

Stephen M. Harris, Esq. State Bar No. 110626
email: stephen@smh-legal.com
LAW OFFICE OF STEPHEN M. HARRIS, P.C.
6320 Canoga Avenue, Suite 1500
Woodland Hills, California 91367
Telephone: (818) 924-3103
Facsimile: (818) 924-3079

Smith & Benowitz
Louis Benowitz, Bar No. 262300
louis@smithbenowitz.com
Benjamin Smith, Bar No., 266712
benjamin@smithbenowitz.com
4515 Van Nuys Blvd., Suite 302
Sherman Oaks, CA, 91403

Attorneys for Plaintiff YANLUY SANTOS

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT**

YANLUY SANTOS, on behalf of himself and all
other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

R.J. ACQUISITION CORP d.b.a., THE AdArt
COMPANY, JOSEPH M. DEMARCO, and
DOES 1 -100, inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No. 20STCV34717
) [Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Mel
) Red Recana, Dept. 45]
)
) **[UNLIMITED CASE]**
)
) **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**
) **FOR APPROVAL OF LABOR CODE**
) **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL**
) **ACT SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM**
) **OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**
)
)

) Date: 3-28-23
) Time: 8:30 a.m.
) Dept.: 45

Date Filed: 9-10-20
TRIAL DATE: NONE

Reservation No.: 550050683234

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on the 28th day of March, 2023, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon
3 thereafter as counsel may be heard, Plaintiff Yanluy Santos, pursuant to California Labor Code
4 Section 2699, et. seq. (The Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act, “the Act” or “PAGA”), will
5 move the court for an order approving the PAGA settlement entered into in connection with this
6 action.

7 This motion is based on this notice, the attached memorandum of points and authorities, the
8 declarations of Stephen M. Harris and Yanluy Santos, the exhibits attached to the Harris
9 Declaration, the PAGA Settlement Agreement, and on such oral or documentary evidence as may
10 be presented at the hearing.

11 Dated: February 21, 2023

THE LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN M. HARRIS,
P.C.

12
13 By: /s/ Stephen M. Harris
14 Stephen M. Harris, Esq.
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff YANLUY
16 SANTOS individually, and on behalf of all
17 other aggrieved employees
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Prefatory Statement

This motion seeks approval of the parties' \$50,000.00 PAGA settlement. Court approval of the settlement is warranted given the nature of the claims involved, the discovery and investigation conducted, the agreement of the parties, and the value of other settlements of PAGA cases.

B. Procedural History

Plaintiff Yanluy Santos ("Plaintiff" or "Santos") sent a PAGA notice to the Labor Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") on January 7, 2020, and an amended notice on November 21, 2022, asserting various claims against defendants RJ Acquisition, Inc., d.b.a. The AdArt Company ("AdArt") and Joseph M. DeMarco ("DeMarco") (collectively "Defendants"). (See, exhibit 1 to Declaration of Stephen M. Harris, "Harris Declaration".) Plaintiff filed this action on September 10, 2020, and subsequently filed a first amended complaint in January of 2023.

The operative complaint contains causes of action for PAGA violations, asserting various California Labor Code violations, statutory violations of the California Labor Code based on an alleged failure to pay wages, meal and rest period violations, Unfair Competition, and wrongful termination of employment. The time period covered by the PAGA settlement is July 20, 2019 to December 31, 2022. The dates covered by the PAGA lawsuit embrace a time period after the dates included in a pending Labor Commissioner proceeding. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 4.)

The parties mediated this matter in September of 2022, before respected mediator Scott Markus. Although a settlement was not reached at the time of mediation, through further negotiations and with the assistance of Mr. Markus, the parties were able to reach an agreement to settle the PAGA claims, and documented the formal PAGA Settlement Agreement. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 3; See, exhibit 2).¹ Santos entered into a separate agreement embracing all his individual claims for relief. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 3.)

¹ All exhibits are attached to the Harris Declaration.

