

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Eduardo Garcia (State Bar #290572)
Sydney S. Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3500
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619)599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3500
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
julieann@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff OMAR VEJAR

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

OMAR VEJAR, on behalf of himself and on
behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FINELINE WOODWORKING, INC., a
California Corporation, FINELINE
ARCHITECTURAL MILLWORK, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 30-2021-01208607-CU-OE-CXC

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Date: September 9, 2022

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Randall J. Sherman

Dept.: CX105

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE LITIGATION	2
III.	THE SETTLEMENT BEFORE THE COURT	4
IV.	GENERAL STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO JUDICIAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS	5
V.	THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE, AND ADEQUATE	6
	A. The Class Counsel Conducted a Thorough Investigation	7
	B. The Parties Settled Following Mediation	7
	C. Class Counsel is Experienced in Similar Litigation	8
	D. The Settlement Class Responded Positively to the Settlement	8
	E. The Gross Settlement Amount is Fair and Reasonable	9
	F. The Strength of Plaintiff's Case and Risks of Continued Litigation	11
VI.	THE PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT OF 2004 ARE REASONABLE	14
VII.	CONCLUSION	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
CASES

1		
2		
3	<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i>	
4	(2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1150-51.....	5, 6
5	<i>Ali v. U.S.A. Cab Ltd.</i>	
6	(2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 1333, 1341.....	12
7	<i>Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc.</i>	
8	2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118, *9 (S.D. Cal. 2009).....	13
9	<i>Brinker</i>	
10		12
11	<i>Brown v. Fed Express Corp.</i>	
12	(C.D. Cal. 2008) 249 F.R.D. 580, 587-88.....	12
13	<i>Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc.</i>	
14	2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86266, at *30 (N.D. Cal. 2007).....	13
15	<i>Campbell v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.,</i>	
16	(C.D. Cal. 2013) 2013 WL 5302217 at *11-13.....	12
17	<i>Contreras v. United Food Group, LLC</i>	
18	Case No. BC389253 (L.A. County Super. Ct.).....	11
19	<i>Doty v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i>	
20	Case No. CV05-3241 FMC-JWJx (C.D. Cal. May 14, 2007).....	11
21	<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	
22	(1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801.....	5-7
23	<i>Dunleavy v. Nadler (In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.)</i>	
24	(9th Cir. 2000) 213 F.3d 454, 459.....	10
25	<i>Duran v. U.S. Bank National Association</i>	
26	(2014) 59 Cal.4th 1, 31.....	12-14
27	<i>Fukuchi v. Pizza Hut</i>	
28	Case No. BC302589 (L.A. County Super. Ct.).....	11
	<i>Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.</i>	
	2007 WL221862.....	11
	<i>Gomez v. Amadeus Salon, Inc.</i>	
	Case No. BC392297 (L.A. Super. Ct.).....	11
	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i>	
	(9th Cir. 1998) 150 F.3d 1011, 1026).....	13
	<i>Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.</i>	
	2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 at * 19-20 (N.D. Cal. 2009).....	13-14
	<i>Huens v. Tatum</i>	
	(1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 259, 265.....	5
	<i>In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litigation</i>	
	(S.D.N.Y. 2000)80 F.Supp.2d 164, 175.....	8-9
	<i>In re Newbridge Networks Sec. Litig.</i>	
	(D.D.C. Oct. 23, 1998) 1998 WL 765724, at *2.....	10
	<i>Jack v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.</i>	
	No. 09cv1683 MMA (JMA), 2011 WL 4899942, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2011).....	14
	<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i>	
	(2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 128-29.....	7, 9
	<i>Laskey v. Int'l Union</i>	
	(6th Cir. 1981) 638 F.2d 954.....	9

