

Tentative Rulings for June 25, 2025
Department 403

For any matter where an oral argument is requested and any party to the hearing desires a remote appearance, such request must be timely submitted to and approved by the hearing judge. In this department, the remote appearance will be conducted through Zoom. If approved, 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.*

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

(Tentative Rulings begin at the next page)

Tentative Rulings for Department 403

Begin at the next page

(20)

Tentative Ruling

Re: ***Sanchez, Jr. v. Jim Crawford Construction Company, Inc.***
Superior Court Case No. 24CECG01421

Hearing Date: June 25, 2025 (Dept. 403)

Motion: Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement

Tentative Ruling:

To deny without prejudice.

Explanation:

Certification of Class for Settlement

Settlements preceding class certification are scrutinized more carefully to make sure that absent class members' rights are adequately protected, although there is less scrutiny of manageability issues. (*Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 240; see *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1803, fn. 9, 19.a) The trial court has a "fiduciary responsibility" as the guardian of the absentee class members' rights to decide whether to approve a settlement of a class action. (*Luckey v. Superior Court* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 81, 95.)

A precertification settlement may stipulate that a defined class be conditionally certified for settlement purposes. The court may make an order approving or denying certification of a provisional settlement class after the preliminary settlement hearing. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.769(d).) Before the court may approve the settlement, however, the settlement class must satisfy the normal prerequisites for a class action. (*Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor* (1997) 521 US 591, 625-627.)

"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.)

Plaintiff bears the burden of establishing the propriety of class treatment with admissible evidence. (*Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.* (1981) 29 Cal.3d 462, 470 [trial court's ruling on certification supported by substantial evidence generally not disturbed on appeal]; *Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Superior Court, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at pp. 1107-1108 [plaintiff's burden to produce substantial evidence].)

Counsel represents that there are approximately 148 class members. However, no admissible evidence is submitted as to this number. Nor is there any evidence of

ascertainability, such as a showing that the class members are identifiable from defendant's own records. A conclusory statement to this effect in the points and authorities is insufficient. In a future motion for preliminary approval, a declaration from defendant should be submitted, establishing the number of class members and ascertainability.

Under the community of interest requirement, the class representative must be able to represent the class adequately. (*Caro v. Procter & Gamble* (1993) 18 Cal.App.4th 644, 669.) "[I]t has never been the law in California that the class representative must have identical interests with the class members . . . The focus of the typicality requirement entails inquiry as to whether the plaintiff's individual circumstances are markedly different or whether the legal theory upon which the claims are based differ from that upon which the claims of the other class members will be based." (*Classen v. Weller* (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 27, 46.)

Usually, in wage and hour class actions or PAGA class claims, the distinctive feature that permits class certification is that the employees have the same job title or perform similar jobs, and the employer treats all in that discrete group in the same allegedly unlawful fashion. In *Brinker Restaurant v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1017, "no evidence of common policies or means of proof was supplied, and the trial court therefore erred in certifying a subclass."

Plaintiff has submitted no evidence on this point. All that is submitted is conclusory statements in the points and authorities. Plaintiff's declaration must attest to the violations experienced. Evidence must be submitted showing with declarations and written policies showing that the same practices and policies applied to all members of the class, and across the multiple locations where potential class members worked.

The adequacy of representation component of the community of interest requirement for class certification comes into play when the party opposing certification brings forth evidence indicating widespread antagonism to the class suit. " 'The adequacy inquiry ... serves to uncover conflicts of interest between named parties and the class they seek to represent.' [Citation.] '... To assure "adequate" representation, the class representative's personal claim must not be inconsistent with the claims of other members of the class. [Citation.], [Citation.]" (*J.P. Morgan & Co., Inc. v. Superior Court* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 195, 212.)

"[T]he adequacy inquiry should focus on the abilities of the class representative's counsel and the existence of conflicts between the representative and other class members." (*Caro v. Procter & Gamble Co.* (1993) 18 Cal.App.4th 644, 669.) This consideration is satisfied, as counsel has substantial class action experience.

Settlement Approval

"[I]n the final analysis it is the Court that bears the responsibility to ensure that the recovery represents a reasonable compromise, given the magnitude and apparent merit of the claims being released, discounted by the risks and expenses of attempting to establish and collect on those claims by pursuing litigation. The court has a fiduciary responsibility as guardians of the rights of the absentee class members when deciding

whether to approve a settlement agreement." (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129.) "[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.)

Clark v. America Residential Services (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785 vacated approval of a class settlement coupled with class certification, an award of \$25,000 each to two named plaintiffs, and more. The problem was that the plaintiffs presented "no evidence regarding the likelihood of success on any of the 10 causes of action, or the number of unpaid overtime hours estimated to have been worked by the class, or the average hourly rate of pay, or the number of meal periods and rest periods missed, or the value of minimum wage violations, and so on." (*Id.* at p. 793.)

Counsel states that prior to mediation, there was informal discovery and production of time and pay records. However, what exactly was produced is not explained. There is no showing that a statistically reliable sampling of data was provided. The policies produced are not provided with the motion. And no admissible evidence of the number of putative class members has been provided.

Class counsel determined that the total potential best-case-scenario liability is \$5,985,577. However, this valuation is entirely conclusory, with no showing how counsel arrived at this figure. The base inputs or assumptions going into the valuations must be explained. There is reference to counsel relying on an expert. Without a declaration from the expert, the valuation lacks foundation.

Insufficient information is provided to enable the court to preliminarily approve the award of attorney's fees and costs. Plaintiff's counsel seeks up to \$108,333.33 in attorney's fees, which is 1/3 of the total gross settlement, plus costs of up to \$30,000. 1/3 is within the range of fees that have been approved by other courts in class actions, which frequently approve fees based on a percentage of the common fund. (*City & County of San Francisco v. Sweet* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 105, 110-11; *Quinn v. State* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 162, 168; see also *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2005) 126 Cal.App.4th 1253, 1270; *Lealao v. Beneficial California, Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 26.)

While it is true that courts have found fee awards based on a percentage of the common fund are reasonable, the California Supreme Court has also found that the trial court has discretion to conduct a lodestar "cross-check" to double check the reasonableness of the requested fees. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503-504 [although class counsel may obtain fees based on a percentage of the class settlement, courts may also perform a lodestar cross-check to ensure that the fees are reasonable in light of the number of hours worked and the attorneys' reasonable hourly rates].)

The court prefers to do a lodestar analysis as a cross-check on the reasonableness of the fees. Counsel provides no information about the billing rates or time expended on the matter. Counsel must provide their billing rates, show that the rates are reasonable,

and detailed information about the time spent on the matter (billing records). Counsel also must document the costs incurred.

The motion seeks preliminary approval of a \$7,500 enhancement payment to plaintiff. Plaintiff's counsel includes in her declaration a conclusory statement that the enhancement payment is reasonable, but includes no specific information about plaintiff's services to the class. (Rose Decl., ¶ 10.) Plaintiff estimates that she spent around 34-38 hours on the matter. (Sanchez Decl., ¶ 10.) Based on the information provided, the court will approve a \$5,000 for the enhancement.

The settlement provides that class administrator Apex Class Action LLC will be paid \$7,000, even though it agreed to cap its fee at \$5,990. There is no indication that the parties solicited or received bids from any other administrators. With the next motion for preliminary approval, plaintiff should provide the court with any other bids that were received and explain why Apex was chosen. And obviously the court will approve no more than the actual cost of administration.

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: Img **on** 6-23-25.
(Judge's initials) (Date)