concession or admission by Defendants in any way that the claims asserted have any merit or that this Action was properly brought as a class or representative action, and shall not be used as evidence of, or used against Defendants as, an admission or indication in any way, including with respect to any claim of any liability, wrongdoing, fault or omission by Defendants or with respect to the truth of any allegation asserted by any person. Whether or not the Settlement is finally approved, neither the Settlement, nor any exhibit, document, statement, proceeding or conduct related to the Settlement, nor any reports or accounts

thereof, shall in any event be construed as, offered or admitted in evidence as, received as or deemed to be evidence for any purpose adverse to the Defendants, including, but not limited to, evidence of a presumption, concession, indication or admission by Defendants of any liability, fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession or damage.

- 16. In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the 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 and shall be vacated, and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement, and expressly reserve their respective rights regarding the prosecution and defense of this Action, including all available defenses and affirmative defenses, and arguments that any claim in the Action could not be certified as a class action and/or managed as a representative action. In such an event, the Court's orders regarding the Settlement, including this Order, shall not be used or referred to in litigation for any purpose. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to alter the terms of the Agreement with respect to the effect of the Agreement if it is not approved.
- 17. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the final approval hearing and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to Class Members and retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

20

Dated:

Ø^ঠ*æ¦^ÁGÉÆG

Stuart M. Rice/Judge

HON. STUART M. RICE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

25

26

27