1	<i>Leverage v. Traeger Pellet Grills, LLC</i>	
2	(N.D. Cal. June 28, 2017, No. 16-CV-00784) 2017 WL 2797811, at *7.....	10
3	<i>Lim v. Victoria's Secret Stores, Inc.</i>	
4	Case No. 04CC00213 (Orange County Super. Ct.).....	11
5	<i>Louie v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.</i>	
6	2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314, *14 (S.D. Cal. 2008).....	13
7	<i>Magadia v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc.</i>	
8	(9 th Cir. 2021) 999 F.3d 668.....	12-13
9	<i>Malibu Outrigger Bd. Of Governors v. Superior Court</i>	
10	(1980) 103 Cal.App.3d 573, 578-579.....	5
11	<i>McKenzie v. Fed. Express Corp.</i>	
12	No. CV 10-02420 GAF (PLAx), 2012 WL 12882124, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2012).....	14
13	<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i>	
14	(2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408.....	7
15	<i>Newberg on Class Actions</i>	
16	(3d ed. 1992) §11.41, pp. 11-91.....	6
17	<i>O'Conner v. Uber Technologies, Inc.</i>	
18	(9 th Cir. 2018) 904 F.3d 1087, 1133.....	12-13
19	<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n</i>	
20	(9 th Cir. 1982) 688 F. 2d 615, 625.....	6
21	<i>Palencia v. 99 Cents Only Stores</i>	
22	No. 34-2010-00079619.....	11
23	<i>Rebney v. Wells Fargo Bank</i>	
24	(1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 1117, 1138.....	6
25	<i>Ressler v. Federated Department Stores, Inc.</i>	
26	Case No. BC335018 (L.A. County Super. Ct.).....	11
27	<i>Sorenson v. PetSmart, Inc.</i>	
28	Case No. 2:06-CV-02674-JAM-DAD (ED. Cal.).....	11
29	<i>Stoetzner v. U.S. Steel Corp.</i>	
30	(3d. Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 115, 118-119.....	9
31	<i>Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.</i>	
32	2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78671.....	10
33	<i>Tech-Bilt, Inc. v. Woodward-Clyde & Associates</i>	
34	38 Cal.3d 488, 499-500 (1985).....	9
35	<i>Tien v. Tenet Healthcare Corp.</i>	
36	(2012) 209 Cal.App.4th 1077, 1088.....	12
37	<i>Viceral v. Mistras Grp., Inc.</i>	
38	(N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2016, No. 15-CV-02198) 2016 WL 5907869, at *3, 7.....	10
39	<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer</i>	
40	(2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245-46, 250, 2246.....	6, 9

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff OMAR VEJAR (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) seeks final approval of the Stipulation for Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims (“Agreement”)¹, which if approved, would provide valuable monetary relief for 181 Settlement Class Members employed by Defendant FINELINE WOODWORKING, INC., and Defendant ARCHITECTURAL MILLWORK, INC. (hereinafter “Defendants”) during the Class Period.

In an order dated May 20, 2022, this Court preliminarily approved the Agreement and preliminarily certified the Class. Declaration of Jean-Claude Lapuyade (“JCL Dec.”), ¶ 4. On June 23, 2022, the Court-approved Class Notice was mailed to each Class Member via U.S. First Class Mail. Declaration of Karen Hernandez (“ILYM Dec.”), ¶ 7. *The Class greeted news of the Settlement with 98.9% approval.*² There are two opt-outs and zero objections to the Settlement. ILYM Dec., ¶¶ 11-12. The high approval by the Settlement Class evidences the clear fairness and reasonableness of the Settlement. JCL Dec., ¶ 7.

An objective evaluation of the proposed settlement of Two Hundred Sixty-Four Thousand Dollars (\$264,000.00) (“Gross Settlement Amount”) confirms that the relief negotiated on behalf of the Settlement Class is fair, reasonable, and valuable. The Settlement is a product of informed, adversarial, and non-collusive negotiations, between experienced counsel, and presided over by Hon. Carl J. West (Ret.), a respected jurist experienced in wage and hour class and PAGA actions. After deducting any Court-approved attorneys’ fees and costs, class representative incentive payments, administration costs, and the payments to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), the net settlement fund shall be distributed to the Settlement Class based on the number of Workweeks they worked while employed by Defendants during the Class Period. JCL Dec., ¶ 7.

This Settlement provides substantial recovery for Defendants’ alleged wage and hour violations. Plaintiff estimates that the Settlement, if approved, would result in a Net Settlement Amount of approximately \$131,300.00. This will result in an average Individual Settlement Payment of **\$725.41**

¹ The Agreement is attached as Ex “A” to the Declaration of Jean-Claude Lapuyade (“JCL Dec.”) at ¶ 3. All citations to the Agreement incorporate by this reference a citation to the JCL Dec., ¶ 3. Further, unless indicated otherwise, capitalized terms used herein have the same meaning as those defined by the Agreement.

² Eight (8) Notice Packets were deemed undeliverable. ILYM Dec. at ¶¶ 10.

1 and high payment of **\$2,647.78**. JCL Dec., ¶ 8; ILYM Dec. at ¶ 14.

2 The relief offered by the Settlement is immediate and is particularly impressive when viewed
3 against the difficulties encountered by plaintiffs pursuing similar wage and hour cases (*see infra*).
4 Indeed, by settling now rather than proceeding to trial, the Settlement Class will not have to wait
5 (possibly years) for relief, nor will they have to bear the risks associated with prolonged and uncertain
6 litigation. JCL Dec., ¶ 9.

7 As discussed below, the proposed Settlement satisfies all criteria for final settlement approval
8 under California law and falls well within the range of reasonableness. Accordingly, the Class
9 Representative and Class Counsel respectfully request this Court grant final approval of the Agreement
10 and, entry of the proposed Final Approval Order and Judgment. JCL Dec., ¶ 10.