1 **C. Nature of Case**

2 This is a PAGA and an individual case, filed by Santos. The PAGA case requests civil
3 penalties on behalf of approximately 223 exempt and non-exempt employees employed by AdArt,
4 which manufactures displays and other signage for retailers for inside or outside advertising.
5 AdArt maintains a warehouse where it designs, manufactures and ships product to customers.
6 (Harris Declaration, ¶ 5.)

7 Santos worked as a Screen Department Supervisor for AdArt from approximately July 12,
8 2004, to December 13, 2019, when he contends he was terminated from his employment because
9 he refused to sign a release of claims on account of wages owed, and because of his cooperation
10 with the pending Labor Commissioner proceeding. The consideration for the release presented to
11 Santos (which he refused to sign) is undisputed: One Dollar. In approximately the last six weeks of
12 his employment for AdArt, Santos was classified as a non-exempt employee. At all other times
13 during his employment with AdArt, Santos was paid a salary, and he contends he was misclassified
14 as an exempt employee.² (Harris Declaration, ¶ 5.)

15 **1. PAGA Penalties**

16 This lawsuit seeks PAGA penalties on behalf of AdArt's employees for the following
17 claimed wage and hour violations:

- 18 • Meal and Rest period violations, asserting meals and rest breaks were not provided,
19 were short, and/or were interrupted, including resulting unpaid wages for time
20 allegedly spent working through breaks and/or for the failure of AdArt to pay a meal
21 or rest period premium when compliant breaks were not provided;
- 22 • Unreimbursed business expenses, including the cost of driving personal vehicles,
23 purchasing and maintaining uniforms, the cost of tools and safety equipment and
24 personal cell phone use;
- 25 • Unpaid wages, including minimum wage and overtime wages in connection with

26 _____
27 ² The parties heavily disputed the nature of the job duties performed by Santos, as well as the hours
28 worked. Harris Declaration, ¶ 5.

work performed off the clock, the alleged failure to include all forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay, the alleged rounding or shaving of time, the alleged failure to correctly pay vacation or other compensation;

- Untimely payment of wages due, including during and at the conclusion of employment;
- Wage Statement Violations;
- Violation of notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5;
- Paid Sick Leave violations;
- Preventing employees from engaging in lawful conduct, thus violating state statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct.

(Harris Declaration, ¶ 6.)

At the time of mediation, there were approximately 11,050 pay periods for the 223 aggrieved employees in California during the period of time covered by this settlement, that is, July of 2019 to December of 2022.³ (*Id.*, ¶ 7.)

The Labor Commissioner has a pending PAGA claim which asserts similar violations and covers the time period of December 20, 2015 through July 20, 2019. Thus, this case cannot extend any further back than July 21, 2019, even though it was filed in January of 2020. (*Id.*)

D. Discovery And Investigation

Plaintiff served special interrogatories (two sets), form interrogatories, and demands to produce (three sets). Santos also filed a discovery motion challenging the responses of AdArt to the initial discovery, and in particular challenging the discovery responses related to Plaintiff's PAGA claim. Before the discovery dispute was resolved by the Court, the Parties reached an agreement and Defendants furnished supplemental responses. AdArt also furnished supplemental responses to other discovery requests as a result of meet and confer efforts by Santos. The parties also collectively produced hundreds of documents. (*Id.*, ¶ 8.)

³ These figures were provided at the time of the mediation.

1 Prior to mediation, the Parties engaged in multiple depositions, including the deposition of
2 Plaintiff, Mr. DeMarco, Michael Duarte (human resources), Robin Duarte (human resources) and
3 Eddie Leon (the Plant Manager). Plaintiff was planning to depose Mr. De La Torre (his supervisor)
4 when the case settled, and intended on taking additional depositions as well if the matter did not
5 resolve at mediation. (*Id.*, ¶ 9.)

