

Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175)
Mai Tulyathan (State Bar No. 316704)
DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.
515 S. Figueroa St., Suite 1250
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 488-6555
(213) 488-6554 facsimile

Dennis S. Hyun (State Bar No. 224240)
HYUN LEGAL, APC
515 S. Figueroa St., Suite 1250
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 488-6555
(213) 488-6554 facsimile

Attorneys for Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees
(Additional Counsel on Following Page)

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO

DIEN TRUONG, as an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DS SERVICES OF AMERICA, INC., a
Delaware corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: FCS054399

[Assigned to the Hon. E. Bradley Nelson, Dept. 4]

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM L. MARDER
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Date: March 29, 2021

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 4

ADDITIONAL ATTORNEYS

William L. Marder (State Bar No. 170131)

Polaris Law Group

501 San Benito Street, Suite 200

Hollister, CA 95023

Tel: (831) 531-4214

Fax: (831) 634-0333

Attorneys for Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees

1 I, WILLIAM L. MARDER, hereby declare and state as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all courts in the State of
3 California and am the sole shareholder of the law firm of the Polaris Law Group, one of the
4 attorneys of record for Plaintiff Dien Truong ("Plaintiff"), in the above-entitled action. I have
5 personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein, and if called upon as a witness to testify
6 thereto, I could and would competently do so.

7 2. Based on their own independent investigations and evaluations, the Parties and
8 their respective counsel are of the opinion that settlement for the consideration and on the terms
9 set forth in the Settlement Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best
10 interests of the Class and Defendants in light of all known facts and circumstances and the
11 expenses and risks inherent in litigation.

12 3. Plaintiff strongly believes that plaintiff can prevail at trial. However, Plaintiff
13 also believes in the fairness of the settlement, which is based on factoring in the uncertainty and
14 risks to Plaintiff involved in not prevailing on one or more of the causes of action or theories
15 alleged in his Complaint and in the possibility of appeals.

16 4. After taking into account sharply disputed factual and legal issues involved in this
17 litigation, the risks attending further prosecution, and the substantial benefits to be received
18 pursuant to the compromise and settlement of the litigation, Plaintiff and Class Counsel have
19 concluded that settlement on the terms hereinafter set forth is appropriate and in the best interests
20 of the Parties and that this settlement is fair and reasonable.

21 5. Based on my review of all the information, and based on my experience in class
22 action litigation, I believe this settlement to be fair, adequate and reasonable.

23 6. Plaintiff and his counsel are adequate representatives in that they have no
24 conflicts with the class and will adequately represent the class.

25 7. I was retained based upon a contingency fee arrangement wherein Plaintiff's
26 counsel agreed to advance all costs and receive no fee unless a recovery was accomplished.
27 Specifically, had Plaintiff failed to prevail on these cases, counsel for Plaintiff would have spent
28 a significant amount of time, money and other resources without any benefit or return. In

1 addition, had Plaintiff also failed to prevail in the present cases, Defendants would have been
2 able to seek costs in connection with their defense of the case.

3 8. I graduated from UCLA Law School in 1993 and was admitted to the California
4 Bar in 1994. Since that time, I have acquired substantial experience in employment litigation. I
5 have represented both plaintiffs and defendants. I estimate that I have handled more than 300
6 employment cases, litigating cases in state and federal courts.

7 9. I have defended large institutional employers in employment cases. From 1995
8 to 1997, as an associate at Bolling, Walter & Gawthrop in Sacramento, I represented the City of
9 Sacramento, Yolo County, the City of Davis, Solano County and other employers in
10 employment litigation in state and federal courts.

11 10. From 1997 to 2000, I served as a Deputy County Counsel in San Benito,
12 handling all of its employment matters. These matters include advising the county on
13 compliance with wage and hour laws, arbitrations, and litigation.

14 11. From 2002 to 2006, I was a partner at Paxton O'Brien, LLP in Hollister, an AV
15 rated firm, where I represented numerous plaintiffs and defendants in employment lawsuits.

16 12. In 2006, I co-founded the Polaris Law Group where I spend most of my time
17 handling employment cases. I primarily represent employees.

18 13. I have been approved as class counsel in numerous cases, either as a result of the
19 granting of class certification or as part of the class settlement approval process, including
20 without limitation, the following cases:

- 21 a. *Sison v. Headway Technologies*, Case No. 1-13-CV-254591;
- 22 b. *Barrera v. Home Depot*, Northern District of California Case No. C 12 5199
23 LHK;
- 24 c. *Chavez v. Converse, Inc.*, N.D. Cal. Case No. 15-cv-03746-NC;
- 25 d. *Lao v. H&M Hennes & Mauritz*, N.D. Cal. Case No. 5:16-cv-333 EJD;
- 26 e. *Magadia v. Wal-Mart Assocs.*, N.D. Cal. Case No. 5:17-cv-00062-LHK;
- 27 f. *Naranjo v. Bank of America, N.A.*, N.D. Cal. Case No. C 14-02748 LHK;
- 28

1 g. *Ortegon-Ramirez v. Cedar Fair*, Santa Clara Sup. Ct. Case No. 1-13-CV-
2 254098;

3 h. *Rodriguez v. NIKE Retail Services, Inc.*, N.D. Cal. Case No. 5:14-CV-1508 BLF;

4 i. *Vass v. Gardner Trucking*, San Joaquin Sup. Ct. Case No. 39-2013-294819-CU-
5 OE-STK;

6 j. *Huertas v. Chevron Stations*, Santa Clara Sup. Ct. Case No. 17CV309996;

7 k. *Chavez v. Hugo Boss, Inc.*, Santa Clara Sup. Ct Case No. 18CV322644.

8 14. I was part of the trial team that prevailed on behalf of the certified class in
9 *Magadia v. Wal-Mart Assocs., Inc.*, 384 F. Supp. 3d 1058 (N.D. Cal. 2019), in which we
10 obtained a \$102 million judgment for the class. I also am counsel in *Rodriguez v. Nike Retail*
11 *Servs., Inc.*, 928 F.3d 810, 818 (9th Cir. 2019), in which we prevailed on class certification and
12 in reversing the district court's granting of summary judgment for the employer.

13 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
14 foregoing is true and correct.

15 Executed on March 3, 2021, at Hollister, California.

16
17 
18 _____
19 WILLIAM L. MARDER
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28