11 **II. OVERVIEW OF THE LITIGATION**

12 Defendants are California corporations that provide complete interior and exterior finish
13 carpentry packages for custom home builders, designers, and homeowners throughout California,
14 including Orange County, where Plaintiff worked. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a non-exempt
15 employee from September 2019 to July 2020. At all times during his employment, Plaintiff earned an
16 hourly wage and was entitled to legally compliant meal and rest periods, and minimum, regular, and
17 overtime wages for all hours worked. Throughout his employment, Plaintiff was subject to Defendants'
18 written policies and procedures contained in, among other documents, Defendants' Employee
19 Handbook. JCL Dec., ¶ 11.

20 Generally, Plaintiff claims that Defendants failed to pay him minimum wages, failed to provide
21 compliant meal and rest periods, failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failed to
22 reimburse mandatory business expenses, and failed to pay all wages due at the time of his separation.
23 Defendants forcefully deny liability for each of Plaintiff's claims. Further, Defendants assert that they
24 fully complied with all applicable employment laws and raised several other significant defenses to
25 Plaintiff's claims, including, but not limited to, facially compliant meal and rest period policies and
26 lack of any evidence of overtime and minimum wage violations. JCL Dec., ¶ 12.

27 On April 23, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Violations ("PAGA Notice") with the Labor and
28 Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and served the same on Defendants. Plaintiff's PAGA

1 Notice set forth the facts and theories supporting Defendants’ alleged violations of various California
2 Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commissions (“IWC”) Wage Order and of his intent to
3 pursue claims under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code sections
4 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”). JCL Dec., ¶ 13.

5 On June 29, 2021, Plaintiff filed a class action complaint in the Orange County Superior Court,
6 Case Number 30-2021-01208607-CU-OE-CXC for: (1) Unfair Competition in Violation of Business
7 and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; (2) failure to pay minimum wages in violation of California
8 Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1; (3) failure to pay overtime wages in violation of California
9 Labor Code §§ 510 *et seq.*; (4) failure to provide required meal periods in violation of California Labor
10 Code §§ 226.7 and 512; (5) failure to provide required rest periods in violation of California Labor
11 Code §§ 226.7 and 512; (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of
12 California Labor Code § 226; (7) failure to reimburse employees for required expenses in violation of
13 California Labor Code § 2802; (8) failure to provide wages when due in violation of California Labor
14 Code §§ 201, 202, and 203; and (9) violations of the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). JCL
15 Dec., ¶ 14.

16 Plaintiff propounded written discovery on Defendants, and after serving the discovery, the
17 Parties agreed to mediation the action. To prepare for mediation, the Parties agreed to informally
18 produce certain documents and data points subject to the mediation privilege, including but not limited
19 to, a sample of the Class Members’ time and payroll data. As discussed *infra*, Plaintiff’s counsel
20 retained the Berger Consulting Group (“BCG”), to analyze Defendants’ time and payroll data. JCL
21 Dec., ¶ 15.

22 On January 26, 2022, the Parties participated in a mediation presided over by Hon. Carl J. West,
23 a respected jurist experienced in wage and hour class and PAGA actions. The mediation concluded
24 with a settlement, after both sides agreed to a Mediator’s proposal which was subsequently
25 memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”). Thereafter, the Parties
26 drafted and negotiated a long-form settlement agreement, which is the subject of the instant motion.
27 JCL Dec., ¶ 16.

28 On May 20, 2022, this Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement. JCL Dec., ¶ 4. On

June 23, 2022, the Settlement Administrator mailed Notice Packets to all 181 Settlement Class Members. ILYM Dec., ¶ 7. The mailing of the Notice Packets triggered a forty-five (45) day Response Deadline for the Settlement Class to submit requests for exclusion or objections to the Settlement. The response from the Settlement Class to the Settlement was outstanding – 98.9% of the Class Members are participating in the Settlement. ILYM Dec., ¶¶ 13.

III. THE SETTLEMENT BEFORE THE COURT

The Court preliminarily approved an initial Gross Settlement Amount of Two Hundred Sixty-Four Thousand Dollars (\$264,000.00) based on a total estimated 13,108 Workweeks worked by the Class during the Class Period. The Gross Settlement Amount shall be used: (1) to satisfy Individual Settlement Payments; (2) to satisfy the Class Representative Service Award; (3) to satisfy the Class Counsel Award; (4) to satisfy the PAGA Settlement; and (5) to satisfy the Settlement Administration Costs incurred in this action. JCL Dec., ¶ 17.

Defendants will fund the Settlement by transferring the Gross Settlement Amount into a Qualified Settlement Fund within thirty (30) days after the Effective Date. Agreement, ¶ I(N). The Settlement Administrator shall disburse the Individual Settlement Payments to the Settlement Class Members no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after Defendants fund the Gross Settlement Amount. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(7). The Settlement Administrator will calculate Individual Settlement Payments by adding up the total number of Workweeks for all Class Members. The Settlement Administrator will then divide the respective Workweeks for each member of the Settlement Class by the total Workweeks for the entire Settlement Class, resulting in a Payment Ratio for each Class Member. Each Settlement Class Member's Payment Ratio is then multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to calculate each estimated Individual Settlement Payment. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(1). The estimated average Individual Settlement Payment is approximately **\$725.41**. JCL Dec., ¶19; ILYM Dec., ¶ 14.