6 In addition to the discovery conducted in this case, the Parties also obtained and exchanged
7 discovery in connection with a citation issued by the Labor Commissioner against AdArt. That
8 citation alleged claims on behalf of both non-exempt and exempt employees for a time frame
9 earlier than the time period embraced by the settlement in this matter. AdArt timely appealed the
10 citation and a multi-day hearing was held between December 2020 and January 2021 involving
11 numerous witnesses, including Santos. No decision has been rendered in that matter, but the Labor
12 Commissioner has twice reduced the amount of the citation and/or withdrew certain employees
13 from the citation. (*Id.*)

14 **E. Analysis of PAGA Penalties**

15 At mediation, the Parties estimated there were approximately 11,050 pay periods at issue.
16 Thus, one statutory penalty in the amount of \$100 per pay period for all alleged violations totals
17 \$1,105,000 (\$100.00 x. 11,050.) Plaintiff uses the initial violation penalty, and does not calculate
18 penalties by stacking them for each individual claimed violation.⁴ As noted below, PAGA cases
19 routinely settle for a per payroll period amount which ranges from \$4.00 to \$5.50. (*Id.*, ¶ 10.)

20 **F. Settlement Terms**

- 21 • The aggrieved employees are defined in the Settlement Agreement as all employees
22 working for AdArt during the period of time covered by the settlement, other than
23 those excluded in the agreement. (Settlement Agreement, “Agreement”, attached as
24 exhibit 1, ¶¶ 2, 20.) Those excluded consisted of the Company’s owners, Human
25

26 ⁴ There does not appear to be any case authority prohibiting this practice, but the court does also
27 have discretion over the amount of penalties. Labor Code Section 2699 (e) and (g); See, also,
28 *Gunther v. Alaska Airlines, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 334, 355-56.

1 Resource employees, outside sales employees and General Managers. These
2 individuals were excluded as there was no allegation of violations as to them (i.e.
3 no claim of misclassification), and/or because they were alleged to have exercised
4 control or decision making authority over the remaining employees.

- 5 • The period of time covered by the settlement is July 20, 2019 to December 31, 2022.
6 (“Settlement Period”; *Id.*, ¶ 12). The Parties affirmatively elected to negotiate a
7 settlement through December 31, 2022 instead of through approval to ensure there
8 was a defined number of pay periods covered by the settlement. (Harris Declaration,
9 ¶ 4.)
- 10 • There are approximately 223 aggrieved employees encompassed in the \$50,000
11 settlement. The deductions from the gross settlement sum consist of attorneys’ fees
12 of 1/3 of the settlement amount, or \$16,666.66, costs of up to \$6,837.78, and costs
13 of administration of \$5,000.00. (Agreement, ¶¶ 2, 17, 18, 20.)
- 14 • There is no enhancement payment provided for Santos. (*Id.*)
- 15 • 75% of the net settlement fund will be payable to the LWDA, or \$16,121.67, while
16 the aggrieved employees will receive a total distribution of \$5,373.89. This sum will
17 be distributed to the aggrieved employees on a pro rata basis. Each employees’ share
18 will be determined by dividing their eligible pay periods into the total number of
19 eligible pay periods. (*Id.*, ¶¶ 16-18.)
- 20 • The sums paid to the aggrieved employees will be reported on a 1099. The release
21 of the aggrieved employees will be limited to the PAGA claims at issue, while the
22 release signed by Plaintiff encompasses any and all claims. (*Id.*, ¶¶ 22-23.)
- 23 • The Agreement also contains detailed provisions governing distribution of the
24 Settlement Proceeds. (*Id.*, ¶¶ 20-22; See, also, exhibit 3, proposed notice to
25 aggrieved employees.)
- 26 • The aggrieved employees only release their PAGA claims against Defendants for
27 the Covered Period. (*Id.*, ¶ 23.) There is no release of underlying Labor Code
28 violations by the aggrieved employees. (*Id.*)

II. ANALYSIS OF VIOLATIONS

A. Santos Is An Appropriate Representative of the Aggrieved Employees

Labor Code Section 2699 (c) defines an aggrieved employee as “any person who was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.” See, also, *Kim v. Reins Int'l Cal., Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 73, 82.

Santos worked as both a salaried and hourly employee, and alleges multiple violations of the Labor Code within the limitations periods. (Harris Declaration, ¶¶ 11-15.) There is no doubt that Santos meets this standard, as set forth below.

