

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	2:24-cv-02886-WLH-SK	Date	March 9, 2026
Title	<i>David Hough et al v. Ryan Carroll et al</i>		
Present: The Honorable	WESLEY L. HSU, United States District Judge		
	Lesbith Castillo		None
	Deputy Clerk		Court Reporter
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:		Attorneys Present for Defendants:	
	None		None

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER RE UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT [354]

The Court is in receipt of Plaintiffs’ unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (“Motion”). (Mot., Dkt. No. 354).¹ For the reasons stated herein, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion and sets a Final Fairness Hearing for June 12, 2026, at 8:30 a.m.

I. BACKGROUND

This case involves an alleged fraudulent scheme which the Court has detailed in previous orders. (Temporary Restraining Order, Dkt. No. 17 at 1-4). In short, Plaintiffs allege that putative class members were fraudulently induced to purchase ecommerce stores from Defendant Wealth Assistants, owned, directly or indirectly, by Individual Defendants Ryan Carroll, Max. K. Day, and Max O. Day for a buy-in of up to \$125,000. (Third Amended Complaint (“TAC”), Dkt. No. 306 ¶ 10). Wealth Assistants advertised that it would set up and manage clients’ online stores which would earn more than

¹ The Motion was filed as a Motion to Certify Class in error. The Court will construe the Motion as a motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action settlement pursuant to its contents.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

\$10,000 per month by the end of the store’s first year. (*Id.* ¶¶ 11-14). Plaintiffs allege that Wealth Assistants not only failed to deliver on their promises but never intended to honor their commitments to clients. (*Id.* ¶¶ 9, 13).

Plaintiffs further allege that Wealth Assistants pursued a “payment processing strategy” to conceal the proceeds of its allegedly fraudulent scheme from creditors, including the putative class members. (*Id.* ¶¶ 85-90). As part of this strategy, Wealth Assistants allegedly broke up large transactions into multiple, small transactions; used many different payment processors; divided assets into myriad bank accounts; and passed money through various accounts and processors “before the money reached its final destination.” (*Id.* ¶ 90). Defendant Reyhan Pasinli, the owner and operator of Defendant Total Apps, is alleged to have orchestrated this payment processing strategy by Wealth Assistants. (*Id.* ¶ 22).

The parties engaged in negotiations to resolve the claims, and Plaintiffs filed an unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action² Settlement on December 19, 2025. (Dkt. No. 354). Plaintiffs ask the Court to provisionally certify the class for settlement purposes only, appoint Plaintiffs as settlement class representatives, appoint Plaintiffs’ current counsel as settlement class counsel, approve the notice program, preliminarily approve the settlement, appoint Stretto as the settlement administrator and schedule a hearing for final approval of the settlement. (Mot. at 2). For the following

² Several other entities/individuals are implicated in the lawsuit. For purposes of identifying the relevant settlements addressed in this Order, Defendants Max K. Day; Max O. Day; Michael Day; Jared Day; Precision Trading Group, LLC; and Providence Oak Properties LLC are referred to collectively, as the “Day Defendants.” Total Apps, Inc. and Reyhan Pasinli are referred to collectively as the “Total Apps Defendants.” Travis Marker; The Law Office of Travis R. Marker, a Professional Corporation (d.b.a. “Marker Law and Mediation”); and Parlay Law Group, A Professional Corporation are referred to collectively as the “Marker Defendants.” (*See* Mot. at 1).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

reasons, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion and preliminarily **CERTIFIES** the proposed class for settlement purposes.

II. PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

A. Settlement Class

The proposed settlement class includes “[a]ll individuals who (a) purchased services relating to the setup or management of an online store from Yax Ecommerce LLC, Precision Trading Group, LLC, WA Distribution LLC, Providence Oak Properties, LLC, WA Amazon Sellers LLC, and Yax IP and Management Inc. (collectively, “Wealth Assistants”) between June 2021 and November 2023, (b) did not make a profit on their purchase of that business opportunity, and (c) have never been owners, employees, legal representatives, or successors of Wealth Assistants” (the “Settlement Class” or “Class Members”). (Mot. at 2). Plaintiffs seek conditional approval of this settlement class in the present motion. (*See generally* Mot.).