In exchange for the valuable consideration, as of the funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Class Members will release the Released Parties from the Released Class Claims that accrued during the Class Period. Agreement, ¶ III(A)(1).

ILYM Group, Inc. was appointed as the Settlement Administrator for the class. Settlement Administration Costs include those expenses of effectuating and administering the Settlement, i.e., the

costs incurred to the Settlement Administrator, the costs of giving notice to the Class, the costs of administering and disbursing the Individual Settlement Payments, and the fees of the Settlement Administrator approved for reimbursement by the court. The Settlement Administrator expenses are \$9,500. ILYM Dec., ¶ 15. These expenses shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(12).

Subject to Court approval, Class Counsel shall seek Class Counsel Award in the amount of \$103,000.00 comprised of attorneys' fees equal to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount estimated to be at least \$88,000.00 and up to \$15,000 for actually incurred litigation expenses. Plaintiff's counsel is to split the fees 50% to the JCL Law Firm, APC, and 50% to the Zakay Law Group, APLC. Agreement, ¶ I(E). The Agreement also provides for a Class Representative Service Award in the amount of \$10,000 for Plaintiff, in consideration of his time, risk, and efforts as the Class Representative on behalf of the Settlement Class and a general release of claims, including a California Civil Code section 1542 waiver. Agreement, ¶¶ I(I); III(A)(1); III(D); III(M)(9).

As explained in further detail below, the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable to the class and should be granted final approval. This is evidenced by the high approval of the Settlement by the Settlement Class, the absence of any objections to the Settlement and the average Individual Settlement Payment of \$725.41. ILYM Dec., ¶¶ 12-13; JCL Dec., ¶ 19.

IV. GENERAL STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO JUDICIAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS

Settlements of disputed claims are favored by the courts. *Huens v. Tatum* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 259, 265. In evaluating settlements, the courts have long recognized that compromise is particularly appropriate since such litigation is difficult and notoriously uncertain. *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Fran. v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1151 ("voluntary conciliation and settlement are the preferred means of dispute resolution. This is especially true in complex class action litigation").

"[T]o prevent fraud, collusion or unfairness to the class, the settlement or dismissal of a class action requires court approval." *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 *citing Malibu Outrigger Bd. Of Governors v. Superior Court* (1980) 103 Cal.App.3d 573, 578-579. The court must decide whether the proposed settlement falls within the range of reasonable settlements,

1 considering that settlements are compromises between the parties reflecting subjective, unquantifiable
2 judgments concerning the risks and possible outcomes of litigation. See also *Wershba v. Apple*
3 *Computer* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 2246 (The proposed settlement is not to be judged against a
4 hypothetical or speculative measure of what might have been achieved had plaintiffs prevailed at trial.”).
5 In *Wershba*, appellants argued that the settlement was too low given the “clear” liability, however, the
6 Court rejected this argument and held that “the merits of the underlying class claims are not a basis for
7 upsetting the settlement of a class action.” *Wershba, supra*, at 246; *see also 7-Eleven, supra*, at 1150.

8 In these cases, Courts have repeatedly emphasized that there is a strong initial presumption that
9 the compromise is fair and reasonable. *Wershba*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 245. Courts should not substitute
10 their judgment for that of the parties who negotiated the settlement. *Id.* At 246. The presumption of
11 fairness exists where: (1) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act
12 intelligently; (2) the settlement is reached through arm’s-length bargaining; (3) counsel is experienced
13 in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small. *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801, citing
14 Newberg & Conte, *Newberg on Class Actions*, (3d ed. 1992) §11.41, pp. 11-91. Here, all of these factors
15 support a presumption of fairness.

16 The essential evaluation is whether, given the risks of litigation and the range of probable results,
17 the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable, and adequate to all concerned. Here, the facts and
18 circumstances compel the conclusion that the proposed settlement satisfies that standard.

19 **V. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE, AND ADEQUATE**

20 The court must determine whether the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable. *Dunk v. Ford*
21 *Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801; *see also Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com'n* (9th
22 Cir. 1982) 688 F. 2d 615, 625. The purpose of the requirement is "the protection of those class members,
23 including the named plaintiffs, whose rights may not have been given due regard by the negotiating
24 parties." *Dunk, supra*, at 1801.

25 The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether the settlement is fair. *Rebney v. Wells*
26 *Fargo Bank* (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 1117, 1138. “The well-recognized factors that the trial court should
27 consider in evaluating the reasonableness of a class action settlement agreement include 'the strength of
28 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.' [Citations.]" *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 128; see also *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408.