B. Santos Misclassification Claim, and the Claim that Others were Misclassified

Santos’ job title was the supervisor of the screen department. He asserts that eighty percent of his time was spent performing physical tasks. He would count screens, move screens to the emulsion area, wash screens, engrave them, and prepare them for use. He could also ask for more inventory to permit work to continue. He had to fill out a request form for such materials and give it to Adam De Marco. He contends he did not hire, fire or give employees time off. And Santos further contends that Enrique de la Torre was the manager of the department who made all decisions on important issues, including costs. (Santos Declaration, ¶ 3.)

Santos was paid a salary that did not fluctuate based on his hours. While he was on salary, Santos was not paid overtime. Santos testified that he in fact routinely performed uncompensated overtime, and did so off the clock. According to Santos, Mr. de la Torre advised Santos and another employee that it was cheaper to have the salaried employees perform overtime. Mr. Santos alleges that texts and phone calls from Mr. de la Torre (and records relating to the operation of Santos’ machine) substantiate Santos’ contentions relating to performing uncompensated overtime work. Moreover, Robin Duarte, an HR supervisory employee, testified that she observed Mr. de la Torre at work on weekends with other employees. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 12; Santos Declaration, ¶ 4.)

Santos also claims to have observed other employees classified as exempt perform physical tasks more than 50% of the time that they spent working. (Santos Declaration, ¶ 5.)

1. Santos Also Was Classified As A Non-Exempt Employee

Santos was classified as non-exempt and paid hourly during approximately the last six

1 weeks of his employment. (*Id.* at ¶ 6.)

2 **2. Defendants Dispute Misclassification of Santos**

3 Throughout this litigation, Defendants have maintained that Santos was correctly classified
4 as a salaried-exempt employee under both California’s administrative and executive exemptions,
5 and even if Santos does not meet the duties test of the exemptions, he did not suffer any damages
6 since he did not work overtime. In support of their position, Defendants rely on the testimony and
7 declarations of other employees, as well as notes from an interview Santos gave to the DLSE.
8 Defendants claim Santos was responsible for overseeing the Screen Department and supervising
9 other employees. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 14.)

10 **3. Defendants Claim Santos Resigned**

11 Another hotly contested issue in this litigation concerned the circumstances under which
12 Plaintiff’s employment ended, and whether – as relevant here – there was an attempt to preclude
13 him from asserting or disclosing certain claims. (*Id.*)

14 **4. Other Employees Testified Similarly To Santos**

15 Counsel for Plaintiff reviewed some of the testimony provided in the Labor Commissioner
16 proceeding, which Plaintiff believes supports Santos’ version of events. (*Id.* ¶ 16.) For example,
17 Sergio Pardo (during 2004 to 2020) was classified as a screen department supervisor, as was
18 Santos. (AdArt had three separate shifts.) Pardo testified that 70% of the time he performed
19 physical tasks, could not fire other employees, was paid by a salary, and his supervisor was Enrique
20 de la Torre, the same individual supervising Santos. Pardo did not schedule other departmental
21 employees work, hire them, or approve vacation. Pardo also worked uncompensated overtime. (*Id.*)

22 Similarly, Juan Garcia was a salaried shipping coordinator who testified to working 5-15
23 overtime hours a week. He did not supervise other employees, and would receive new orders,
24 locate items that had to do with production, prepared packing slips, and ordered supplies. If a label
25 or product had to be reprinted or if a product was damaged, he would have to discuss the issue with
26 his supervisor Mr. Puentes, who would then address the matter with De Marco. Garcia did not
27 negotiate pricing. The other salaried shipping coordinators would average working six hours of
28 overtime a week. Moreover, Jose Puentes (the plant manager) admitted that shipping coordinators

1 did not supervise, hire or fire anyone. (*Id.* at ¶ 17.)

2 **5. Defendants Dispute The Case Presented By The DLSE**

3 As noted above, Defendants filed an appeal from the citation and contend that the citation is
4 unsupported by the evidence. (*Id.* at ¶ 18.)