B. Settlement Overview

i. Monetary Relief and Distribution to Class Members

Under the Settlement Agreements (the “Agreements”) (*see* Docket No. 354-6), Defendants will create a \$222,000 common fund (the “Settlement Fund”). (Mot. at 6-7; Declaration of Nico Banks in Support of Motion (“Banks Decl.”), Dkt. No. 354-1, Ex. B (“Day Defendants Settlement”); Banks Decl., Ex. C (“Defendant Hagar Settlement”); Banks Decl., Ex. D (“Total Apps Defendants Settlement”); Banks Decl., Ex. E (“Marker Defendants’ Settlement”). Of that total, the Day Defendants will contribute \$125,000 (Day Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a)); Defendant Hagar will contribute \$24,500 (Defendant Hagar Settlement ¶ 5(a)); the Total Apps Defendants will contribute \$15,000 (Total Apps Defendants Settlement ¶ 6(a)); and the Marker Defendants will contribute \$57,500 (Marker Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a)).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

The Settlement Fund may be used to pay any attorneys' fees (which will not exceed \$55,500), litigation costs (which will not exceed \$10,000), and administrator costs (which will not exceed \$28,000, so long as the number of class members does not exceed 775,000 and the number of claim forms submitted does not exceed 155,000). (Day Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a); Defendant Hagar Settlement ¶ 5(a); Total Apps Defendants Settlement ¶ 6(a); Marker Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a)). The remainder of the Settlement Fund will be distributed to the class on a *pro rata* basis. (*Id.*). Class Members will have forty-five (45) days following the Notice Commencement Date (that will occur within 30 days after entry of this Order) to submit a timely, valid claim form to the Settlement Administrator via mail or the settlement website. (Banks Decl., Ex. G, Dkt. No. 354-9 ("Claim Form")).

ii. Class Notice and Settlement Administration

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) requires the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all class members who can be identified through reasonable effort. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). The proposed Notice Plan requires the Notice to be sent directly to Class Members via U.S. mail (via a postcard) and email (at the email addresses and mailing addresses available in the Day Defendants' records or which otherwise may be identified through further reasonable effort). (Banks Decl., Ex. A (the "Notice"); *see* Mot. at 9). The mailed postcard will direct recipients to a website where they may view the Notice and submit a claim. (*Id.* ¶ 1.36).

The Notice clearly informs Settlement Class Members of their right to opt out or object, how to do so, the binding effect of participating in the Settlement, and the date of the Final Fairness Hearing. *See Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

iii. *Attorneys' Fees and Expenses*

The Settlement Fund may be used to pay any attorneys' fees (which will not exceed \$55,500), litigation costs (which will not exceed \$10,000), and administrator costs (which will not exceed \$28,000, so long as the number of class members does not exceed 775,000 and the number of claim forms submitted does not exceed 155,000). (Day Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a); Defendant Hagar Settlement ¶ 5(a); Total Apps Defendants Settlement ¶ 6(a); Marker Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a)).

iv. *Class Representative Service Award*

Plaintiffs, as Class Representatives, have not requested any service award. (Mot. at 19).

v. *Release*

In exchange for the relief provided under the Settlement Agreement, all Class Members who do not validly request exclusion will release their right to “sure, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against the Settling Defendants about the claims asserted in this Action or that could have been asserted in this Action. It also means that all of the Court’s orders will apply to [Class Members] and legally bind [Class Members] and [Class Members] will release [thei]r Released Claims against the Released Parties as outlined below.” (Notice at 5). The “Releasing Parties” include “the Settlement Class Representatives, all Settlement Class Members who have not timely and validly excluded themselves from the Settlement Class, and any person or entity claiming by, for, on behalf of, or through them.” (*Id.* at 6). The “Released Claims” include “any and all liabilities, claims, causes of action, suits, debts, liens, rights, duties, obligations, agreements, promises, representations, damages, costs (including costs of suit and attorneys’ fees and expenses), or demand, of whatever nature, character, type, or description, whether known or unknown, existing or potential, or suspected or

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

unsuspected which the Releasing Parties now own or hold, or have at any time heretofore owned or held, against the Released Parties and the Day Releasees and that are arising from, relating to, or in connection with the Action, including any claims that were brought or could have been brought in the Action, irrespective of any undiscovered or after-acquired information.” (*Id.*).

The release is narrowly tailored to the subject matter of the litigation and does not affect claims unrelated to the alleged fraud. Settlement Class Members who timely opt out of the Settlement will not release any claims and will retain their individual rights. (*Id.* at 2).