The list of factors is not exhaustive and should be tailored to each case. *Dunk, supra*, at 1801. Due regard should be given to what is otherwise a private consensual agreement between the parties. *Id.* The inquiry "must be limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment that the agreement is not the product of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion between, the negotiating parties, and that the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned." *Id.* "Ultimately, the [trial] court's determination is nothing more than 'an amalgam of delicate balancing, gross approximations and rough justice.' [Citation omitted.]" *Id.*

These factors are analyzed seriatim below and all support final approval of the class action settlement before this Court.

A. Class Counsel Conducted a Thorough Investigation.

As detailed in the motion for preliminary approval, Class Counsel thoroughly investigated the proposed Class Members' claims, applicable law, and potential defenses. Specifically, Class Counsel assessed the value of the class claims using data and documents provided by Defendants through informal discovery. Class Counsel obtained time, payroll, and policy records, as well as data regarding the number of Class Members, workweeks, and average rate of pay to assess damages before mediation. Class Counsel retained BCG to analyze Defendants' time and payroll data to formulate damage models estimating Defendants' liability exposure. Class Counsel's investigation, research, experience, and damage models informed and guided the mediated negotiations that resulted in this settlement. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counsel fully understood the strengths and weaknesses of the class claims before the parties reached a settlement. JCL Dec., ¶ 20-27.

B. The Parties Settled Following Mediation.

On January 26, 2022, the Parties participated in a mediation presided over Hon. Carl J. West (Ret.), a respected jurist experienced in wage and hour class and PAGA actions. Judge West helped to

1 manage the Parties' expectations and provided a useful, neutral analysis of the issues and risks to both
2 sides. The Parties made substantial progress with Judge West's assistance. Namely, the Parties
3 exchanged information regarding their respective claims and defenses, including their respective
4 evaluations of the damages. After several hours of arm's length and adversarial negotiations, the
5 mediation concluded with a settlement based on a Mediator's proposal which was subsequently
6 memorialized in the form of an MOU. The Parties then drafted and negotiated a long-form settlement
7 agreement. The amount of the service awards was not negotiated until after the parties agreed to the
8 Gross Settlement Amount and many other terms. JCL Dec., ¶ 28. No action would likely have been
9 taken by Class Members individually, and no compensation would have been recovered for them, but
10 for Plaintiff's service on behalf of the Class.

11 **C. Class Counsel is Experienced in Similar Litigation.**

12 Class Counsel in this matter has extensive class action experience in multiple fields and has
13 represented tens-of-thousands of persons in class actions. Counsel has previously litigated similar wage
14 and hour class actions involving similar claims. Class Counsel has been approved as class counsel in
15 similar wage and hour class actions throughout the State of California. As such, courts throughout the
16 California have deemed Class Counsel experienced and knowledgeable in this area of law. Class
17 Counsel has participated in every aspect of the settlement discussions and has concluded the settlement
18 is fair, adequate, and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class. JCL Dec., ¶¶ 29-35; Declaration
19 of Shani Zakay ("Zakay Dec."), ¶¶ 1-3.

20 **D. The Settlement Class Responded Positively to the Settlement.**

21 The reaction of the Settlement Class unequivocally supports approval of the Settlement.
22 Significantly, after dissemination of the notice to the Settlement Class, which provided each class
23 member with the terms of the Settlement, including the specific estimated Individual Settlement
24 Payments. To date, only two of the 181 members of the Settlement Class has opted-out of the
25 Settlement. Moreover, there are zero objections. Stated differently, 98.9% of the Settlement Class
26 chose to participate in the Settlement. JCL Dec., ¶ 7; ILYM Dec., ¶¶ 12-13.

27 The near unanimous approval by the Settlement Class strongly supports a finding that the
28 Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. *See In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litigation*

(S.D.N.Y. 2000)80 F.Supp.2d 164, 175 ("If only a small number of objections are received, that fact can be viewed as indicative of the adequacy of the settlement."); *Stoetznner v. U.S. Steel Corp.* (3d. Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 115, 118-119 (29 objections out of 281 member class "strongly favors settlement"); *Laskey v. Int'l Union* (6th Cir. 1981) 638 F.2d 954 (The fact that 7 out of 109 class members objected to the proposed settlement should be considered when determining fairness of settlement.). Consequently, Class Counsel respectfully request the Court to follow the high approval of the Settlement Class and grant final approval of the Settlement.

E. The Gross Settlement Amount is Fair and Reasonable.

The Gross Settlement Amount of Two Hundred Sixty-Four Thousand Dollars (\$264,000.00) in this case is fair and well within the range of recognized reasonableness. The *Kullar* decision acknowledged that "as the court does when it approves a settlement as in good faith under Code of Civil Procedure section 877.6, the court must at least satisfy itself that the class settlement is within the 'ballpark' of reasonableness." *Kullar, supra*, at 129; *See Tech-Bilt, Inc. v. Woodward-Clyde & Associates*, 38 Cal.3d 488, 499-500 (1985.).