5 Further, Defendants contend that the DLSE interviewed only a limited number of
6 employees, and thus any extrapolation of their findings to other employees was improper.
7 Specifically, ten of the 28 employees who were interviewed were found to be exempt, but it was
8 assumed that all 32 employees not interviewed were misclassified as exempt. This same sampling
9 error extended to the claimed damages, Defendants contend. However, Plaintiff notes that there
10 was evidence that AdArt encouraged employees not to cooperate with the investigation. (*Id.* at ¶¶
11 19-20.)

12 In short, whether any employee was misclassified was a hotly contested issue between the
13 Parties, including whether any worked overtime. Defendants assert that they were prepared to
14 challenge the manageability of Plaintiff's claims if the matter did not settle. (*Id.* at ¶ 21.)

15 **C. Rest and Meal Period Violations**

16 Santos asserts that he and other employees routinely missed meal and rest periods, since
17 they worked through them, or otherwise were not furnished such breaks. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 22;
18 Santos Declaration, ¶ 7; First Amended Complaint ("FAC"), ¶¶ 23-27.) This point was contested
19 by Defendants, who relied on the existence of compliant policies and the fact that the DLSE did not
20 cite for the alleged violations following their investigation. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 22.)

21 **D. Expense Reimbursement Violations**

22 Plaintiff claims that, under Labor Code Section 2802, he and the aggrieved employees are
23 denied mileage reimbursement for use of their personal vehicles and denied reimbursement of other
24 expenses. (FAC, ¶¶ 34-35.) Santos testified in his deposition that he travelled to San Francisco and
25 back during one day, without any compensation beyond his regular salary. (Harris Declaration, ¶
26 22.) Whether and to what extent any expense was reasonable and necessary was a contested point
27 in this case, Defendants contend. (*Id.*)

1 **E. Wage Statement Violations/Violation of Labor Code Sections 201-203**

2 Based on AdArt's alleged failure to pay wages owed to employees, which is disputed by it,
3 as discussed below, Santos claims that it committed wage statement violations and other similar
4 violations supporting PAGA penalties. (See, Lab. Code §§ 226, 432, 1174, 1198.5, 2810.5; FAC,
5 ¶¶ 28-30, 32-33.) Further, Plaintiff contends that since AdArt failed to pay all wages owed during
6 or at conclusion of the employment of the aggrieved employees no longer employed by it, PAGA
7 penalties are owed based on this dereliction as well. (FAC, ¶¶ 31, 39-40.)

8 **F. Failure to Pay All Wages Due/Overtime**

9 As stated above, Santos states he routinely performed uncompensated overtime, or worked
10 off the clock without pay. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 23; FAC, ¶¶ 19-22, 28; Santos Declaration, ¶ 4.)
11 This was a significant point of contention not only for Plaintiff, but for all aggrieved employees,
12 Defendants assert. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 23.)

13 **G. Other Violations**

14 Further, Santos contends (which defendant disputed) that AdArt committed violations of
15 PAGA relating to uniform deposits, sick leave, paid time off, and disclosure of employment and
16 wage information. (FAC, ¶¶ 35-38, 41-43.)

17 **III. THE SETTLEMENT SHOULD BE APPROVED**

18 The court must review and approve any settlement of a PAGA case. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699
19 (1)(2). The court has discretion to award a lesser amount than the maximum civil penalty allowed
20 under PAGA. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(e) (2); See, also *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.* (2018) 30
21 Cal.App.5th 504, 529 [imposing penalty of \$5.00 per initial violation]; *Enomgbang v. Target Corp.*,
22 Alameda County Superior Court Case No.: RG17853948 (\$9,000,000 settlement; 1,939,006 pay
23 periods; \$4.66/pay period); *Ramos v. Home Depot*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No.:
24 RG15797737 (\$2,600,00 settlement; 486,000 pay periods; \$5.34 per pay period).

25 Here, the PAGA penalties are reasonable since they are based on a settlement where
26 liability is disputed, and Defendants presented arguments and challenges to the manageability of
27 the PAGA action. The settlement represents a reasonable percentage of the potential gross value of
28 the claim, in light of the challenges Defendants raised. The value of the settlement is in line with

1 the value of the per pay period settlement figures referred to above.