III. CONDITIONAL CLASS CERTIFICATION

A. Legal Standard

Where “the parties reach a settlement agreement prior to class certification, courts must peruse the proposed compromise to ratify [] the propriety of the certification” *Staton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 952 (9th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, approval of a proposed class action settlement requires conditional certification of a settlement class. *LaFleur v. Med. Mgmt. Int’l, Inc.*, 2014 WL 2967475, at *2–3 (C.D. Cal. June 25, 2014). “[T]he Ninth Circuit has taught that a district court should not avoid its responsibility to conduct a rigorous analysis [just] because certification is conditional[.]” *Arabian v. Sony Elecs., Inc.*, No. 05-CV-1741-WQH, 2007 WL 627977, at *2 n.3 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2007). A court may certify a class when the class meets the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and fulfills at least one requirement of Rule 23(b).

B. Analysis

i. Rule 23(a) is satisfied

Rule 23(a) imposes three requirements on a putative class: (1) the class must be so numerous that joinder is impracticable; (2) there must be questions of law or fact

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

common to the class; (3) the claims of the class representative must be typical of the other class members; and (4) the representative parties must fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a). Plaintiffs seek to conditionally certify a class of more than 600 individuals (the “Settlement Class”) who purchased services relating to the setup or management of an online store from Defendants and did not make a profit on the purchase of such business opportunity. (TAC ¶ 9; Notice at 1). This proposed class satisfies all four Rule 23(a) requirements.

Under Rule 23(a)(1), a class may be certified only if it “is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.” Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 23(a)(1). Here, the Settlement Class includes hundreds of individuals identified by Defendants as affected by the scheme. (TAC ¶ 9). Requiring joinder of over 600 individual plaintiffs is impracticable, so numerosity is satisfied. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1).

Under Rule 23(a)(2), a class may be certified only if there are “questions of law or fact common to the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2). In this action, several common issues of fact and law exist—which are suitable for disposition via class-wide proof, including (1) whether Wealth Assistants included in its marketing materials statements that were not true, or omitted to state material facts about that business opportunity necessary to make statements made not misleading; (2) whether those misstatements or omissions were material; and (3) whether Defendants knew that those statements were not true; whether those misrepresentations and omissions—such as the representation that the business opportunities Wealth Assistants was offering were profitable—were necessarily relied upon by any individual who purchased the business opportunity Wealth Assistants was offering. (Mot. at 21). Answers to these questions would resolve the allegations for the entire Class in “one stroke.” *Jimenez v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 765 F.3d

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

1161, 1165 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting *WalMart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338, 359 (2011)). As such, commonality is satisfied.

Under Rule 23(a)(3), a class may only be certified if the claims of the representative parties are typical of the claims of the class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3). Here, Plaintiffs' claims are typical of those of the Settlement Class because they arise from the same events and/or course of conduct as those underlying the claims of other Class Members—namely, the purchase of a business opportunity fraudulently sold by Wealth Assistants that Defendants participated in and aided. (Mot. at 22).

Rule 23(a)'s final pre-requisite is that representative parties “will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). The Ninth Circuit instructs this Court to ask two questions: “(1) Do the representative plaintiffs and their counsel have any conflicts of interest with other class members, and (2) will the representative plaintiffs and their counsel prosecute the action vigorously on behalf of the class?” *Staton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 957 (9th Cir. 2003). There is no indication of any conflict of interest between Plaintiffs and other Settlement Class Members. Plaintiffs are represented by Nico Banks of Banks Law Office and Richard A. Nervig of Richard A. Nervig, P.C., both of whom have extensive experience litigating consumer class actions and have actively prosecuted this case. (Banks Decl., ¶¶ 11-12, Ex. H). As such, the adequacy requirement is met.

ii. Rule 23(b) is satisfied

In addition to meeting the four requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a), a class must fall into one of three categories of Rule 23(b) to be certified. Plaintiffs seek class certification pursuant to Rule 23(b)(3), which requires a showing that “the questions of law or fact common to class members predominate over any questions

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

affecting only individual members” and that “a class action is superior to other available methods of fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3).

The “predominance inquiry asks whether the common, aggregation-enabling, issues in the case are more prevalent or important than the non-common, aggregation-defeating, individual issues.” *Amchem Prod., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 626 (1997) (quotation marks omitted). Common questions as to the falsity of Wealth Assistants’ statements of material facts related to the business opportunity offers, the omission of certain material facts related to the business opportunity offered, and Defendants’ knowledge as to the fraudulent nature of the scheme do not only predominate but can be adjudicated collectively and will drive the resolution of class claims. *See Amchem Prods. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 625 (1997) (“Predominance is a test readily met in certain cases alleging consumer or securities fraud.”).