Here, the Settlement is clearly within the "ballpark" of reasonableness because the Settlement provides a sizeable recovery to the Settlement Class Members and need not necessarily obtain 100 percent of the damages sought to be fair, reasonable, and ultimately, meaningful. *Wershba*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 250. While the Gross Settlement Amount of Two Hundred Sixty-Four Thousand Dollars (\$264,000.00) represents a discount on Defendants' potential exposure if Plaintiff established liability on all claims and was awarded the full amount of the estimated damages at trial, this compromise is reasonable because (1) the formidable defenses raised by Defendants presented a risk that could award significantly less in damages than Plaintiff's estimate and (2) any theoretical post-trial recovery may require many more years of litigation, resulting in added fees and costs without any guarantee of recovery for the Class. JCL Dec., ¶ 36.

As detailed at the time of preliminary approval, the Gross Settlement Amount is fair and reasonable considering the nature and magnitude of the claims being settled and the various potential impediments to recovery. Class Counsel developed varied economic damages models measuring Defendants' liability exposure while accounting for the uncertainties of continued litigation. The various

1 models were informed by Class Counsel’s investigation, including the analysis of a significant sample
2 of time and payroll data. As detailed in greater depth during the preliminary approval process, Class
3 Counsel projected a range of Defendants’ liability exposure for the claims asserted on behalf of the
4 Settlement Class. The Gross Settlement Amount represents between approximately 10.3% and 14.2%
5 of Defendants’ *class-wide* liability exposure as estimated by Class Counsel at the time of mediation.
6 JCL Dec., ¶ 37.

7 In *Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78671, at * 12, the District
8 Court for the Northern District of California granted final approval in a wage and hour misclassification
9 action and found that the Gross Settlement Amount representing 10% of the estimated trial award was
10 within the “range of reasonableness.” In *Dunleavy v. Nadler (In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.)* (9th Cir.
11 2000) 213 F.3d 454, 459, the Ninth Circuit approved a settlement representing “roughly one-sixth of the
12 potential recovery.” Given the amount of the settlement here as compared to potential value of the
13 claims, particularly the strength of Plaintiff’s action, the settlement is clearly fair and reasonable³.

14 The calculation methodology used to compensate the Settlement Class Members for the alleged
15 damages was negotiated at the time of the Settlement. More importantly, the methodology is fair,
16 objective, and impartial. The calculation methodology is based on the number of Workweeks each
17 Settlement Class Member worked for Defendants during the Class Period. The number of Workweeks
18 for the Settlement Class Members is established through Defendants’ data and documented
19 compensation records. The Settlement Administrator is responsible for calculating the Individual
20 Settlement Payments by multiplying the Payment Ratio for each Settlement Class Member by the Net
21 Settlement Amount. The Settlement Administrator will calculate the payment ratio by dividing the total
22 number of Workweeks for each Settlement Class Member by the total number of Workweeks for all
23 Settlement Class Members. This process establishes an objectively fair and reasonable procedure to
24

25 ³ See also *Viceral v. Mistras Grp., Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2016, No. 15-CV-02198) 2016 WL 5907869, at *3, 7 (approving
26 a California wage and hour settlement where the class received 11.6% of the estimated total liability, or approximately \$29
27 per work week); *Leverage v. Traeger Pellet Grills, LLC* (N.D. Cal. June 28, 2017, No. 16-CV-00784) 2017 WL 2797811, at
28 *7 (Approving a California wage and hour settlement where the class received 18% of the estimated total liability); see also
In re Newbridge Networks Sec. Litig. (D.D.C. Oct. 23, 1998) 1998 WL 765724, at *2 (“Courts have not identified a precise
numerical range within which a settlement must fall in order to be deemed reasonable; but an agreement that secures roughly
six to twelve percent of a potential trial recovery, while preventing further expenditures and delays and eliminating the risk
that no recovery at all will be won, seems to be within the targeted range of reasonableness.”).

1 compensate the Settlement Class. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(1).

2 The settlement also provides significant relief to the Settlement Class Members. After deductions
3 for the Class Counsel Award, Settlement Administration Costs, the PAGA Settlement, and the Class
4 Representative Service Award, the Net Settlement Amount is currently estimated to be \$131,300.00.
5 ILYM Dec., ¶14. The average settlement payment is approximately \$725.41, and the highest is
6 approximately \$2,647.78. ILYM Dec., ¶ 14. This average net recovery is on par with many wage and
7 hour class action settlements approved by California state and federal courts. *See, e.g., Palencia v. 99*
8 *Cents Only Stores*, No. 34-2010-00079619 (Sacramento County Super. Ct) (average net recovery of
9 approximately \$80); *Fukuchi v. Pizza Hut*, Case No. BC302589 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net
10 recovery of approximately \$120); *Contreras v. United Food Group, LLC*, Case No. BC389253 (L.A.
11 County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$120); *Ressler v. Federated Department*
12 *Stores, Inc.*, Case No. BC335018 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$90);
13 *Doty v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, Case No. CV05-3241 FMC-JWJx (C.D. Cal. May 14, 2007) (average
14 net recovery of approximately \$65); *Sorenson v. PetSmart, Inc.*, Case No. 2:06-CV-02674-JAM-DAD
15 (ED. Cal.) (average net recovery of approximately \$60); *Lim v. Victoria's Secret Stores, Inc.*, Case No.
16 04CC00213 (Orange County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$35); and *Gomez v.*
17 *Amadeus Salon, Inc.*, Case No. BC392297 (L.A. Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately
18 \$20). Additionally, Defendants must separately fund its share of any employer side payroll taxes.
19 Agreement Amendment #1, ¶ III(A)(1).