2 The parties have exchanged information informally, conducted discovery, and assessed the
3 strengths and weaknesses of the case, as well as the defenses thereto. The PAGA settlement arrived
4 at is reasonable. (Harris Declaration, ¶¶ 24-25.)

5 **IV. ATTORNEYS FEES AND COSTS**

6 The Law Offices of Stephen M. Harris has spent 195.20 hours up to the date of the filing of
7 this document, at the rate of \$750.00 per hour, while costs of \$8,517.45, have been incurred. Smith
8 & Benowitz (Louis Benowitz) has spent 38 hours to date, at the rate of \$600.00 an hour, and
9 incurred costs of \$4,562.72. Thus, the lodestar is approximately \$169,200.00 to date, and does not
10 include appearing at the final approval hearing or other additional work which is anticipated to take
11 place. (Harris Declaration, ¶ 26.)

12 **V.CONCLUSION**

13 We consider the settlement of the PAGA action to be a good faith resolution of a disputed
14 claim. We thus request that the court grant approval and enter the proposed order lodged
15 concurrently with this motion for approval.

16 Dated: February 21, 2023

THE LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN M. HARRIS,
P.C.

17
18
19 By: /s/ Stephen M. Harris
Stephen M. Harris, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff YANLUY
20 SANTOS individually, and on behalf of all
21 other aggrieved employees
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE
Santos v. RJ Acquisition
Case No. 20STCV34717

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES:

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 6320 Canoga Avenue, Suite 1500, Woodland Hills, California 91367. On February 21, 2023, I caused the foregoing document(s) described as MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT to be served on the interested parties in this action as follows:

By placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope(s) addressed as stated on the attached mailing list.

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** (CCP § 1010.6; CRC Rule 2.251(g)): My electronic service address is stephen@smh-legal.com. I served the above listed document(s) described via electronic service on the designated recipients via electronic transmission through my electronic service address. The electronic service addresses of the persons served are listed below. Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses listed below.

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

Executed on February 21, 2023, at Woodland Hills, California.

Stephen M. Harris
(Type or print name)

/s/ Stephen M. Harris
(Signature)

SERVICE LIST
Santos v. R.J. Acquisition
Case No. 20STCV34717

Karin M. Cogbill
kcogbill@hopkinscarley.com
Jonathan A. Heller
jheller@hopkinsscarley.com

Tel: 408.286.9800
Fax : 408.998.4790

HOPKINS & CARLEY
70 S First Street, Suite 4000
San Jose, CA, 95113
(mailing address)
P.O. Box 1469
San Jose, California 95109-1469

Attorneys for Defendants R.J. Acquisition Corp.
dba The ADART and Joseph M. Demarco

Louis Benowitz
louis@smithbenowitz.com
Benjamin Smith
benjamin@smithbenowitz.com

Tel: (818) 839-7800
Fax: 818-839-9700

SMITH & BENOWITZ
4515 Van Nuys Blvd., Suite 302
Sherman Oaks, CA, 91403

Attorneys for, Plaintiff YANLUY SANTOS,
individually, and on behalf of all other
aggrieved employees



Court Reservation Receipt

Reservation

Reservation ID: 550050683234	Status: RESERVED
Reservation Type: Motion for Order (Approving Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act Settlement)	Number of Motions: 1
Case Number: 20STCV34717	Case Title: YANLUY SANTOS vs R.J. ACQUISITION CORP, et al.
Filing Party: Yanluy Santos (Plaintiff)	Location: Stanley Mosk Courthouse - Department 45
Date/Time: March 28th 2023, 8:30AM	Confirmation Code: CR-VUVSFDWAEMBMHJHQD

Fees

Description	Fee	Qty	Amount
Motion for Order (name extension)	60.00	1	60.00
Credit Card Percentage Fee (2.75%)	1.65	1	1.65
TOTAL			\$61.65

Payment

Amount: \$61.65	Type: Visa
Account Number: XXXX7915	Authorization: 09330G
Payment Date: 2022-11-22	

[◀ Back to Main](#)

Print Page