Whether Rule 23’s superiority factor is met rests on factors such as individual class members’ desire to bring individual actions and the utility of concentrating the litigation in one forum. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). Here, “there is no indication[] that class members seek to individually control their cases, that individual litigation is already pending in other forums, or that this particular forum is undesirable for any reason.” *Tierno v. Rite Aid Corp.*, No. C 05-02520 TEH, 2006 WL 2535056, at *11 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2006). Superiority is therefore met because the class mechanism will achieve economies of scale for putative class members and conserve judicial resources.

The putative class comports with the requirements outlined in Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and 23(b). As such, the Court conditionally **CERTIFIES** the Settlement Class.

//

//

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

IV. APPOINTMENT OF SETTLEMENT CLASS COUNSEL

A. Legal Standard

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(g), any court which certifies a class must appoint a class counsel. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1). In deciding whether to appoint Nico Banks of Banks Law Office and Richard A. Nervig of Richard A. Nervig, P.C. as Settlement Class Counsel, the Court must consider (1) the work proposed counsel has done in identifying or investigating potential claims in this action; (2) their experience in handling class actions, other complex litigation, and the types of claims asserted in the action; (3) their knowledge of the applicable law; and (4) the resources they will commit to representing clients. Fed R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1)(A). The Court must also find that proposed Settlement Class Counsel will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the conditionally approved settlement class. Fed R. Civ. P. 23(g)(2); Fed R. Civ. P. 23(g)(4).

B. Analysis

The Court finds that the proposed Settlement Class Counsel all satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(g) and will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Settlement Class. Proposed Settlement Class Counsel have diligently investigated the claims in this case, worked closely with Plaintiffs, reviewed documentation and discovery produced by Defendant and actively participated in negotiating the Settlement Agreement. (Banks Decl., ¶¶ 11-16, Ex. H). They both have extensive experience litigating complex class actions and have been appointed to leadership roles in numerous similar cases. (*Id.* ¶ 11-12). They both have committed the resources and time necessary to represent the Settlement Class Members and have demonstrated their ability to prosecute this matter vigorously. (*Id.* ¶¶ 13–16). Accordingly, the Court **APPOINTS** them to serve as Settlement Class Counsel.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

V. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT

A. Legal Standard

Because the Court has found that conditional class certification is proper, the Court now evaluates, on a preliminary basis, whether the settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate such that notice of the settlement should be sent to the proposed class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2). In addition to finding that the settlement class representative and class counsel have adequately represented the class, which the Court has already done, the Court must consider whether the proposed settlement was negotiated at arm's length, whether the proposal treats class members equitably relative to each other and whether the relief provided for the class is adequate, taking into account five specific factors listed in Rule 23. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2); *see also Spann v. J.C. Penney Corp.*, 314 F.R.D. 312, 324 (C.D. Cal. 2016). When considering whether relief is adequate, the Court must consider: the costs, risks and delay of trial and appeal; the effectiveness of the proposed method of distributing relief to the class; and the terms of any proposed award of attorney's fees. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2)(C).

B. Analysis

i. *Relief in light of costs, risks and delay of trial*

The proposed relief of *pro rata* monetary payments to class members is adequate in light of the costs, risks and delay of trial and appeal. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2)(C)(i). These payments represent meaningful relief in the context of consumer fraud settlements, particularly in light of the uncertainty of proving causation and damages at trial, particularly with the several Defendants implicated. (Banks Decl. ¶¶ 15-16). This provides a significant recovery to class members, *see In re Heritage Bond Litig.*, No. 02-ML-1475 DT, 2005 WL 1594403, at *19 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005) (referring to a

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

settlement fund representing less than 40% of actual loss as an “exceptional result”), particularly in light of the risks, costs and delay of trial and appeal.

In shaping the terms of the Settlement, Settlement Class Counsel considered the risks of establishing liability and damages across the several Defendants, potential defenses available to Defendants and the challenges of taking this action to trial. (Banks Decl. ¶ 15-16).

//

ii. *Effectiveness of Proposed Method of Distributing Relief*

The effectiveness of the proposed method of distributing relief also weighs in favor of preliminary approval. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2)(C)(ii). Settlement Class Members must submit a valid claim form to receive monetary relief under the Settlement. Claims may be submitted online through the Settlement Website or by mail. (*See* Claim Form). The Settlement Administrator will process all timely and valid claims, verify documentation where required and issue payments via mailed checks. (Notice at 5, 8). This constitutes an effective and standard method of distributing relief in consumer fraud class actions, particularly where the Class Members require individualized supporting documentation.

iii. *Terms of Proposed Attorneys’ Fees*

The terms of the proposed attorneys’ fees also weigh in favor of preliminary approval. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2)(C)(iii). Attorneys’ fees will be paid from the Settlement Fund, subject to Court approval. (Day Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a); Defendant Hagar Settlement ¶ 5(a); Total Apps Defendants Settlement ¶ 6(a); Marker Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a)). Class Counsel will file a separate motion seeking an award of attorneys’ fees not to exceed \$55,500 of the Settlement Fund. (*Id.*). Class Counsel may move for the Court to award unreimbursed litigation costs and expenses of

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

up to \$10,000. (*Id.*). The Court will determine the appropriate amounts of each following a noticed motion.

iv. *Arm's Length Negotiations*

That the settlement was secured through hard-fought, arm's-length negotiations also weighs in favor of preliminary approval. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2)(B). Through counsel, the Parties engaged in extensive investigation, discovery, and settlement discussions to reach this stage. (Banks Decl. ¶¶ 14-16).

v. *Equitable Treatment of Class Members*

The proposed Settlement Agreement also comports with the requirement that a settlement treat class members equitably relative to each other. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2)(D). Under the Settlement Agreement, all Settlement Class Members are eligible to receive relief through a uniform claims process, including a *pro rata* distribution of settlement funds. (*See generally* Day Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a); Defendant Hagar Settlement ¶ 5(a); Total Apps Defendants Settlement ¶ 6(a); Marker Defendants Settlement ¶ 5(a)).

For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds that the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2). The Court, therefore, **GRANTS** preliminary approval of the Settlement Agreements.

VI. APPROVAL OF NOTICE PLAN

Rule 23(c)(2) requires that class notice be the “best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). “Notice is satisfactory if it ‘generally describes the terms of the settlement in sufficient detail to alert those with adverse viewpoints to investigate and to come forward and be heard.’” *Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004) (citation omitted). Federal Rule of Civil

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) outlines seven specific pieces of information which notice must include. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B).³

Notice will be sent directly by mail and email to individual Settlement Class Members identified in the Day Defendants' records within thirty (30) calendar days of this Order. (Mot. at 9). The proposed Notice is clear, concise and drafted to include all information required under Rule 23(c)(2)(B).

Accordingly, the Court **APPROVES** the proposed Notice Plan.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and **ORDERS** as follows:

1. The following Settlement Class is conditionally certified for settlement purposes only:

All individuals who (a) purchased services relating to the setup or management of an online store from Yax Ecommerce LLC, Precision Trading Group, LLC, WA Distribution LLC, Providence Oak Properties, LLC, WA Amazon Sellers LLC, and Yax IP and Management Inc. (collectively, "Wealth Assistants") between June 2021 and November 2023, (b) did not make a profit on their purchase of that business opportunity, and (c) have never been owners, employees, legal representatives, or successors of Wealth Assistants.

2. The Parties' settlements, attached as Exhibits B-E of the Banks Declaration are preliminarily **APPROVED**;

³ "(i) [T]he nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the class certified; (iii) the class claims, issues, or defenses; (iv) that a class member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) that the court will exclude from the class any member who requests exclusion; (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion; and (vii) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Rule 23(c)(3)." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

3. The Notice Plan and claims process (including the opt-out process and distribution plan) is **APPROVED**;
4. Stretto is **APPOINTED** as the settlement administrator;
5. Stretto shall commence notice (the “Notice Commencement Date”) within 30 days of this Order;
6. Settlement Class Members must opt out or object to the settlement within 45 days of the Notice Commencement Date. Any objections must state whether it applies only to the objector, to a specific subset of the class or to the entire class, and also state with specificity the grounds for the objection pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(5)(A);
7. Settlement Class Members must submit claims within 45 days of the Notice Commencement Date; and
8. Nico Banks of Banks Law Office and Richard A. Nervig of Richard A. Nervig P.C. are **APPOINTED** as Class Counsel;
9. Class Counsel shall file their motion for attorneys’ fees and costs no later than the date Plaintiffs file their motion for final approval;
10. A Final Approval Hearing is scheduled for **June 12, 2026, at 8:30 a.m.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.