20 Clearly the goal of this litigation to obtain redress for the class has been met by this Settlement.
21 Given the amount of the Settlement, the risks of litigation and the arm's length negotiations between
22 experienced counsel, the settlement is fair and reasonable, and is therefore entitled to final approval.
23 JCL Dec., ¶ 38.

24 **F. The Strength of Plaintiff's Case and Risks of Continued Litigation**

25 Although Class Counsel believes strongly in Plaintiff's claims, it would be misguided to ignore
26 the asserted defenses. If successful on any one its defenses, Defendants could defend the action or, at
27 least, drastically undercut Plaintiff's claims. JCL Dec., ¶ 39. As the federal court in *Glass v. UBS Fin.*
28 *Servs.*, 2007 WL221862 held, where the parties faced uncertainties similar to those in this litigation:

1 *In light of the above-referenced uncertainty in the law, the risk, expense,*
2 *complexity, and likely duration of further litigation likewise favors the*
3 *settlement.* Regardless of how this Court might have ruled on the merits of
4 the legal issues, the losing party likely would have appealed, and the parties
5 would have faced the expense and uncertainty of litigating an appeal. The
6 expense and possible duration of the litigation should be considered in
7 evaluating the reasonableness of [a] settlement.

8 With respect to the most immediate challenge, i.e., class certification, the risks attendant to the
9 certification of similar wage and hour claims are demonstrated by *Magadia v. Wal-Mart Associates,*
10 *Inc.* (9th Cir. 2021) 999 F.3d 668. There, the Ninth Circuit, vacated reversed and remanded a \$110
11 million judgement against an employer for, *inter alia*, inaccurately paying overtime, and directed the
12 trial court to enter judgement in favor of the employer. *See also O’Conner v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*
13 (9th Cir. 2018) 904 F.3d 1087 (decertification of wage and hour misclassification action); *see also*
14 *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Association* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 1, 31 (reversing a trial verdict in favor
15 plaintiffs in a wage and hour class action)); *Tien v. Tenet Healthcare Corp.* (2012) 209 Cal.App.4th
16 1077, 1088 (“[T]he reason, if any, that employees might not take their breaks were predominantly
17 individualized questions of fact not susceptible to class treatment.”); *Ali v. U.S.A. Cab Ltd.* (2009) 176
18 Cal.App.4th 1333, 1341 (affirming denial of certification because employees’ declarations attesting to
19 having taken meal and rest breaks demonstrated that individualized inquiries were required to show
20 harm); *Campbell v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, (C.D. Cal. 2013) 2013 WL 5302217 at *11-13 (following
21 *Brinker* and denying certification of proposed off-the-clock and rest and meal break classes due to lack
22 of uniform policy); *Brown v. Fed Express Corp.* (C.D. Cal. 2008) 249 F.R.D. 580, 587-88 (denying
23 certification of driver meal and rest period claims based on the predominance of individual issues).
24 Collectively, the examples cited above illustrate the uncertain nature of class litigation. Consequently,
25 the uncertainty of obtaining certification through a contested motion is a significant risk factor favoring
26 settlement. JCL Dec., ¶ 40.

27 Although Plaintiff is confident about the strength of his claims, Plaintiff nevertheless recognizes
28 that Defendants have factual and legal defenses that, if successful, would potentially defeat or impair
the value of the lawsuit. Legally, the fast-changing landscape of wage and hour litigation can drastically
affect the value of Plaintiff’s claims and, in fact, already has. JCL Dec., ¶ 41.

1 In a similar wage and hour case, the federal district court in *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.*, 2009
2 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 at * 19-20 (N.D. Cal. 2009), granted approval of an overtime class action
3 settlement and explained:

4 **Plaintiffs may have a strong case, but the risks inherent in continued**
5 **litigation are great.** Defendants strongly deny liability for Plaintiffs'
6 principal claim that full-time Service Associates were misclassified as
7 exempt. In addition to the uncertainties raised by Defendants at the
8 preliminary stage regarding Plaintiffs' chance of success in this case,
9 Defendants notes that the question of an employer's duty to provide rest and
meal periods is an open one, signaling even less certainty for
Plaintiffs.....[T]he **Total Settlement amount and the Class Members'**
10 **expected net recovery, after fees and other costs are deducted, appear**
11 **to be a reasonable compromise, in light of the risks of litigation.**

12 *See also Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86266, at *30 (N.D. Cal. 2007) ("In
13 considering the strength of Plaintiffs' case, legal uncertainties at the time of settlement - particularly
14 those which go to fundamental legal issues - favor approval.").

15 As recognized in a federal decision approving settlement of an overtime wage class action:

16 **The potential complexity and possible duration of trial also weigh in**
17 **favor of granting final approval.** Plaintiffs acknowledge the difficulties
18 of proving damages, recognize the uncertainty of outcome, and believe
19 defendant would appeal in the event of adverse judgment. A post-judgment
20 appeal would require many years to resolve and delay payment to class
21 members. Plaintiffs believe the benefits of a guaranteed recovery today
22 outweigh an uncertain future result. Accordingly, plaintiffs argue, and the
Court agrees, the actual recovery confers substantial benefits on the class
that outweigh the potential recovery through full adjudication.

23 *Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118, *9 (S.D. Cal. 2009); see also *Louie v.*
24 *Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314, *14 (S.D. Cal. 2008).

25 In sum, while other cases have approved class certification in wage and hour claims, class
26 certification in this action would have been hotly disputed and was by no means a foregone conclusion.
27 Where both sides face significant uncertainty, as here, the attendant risks favor settlement. *Hanlon v.*
28 *Chrysler Corp.* (9th Cir. 1998) 150 F.3d 1011, 1026.)

As demonstrated by the decisions in *Magadia, supra*, 999 F.3d 668, *O'Conner v. Uber*
Technologies (N.D. Cal. 2018) 82 F.Supp.3d 1133 and *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.* (2014) 59

Cal.4th 1, the complexities and duration of further litigation cannot be overstated. There is little doubt that if Defendants faced a large adverse judgement, Defendants undoubtedly have the resources to post a bond and appeal. A post-judgment appeal by Defendants would have required many more years to resolve, assuming the judgment was affirmed. If the judgment was not affirmed in total, then the case could have dragged on for years after the appeal. The benefits of a guaranteed recovery today outweigh an uncertain result three or more years in the future. JCL Dec., ¶ 42.

Class Representative and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of a trial against Defendants through possible appeals which could take another three years. In arriving at their informed belief that the present settlement is fair and adequate, Class Counsel accounted for the uncertain outcome and risk inherent in complex actions such as this one. Class Counsel is also mindful of and recognize the inherent problems of proof under, and alleged defenses to, the claims asserted in the litigation. Moreover, post-trial motions and appeals would have been inevitable. Costs would have mounted, and recovery would have been delayed if not denied, thereby reducing the benefits of an ultimate victory. Class Representative and Class Counsel believe that the Settlement confers substantial monetary and non-monetary benefits upon the Class. Based upon their evaluation, Class Representative and Class Counsel have determined that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is in the best interest of the Class, is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and should be granted final approval. JCL Dec., ¶ 43.

VI. THE PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT OF 2004
ARE REASONABLE

Where settlements “negotiate a good faith amount” for PAGA penalties and “there is no indication that this amount was the result of self-interest at the expense of class members,” such amounts are generally considered reasonable. *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.*, No. CV-08-0844 EDL, 2009 WL 928133, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2009). Courts routinely approve of amounts for PAGA penalties in the range of zero to two percent of the settlement. *See id.* at *1, 9 (approving a PAGA payment of 0.3%); *Jack v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.*, No. 09cv1683 MMA (JMA), 2011 WL 4899942, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2011) (approving a PAGA payment of 0.25%); *McKenzie v. Fed. Express Corp.*, No. CV 10-02420 GAF (PLAx), 2012 WL 12882124, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2012) (acknowledging that courts approve PAGA claim settlements in the range of zero to two percent of the total settlement).

1 Here, Plaintiff and Defendants negotiated a good faith PAGA Settlement in the amount of
2 \$10,000 which is 3.78% of the Gross Settlement Amount. As illustrated above, this amount falls well
3 within the range of approved PAGA Settlements. Seventy-Five percent (75%) of the PAGA
4 Settlement (\$7,500) will be paid to the LWDA ("LWDA Payment") with the remaining twenty-five
5 percent (25%) to be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees, which is within the range of PAGA
6 penalties approved by courts and should be approved. JCL Dec., ¶ 44.


7 Class Counsel gave the LWDA notice of this Settlement and proposed allocation by filing a
8 copy of the Settlement, the Motion for Preliminary Approval, and this motion seeking final approval
9 with the LWDA. JCL Dec., ¶¶ 5-6. By not registering an objection with either Class Counsel or the
10 Court, the LWDA has accepted and approved of the proposed PAGA Settlement.

11 VII. CONCLUSION

12 Plaintiff respectfully submits that the proposed settlement satisfies the standard of fairness
13 established in California law and should therefore be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate
14 and requests entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment submitted herewith.

15
16 Dated: August 16, 2022

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

17
18 By: 
19 Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff