

DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.  
Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175)  
[lwlee@diversitylaw.com](mailto:lwlee@diversitylaw.com)  
Simon L. Yang (State Bar No. 260286)  
[sly@diversitylaw.com](mailto:sly@diversitylaw.com)  
515 South Figueroa Street, Suite 1250  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 488-6555  
Facsimile (213) 488-6554

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**FOR THE COUNTY OF TULARE**

RODOLFO TELLEZ, as an individual and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated, and as a  
private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUN VALLEY RAISINS, INC., a California  
corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. VCU284414

[Assigned to Hon. Nathan Ide]

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF  
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**

*[Filed concurrently with Declaration of Larry W.  
Lee; Declaration of Simon L. Yang; Declaration  
of Rodolfo Tellez; Declaration of Kevin Lee;  
[Proposed] Order and Final Judgment]*

Date: March 13, 2023  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Department: 2

Complaint Filed: September 23, 2020

1 **TO THE COURT, DEFENDANT, AND ITS COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on March 13, 2023, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the  
3 matter may be heard in Department 2 of the above-entitled court located at 221 South Mooney  
4 Boulevard, Visalia, California 93291, Plaintiff, Rodolfo Tellez, will and hereby does seek an Order:

- 5 1. granting final approval to the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement (the “Agreement”)  
6 in this action;
- 7 2. approving distribution of the settlement funds to Settlement Class Members and Aggrieved  
8 Employees pursuant to the terms of the Agreement;
- 9 3. approving Plaintiff’s request for a service award of \$5,000.00 to the Class Representative  
10 pursuant to the terms of the Agreement;
- 11 4. approving Class Counsel’s request for an award of attorneys’ fees of 33⅓% of the  
12 \$92,110.00 Gross Settlement Amount, or \$30,703.33, and reimbursement of litigation costs  
13 of \$5,909.03 pursuant to the terms of the Agreement;
- 14 5. approving Plaintiff’s request for payment of the settlement administration costs to Phoenix  
15 Settlement Administrators in the amount of \$4,000.00 pursuant to the terms of the  
16 Agreement;
- 17 6. approving Plaintiff’s request for payment to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency of  
18 \$7,620.00 pursuant to the terms of the Agreement; and
- 19 7. entering final judgment as to all members of the Settlement Class, the Aggrieved Employees,  
20 and the State of California (including the Labor and Workforce Development Agency) in this  
21 action.


22 This motion is made pursuant to Rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court, which provides for  
23 Court approval of the settlement of a purported class action and allows the Court to grant final  
24 certification of a class for settlement purposes. The overwhelmingly positive Class response—as shown  
25 by the lack of any objections to the settlement and also the lack of any opt outs—supports that the  
26 settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and should be granted final approval.

27 This motion will be based on the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the  
28 supporting Declarations of Larry W. Lee, Simon L. Yang, Plaintiff Rodolfo Tellez, and Kevin Lee of

1 Phoenix Settlement Administrators, upon the oral arguments of counsel (should there be any), and on  
2 the complete records and file herein.

3 DATED: February 15, 2023

DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.

4  
5 By:   
6 Larry W. Lee  
7 Simon L. Yang  
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|                                                                                                                                                                     | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| SUMMARY OF MOTION.....                                                                                                                                              | 1    |
| DISCUSSION .....                                                                                                                                                    | 2    |
| I. Class Members Were Provided Notice of the Settlement.....                                                                                                        | 2    |
| II. The Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable Settlement Should Be Given Final Approval. ....                                                                              | 3    |
| A. The Strength of the Case and Likelihood of Class Certification Support Approval. ....                                                                            | 3    |
| 1. The Class Is Ascertainable.....                                                                                                                                  | 3    |
| 2. There Is a Community of Interest. ....                                                                                                                           | 4    |
| a. There Are Predominant Common Questions of Law and Fact.....                                                                                                      | 4    |
| b. Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical of the Class Claims.....                                                                                                          | 4    |
| c. Plaintiff Adequately Represented the Class.....                                                                                                                  | 5    |
| B. Defendant’s Allegations and Position on Class Certification Support Approval. ....                                                                               | 5    |
| C. Risks, Expenses, and Complexity of Further Litigation Support Approval. ....                                                                                     | 5    |
| D. The Settlement Terms and Negotiation—as Well as the Class Member Response—All Support the Conclusion that the Settlement is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable. .... | 6    |
| III. Well-Established Legal Principles Support Final Approval of the Settlement.....                                                                                | 6    |
| A. The Settlement is Presumed to Be Fair.....                                                                                                                       | 7    |
| B. Two-Way Costs and Other Risks Inherent in Litigation Favor Final Approval.....                                                                                   | 8    |
| C. The Complexity, Expense, and Likely Duration of Continued Litigation Against Defendant Favor Final Approval. ....                                                | 9    |
| D. The Opinion of Experienced Counsel Favors Final Approval.....                                                                                                    | 9    |
| IV. The Proposed Payments and Procedures Should Be Approved.....                                                                                                    | 9    |
| A. The Proposed Procedure for Uncashed Settlement Checks Should Be Approved. ....                                                                                   | 9    |
| B. The Requested Class Representative Service Award Should Be Approved.....                                                                                         | 10   |
| C. The Requested Attorneys’ Fees Should Be Approved. ....                                                                                                           | 11   |
| 1. The Percentage of the Fund Method Supports the Requested Fees.....                                                                                               | 11   |
| 2. The Lodestar Cross-Check Supports the Requested Fees.....                                                                                                        | 13   |

|   |                                                                          |    |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | D. The Court Should Approve the Request for Reimbursement of Costs. .... | 14 |
| 2 | E. The Administrator’s Fees and Costs Should Be Approved. ....           | 15 |
| 3 | V. Notice to the LWDA Has Been Provided. ....                            | 15 |
| 4 | CONCLUSION.....                                                          | 15 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### State Cases

|                                                                                                        |      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| <i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> ,<br>85 Cal. App. 4th 1135 (2000) ..... | 7    |
| <i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> ,<br>162 Cal. App. 4th 43 (2008) .....                                  | 12   |
| <i>Classen v. Weller</i> ,<br>145 Cal. App. 3d 27 (1983) .....                                         | 5    |
| <i>Daar v. Yellow Cab Co.</i> ,<br>67 Cal. 2d. 695 (1967) .....                                        | 4    |
| <i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> ,<br>48 Cal. App. 4th 1794 (1996) .....                                  | 7, 8 |
| <i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l</i> ,<br>1 Cal. 5th 480 (2016) .....                                  | 11   |
| <i>Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Superior Court</i> ,<br>29 Cal. 4th 1096 (2003) .....                      | 5    |
| <i>Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.</i> ,<br>72 Cal. App. 5th 56 (2021) .....                                 | 7    |
| <i>Reese v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> ,<br>73 Cal. App. 4th 1225 (1999) .....                          | 4    |
| <i>Reyes v. San Diego County Board of Supervisors</i> ,<br>196 Cal. App. 3d 1263 (1987) .....          | 4    |
| <i>Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.</i> ,<br>29 Cal. 3d 462 (1981) .....                              | 4    |
| <i>Serrano v. Priest</i> ,<br>20 Cal. 3d 25 (1977) .....                                               | 11   |
| <i>Simons v. Horowitz</i> ,<br>151 Cal. App. 3d 834 (1984) .....                                       | 6    |
| <i>Stephens v. Montgomery Ward &amp; Co.</i> ,<br>193 Cal. App. 3d 411 (1987) .....                    | 5    |
| <i>Vasquez v. Superior Court</i> ,<br>4 Cal. 3d 800 (1971) .....                                       | 4    |
| <i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> ,<br>91 Cal. App. 4th 224 (2001) .....                          | 11   |

**Federal Cases**

|                                                                                                             |          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| <i>Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert</i> ,<br>444 U.S. 472 (1980).....                                               | 11       |
| <i>Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.</i> ,<br>485 F. Supp. 610 (N.D. Cal. 1979).....                                    | 9        |
| <i>Brotherton v. Cleveland</i> ,<br>141 F. Supp. 2d 907 (S.D. Ohio 2001) .....                              | 13       |
| <i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle</i> ,<br>955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir. 1992) .....                         | 6, 7     |
| <i>Cook v. Niedert</i> ,<br>142 F.3d 1004 (7th Cir. 1998) .....                                             | 13       |
| <i>Eisen v. Carlisle &amp; Jacquelin</i> ,<br>417 U.S. 156 (1974).....                                      | 3        |
| <i>Ellis v. Naval Air Rework Facility</i> ,<br>87 F.R.D. 15 (N.D. Cal. 1980).....                           | 8, 10    |
| <i>Enterprise Energy Corp. v. Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.</i> ,<br>137 F.R.D. 240 (S.D. Ohio 1991)..... | 13       |
| <i>Fernandez v. Victoria Secret Stores LLC</i> ,<br>2008 WL 8150856 (C.D. Cal. July 21, 2008).....          | 13       |
| <i>Gaskill v. Gordon</i> ,<br>160 F.3d 361 (7th Cir. 1998) .....                                            | 11       |
| <i>Girsh v. Jepson</i> ,<br>521 F.2d 153 (3d Cir. 1975).....                                                | 8, 9     |
| <i>Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.</i> ,<br>976 F.2d 497 (9th Cir. 1992) .....                                  | 5        |
| <i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> ,<br>150 F.3d 1011 (1998).....                                              | 9        |
| <i>In re Dun &amp; Bradstreet Credit Servs. Customer Litig.</i> ,<br>130 F.R.D. 366 (S.D. Ohio 1990).....   | 13       |
| <i>In re General Motors Corp.</i> ,<br>55 F.3d 768 (3d Cir. 1995).....                                      | 9        |
| <i>Linney v. Cellular Alaska P'ship</i> ,<br>151 F.3d 1234 (9th Cir. 1998) .....                            | 10       |
| <i>Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank &amp; Trust Co.</i> ,<br>339 U.S. 306 (1950).....                        | 3        |
| <i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n</i> ,<br>688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982) .....                   | 7, 9, 10 |

|    |                                                |       |
|----|------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1  | <i>Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts</i> ,      |       |
| 2  | 472 U.S. 797 (1985).....                       | 3     |
| 3  | <i>Swedish Hospital v. Shalala</i> ,           |       |
| 4  | 1 F.3d 1261 (D.C. Cir. 1993).....              | 13    |
| 5  | <i>Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.</i> ,        |       |
| 6  | 529 F.2d 943 (9th Cir. 1976) .....             | 7, 10 |
| 7  | <i>Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i> , |       |
| 8  | 901 F. Supp. 294 (N.D. Cal. 1995) .....        | 11    |
| 9  | <i>Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.</i> ,      |       |
| 10 | 557 F. 2d 759 (9th Cir. 1997) .....            | 11    |
| 11 | <i>Young v. Katz</i> ,                         |       |
| 12 | 447 F.2d 431 (5th Cir. 1971) .....             | 9     |
| 13 |                                                |       |
| 14 |                                                |       |
| 15 |                                                |       |
| 16 |                                                |       |
| 17 |                                                |       |
| 18 |                                                |       |
| 19 |                                                |       |
| 20 |                                                |       |
| 21 |                                                |       |
| 22 |                                                |       |
| 23 |                                                |       |
| 24 |                                                |       |
| 25 |                                                |       |
| 26 |                                                |       |
| 27 |                                                |       |
| 28 |                                                |       |

## SUMMARY OF MOTION

On September 23, 2020, Plaintiff, Rodolfo Tellez, filed this class and Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) action against Defendant, Sun Valley Raisins, Inc. The complaint alleges Defendant violated Labor Code section 226(a)<sup>1</sup> by furnishing employees with wage statements that fail to accurately show Defendant’s name and fail to show its address at all.

Plaintiff now seeks the Court’s final approval of the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement (the “Agreement”). The Agreement provides for a \$92,110.00 fund to be created for the benefit of the Class, from which attorneys’ fees, litigation costs, a service award to the Class Representative, payment to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), and costs of settlement administration are to be paid. All other settlement funds remaining after these deductions will be paid to Settlement Class Members and Aggrieved Employees.

The history of this litigation was previously detailed in Plaintiff’s Preliminary Approval Motion. On September 12, 2022, the Court preliminarily approved this settlement. It directed distribution of the Notice of Class Action Settlement (“Class Notice”) and scheduled the hearing for final approval of settlement (the “Preliminary Approval Order”).

As directed by the Court, the Administrator, Phoenix Settlement Administrators, distributed the Class Notice to 54 Class Members. Declaration of Kevin Lee on behalf of Phoenix Settlement Administrators (“Admin Decl.”) ¶ 5. No requests for exclusion have been received. *Id.* ¶ 8. No objections have been filed. *Id.* ¶ 9. As such, there is a 100% participation rate. *Id.* ¶ 11. Thus, an inference can be made that the Class supports the Preliminary Approval Order’s finding that the Agreement is fair and reasonable.

In addition to the results of the notice process, the points discussed in Plaintiff’s Preliminary Approval Motion also support final approval of the settlement:

- The settlement provides a total settlement sum of \$92,110.00;
- The settlement is fair given that Class Members will receive (*after* deductions for fees, costs, etc.) a substantial amount of money (on average, each Settlement Class Member will receive approximately \$672.92, and each Aggrieved Employee will additionally receive another \$47.04, *see* Admin Decl. ¶¶ 13, 14);

---

<sup>1</sup> Except as otherwise noted, all “Section” references are to the Labor Code.

- Class Members did not need to submit claim forms to participate in the settlement but are being paid automatically;
- The allocation reflects that payment of claims will be paid to all Class Members in proportion to the number of relevant wage statements received by each Class Member during the Class Period;
- Plaintiff conducted significant investigation in this case, including formal and informal discovery and exchanges of information by Plaintiff and Defendant of class data for the entire class necessary for Plaintiff to fully evaluate this case;
- A highly regarded administrator, Phoenix Settlement Administrators, was retained for fees of \$4,000.00 only; and
- California’s LWDA will also be the beneficiary of this settlement as it will receive \$7,620.00, should this settlement be granted final approval.

Accordingly, the Court should grant Final Approval consistent with the Preliminary Approval Order.

## DISCUSSION

### **I. Class Members Were Provided Notice of the Settlement.**

The notice procedures required by the Preliminary Approval Order have been followed and satisfy all due process rights of Class Members. The Preliminary Approval Order contemplated that the Class Notice would be sent to all Class Members by first class mail, as specified in the Agreement. Furthermore, the Preliminary Approval Order contemplated that Phoenix Settlement Administrators would serve as the Administrator.

As clearly stated in the Admin Declaration, notice was provided to Class Members, as required by the Preliminary Approval Order. On September 27, 2022, the Administrator received a Class Member mailing list from Defendant’s counsel that included 54 Class Members. Admin Decl. ¶ 3. On October 3, 2022, each of the persons identified on the mailing list were sent the Class Notice via first class mail. *Id.* ¶ 5. The Class Notice mailed to all 54 Class Members provided Class Members with Class Counsel’s contact information, where they could further seek information regarding the settlement, leave questions for the Administrator, and update their addresses. From the date of mailing, five Class Notices were returned and four were then re-mailed to an updated address after performing an address trace. *Id.* ¶ 6. Two of the remailed Class Notices (and three Class Notices total) remained undeliverable. *Id.* ¶ 7.

Plaintiff provided the “best notice practicable” in this case as necessary to protect the due process rights of class members. *See Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*, 472 U.S. 797, 811-12 (1985)

(providing “best notice practicable” with description of the litigation and explanation of opt-out rights satisfies due process); *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 U.S. 156, 174-75 (1974) (explaining individual notice must be sent to class members who can be identified through reasonable means); *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950) (stating best practicable notice is that which is “reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections”).

Here, Class Members were mailed a notice that explained the settlement and allowed Class Members to seek information, ask questions, and object, if so desired. As such, proper notice has been given to the Class Members. Thus, the Court may determine the fairness and adequacy of the settlement and enter its Order granting final approval, secure in the knowledge that all absent Class Members have been given the opportunity to participate fully in the claims, exclusion, and the approval process.

## **II. The Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable Settlement Should Be Given Final Approval.**

### **A. The Strength of the Case and Likelihood of Class Certification Support Approval.**

The Court already addressed the requirements for certifying a class for settlement purposes in its Order granting preliminary approval. Plaintiff briefly addresses the requirements again here.

#### **1. The Class Is Ascertainable.**

“Whether a class is ascertainable is determined by examining (1) the class definition, (2) the size of the class, and (3) the means available for identifying the class members.” *Reyes v. San Diego County Board of Supervisors*, 196 Cal. App. 3d 1263, 1271 (1987); *see also* Code Civ. Proc. § 382.

Here, the Class is defined to include all current and former employees of Defendant in the State of California, who were furnished wage statements showing “SVR” instead of Sun Valley Raisins, Inc. at any time during the Class Period. Agreement ¶ 1.5. The Class Period is from September 23, 2019, through July 14, 2022. *Id.* ¶ 1.7.

There are 54 individuals that comprise the Class. Admin Decl. ¶ 3.<sup>2</sup> This is more than the minimum required to certify a class. Within the context of manageability, the issue is whether there

---

<sup>2</sup> All Class Members are also Aggrieved Employees. Agreement ¶ 1.5. The PAGA Period is the same as the Class Period. *Id.* ¶ 1.7.

exists sufficient means for identifying class members at the remedial stage. *Reyes*, 196 Cal. App. 3d at 1274-75. Here, Class Members have already been identified and have already been sent notice.

## **2. There Is a Community of Interest.**

The “community of interest” requirement embodies three separate factors: (1) predominant common questions of law or fact; (2) class representatives whose claims are typical of the class; and (3) class representatives who can adequately represent the class. *Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.*, 29 Cal. 3d 462, 470 (1981); *Reese v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 73 Cal. App. 4th 1225, 1234 (1999).

### **a. There Are Predominant Common Questions of Law and Fact.**

“The ultimate question in every case of this type [class actions] is whether ... the issues which may be jointly tried, when compared with those requiring separate adjudication, are so numerous and substantial that the maintenance of a class action would be advantageous to the judicial process and to the litigants.” *Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Superior Court*, 29 Cal. 4th 1096, 1104-05 (2003).

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant, as a matter of common corporate policy, practice, or procedure, failed to furnish wage statements showing the name of the legal entity that was the employer or its address. While Defendant denies that liability could be established on a class-wide basis and contend instead that liability would need to be conducted on an individualized basis, common questions predominate Plaintiffs’ theories of liability.

### **b. Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical of the Class Claims.**

A class representative’s claim must be “typical” but not necessarily identical to the claims of other class members; it is sufficient that the representative is similarly situated so that he or she will have the motive to litigate on behalf of the class. *Classen v. Weller*, 145 Cal. App. 3d 27, 45 (1983). Courts look to “whether the action is based on conduct which is not unique to the named Plaintiff” and whether other class members were injured by the same conduct. *Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.*, 976 F.2d 497, 508 (9th Cir. 1992). The purpose of the typicality requirement “is to assure that the interest of the named representative aligns with the interests of the class.” *Id.* at 508.

Plaintiff was employed by Defendant and alleges that he was subjected to the same payroll policies as all other Class Members. Specifically, like other members of the Class, Plaintiff alleges he was provided wage statements that showed “SVR – Sanitation,” without any address. Declaration of

Rodolfo Tellez (“Tellez Decl.”) ¶ 2. In sum, Plaintiff alleges he was subjected to the same policies and practices as other Class Members. Plaintiff’s claims thus are typical to those of Class Members.

**c. Plaintiff Adequately Represented the Class.**

The class representative, through qualified counsel, must be capable of “vigorously and tenaciously” protecting the interests of the class members. *Simons v. Horowitz*, 151 Cal. App. 3d 834, 846 (1984). Here, Plaintiff does not have any interests adverse to the Class, nor have any such issues been raised or presented. Plaintiff has taken all necessary steps to represent the interests of the Class, including providing information and documents to his counsel and reviewing pleadings in this case. Tellez Decl. ¶¶ 3-5. For such reasons, Plaintiff has adequately represented Class Members.

**B. Defendant’s Allegations and Position on Class Certification Support Approval.**

Defendant asserts that even assuming that a class could have been certified, Plaintiff would be unable to establish classwide liability. For example, with respect to wage statement liability, Defendant contended that (i) PAGA penalties would enable up to \$100 (not \$250) per violation, (ii) PAGA penalties in any event be subject to discretionary reductions, and (iii) liability under Section 226(e) would be subject to additional defenses requiring proof of injuries resulting from knowing and intentional violations. Based thereon, Defendant continues to maintain that it is not liable for the allegations made by Plaintiff.

**C. Risks, Expenses, and Complexity of Further Litigation Support Approval.**

Plaintiff believes that a class can be certified. However, Plaintiff also believes in the fairness of the settlement that is based on factoring in the uncertainty and risks involved in not prevailing on one or more of the causes of action or theories alleged in the operative Complaint, the possibility of non-certification, and the potential for appeals.

There is always a risk that the court will not grant certification of the class. As Defendant alleges that a class could not have been certified, there was at least a substantial risk that Plaintiff would not have obtained the total amount of damages alleged, and a substantial number of complex issues that would have necessitated significant expenditure of time and expenses. Therefore, the risks, expenses, and complexity of further litigation warrant granting of this motion.

**D. The Settlement Terms and Negotiation—as Well as the Class Member Response—  
All Support the Conclusion that the Settlement is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable.**

Without reiterating the details in the Preliminary Approval Motion showing that the Agreement (and the negotiation process that led up to it) is fair and adequate, Plaintiff highlights the following facts. The Agreement was the product of negotiation between highly able and experienced attorneys on both sides who possessed the relevant data and extensive legal research which they had carefully analyzed. Declaration of Larry W. Lee (“Lee Decl.”) ¶¶ 4-5.

Following notice to the Class, not a single request for exclusion or objection to the settlement was received. Admin Decl. ¶¶ 8-9. The Court may appropriately infer that the class action settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, given that not a single Class Member has submitted an objection. *See Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d 1268, 1291 (9th Cir. 1992). Indeed, the Class Member response suggests the preliminarily approval settlement should now be granted final approval.

**III. Well-Established Legal Principles Support Final Approval of the Settlement.**

On a motion for final approval of a class action settlement under Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and Rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court, a court’s inquiry is whether the settlement is “fair, adequate and reasonable.” *Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n*, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982). A settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and therefore merits final approval, when “the interests of the class are better served by the settlement than by further litigation.” *See Manual for Complex Litigation, Fourth* § 21.6 at 309 (Fed. Jud. Ctr., 4th ed. 2004) (“MCL”). The law favors settlement, particularly in class actions and other complex cases, where substantial resources can be conserved by avoiding the time, cost, and rigors of formal litigation. *See* 4 Alba Conte & Herbert B. Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* § 11.41 (4th ed. 2002); *Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d 1268, 1276 (9th Cir. 1992); *Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.*, 529 F.2d 943, 950 (9th Cir. 1976).

Although the Court possesses “broad discretion” in determining that a proposed class action settlement is fair, the Court’s role 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. *See Officers for Justice*, 688 F.2d at 625. Accordingly, the Court should give due regard to what is otherwise

1 a “private consensual agreement” between the parties. *Id.*; see also *Church v. Consolidated Freightways,*  
2 *Inc.*, 1993 WL 149840 (N.D. Cal. 1993); *In re Wash. Pub. Power Supply Sys. Sec. Litig.*, 720 F. Supp.  
3 1379 (D. Ariz. 1989), *aff’d sub nom.*; *City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d 1268; MCL § 21.6 at 309 (“The judicial  
4 role in reviewing a proposed settlement is critical, but limited to approving the proposed settlement,  
5 disapproving it, or imposing conditions on it. The judge cannot rewrite the agreement”).

6 As the Court of Appeal has cautioned:

7 It cannot be overemphasized that neither the trial court in approving the settlement nor  
8 this Court in reviewing that approval have the right or duty to reach any ultimate  
9 conclusions on the issues of fact and law which underlie the merits of the dispute. It is  
10 well settled that in the judicial consideration of proposed settlements, ‘the [trial] judge  
does not try out or attempt to decide the merits of the controversy,’ [citation] and the  
appellate court ‘need not and should not reach any dispositive conclusions on the  
admittedly unsettled legal issue.

11 *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.*, 85 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1146 (2000).

12 A court’s review and approval of a PAGA settlement is subject to a similar standard as that for  
13 class action settlement approval. A PAGA settlement must be fair, reasonable, and adequate in view  
14 of PAGA’s purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones, and to maximize  
15 enforcement of state labor laws. *Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.*, 72 Cal. App. 5th 56, 77 (2021).

16 **A. The Settlement is Presumed to Be Fair**

17 The Court should begin with the presumption that the settlement is fair and should be approved:

18 [A] presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached through arm’s-  
19 length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the  
20 court to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the  
percentage of objectors is small.

21 *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1802 (1996); accord, *Ellis v. Naval Air Rework*  
22 *Facility*, 87 F.R.D. 15, 18 (N.D. Cal. 1980); *In re Wash. Pub Power Supply*, 720 F. Supp. at 1387.

23 The settlement in the case at bar warrants approval and carries a presumption of fairness. As  
24 previously noted in the application for Preliminary Approval, this current settlement was negotiated at  
25 arm’s length. Lee Decl. ¶¶ 4-5. Class Counsel engaged in extensive factual investigation before settling,  
26 including the exchange of formal and informal discovery and class data enabling Class Counsel to  
27 evaluate the full extent of Defendant’s potential liability. *Id.* ¶ 4. Further, Class Counsel is highly  
28 experienced in this type of litigation. As shown in the supporting declarations, Class Counsel has

significant experience in class actions and employment wage and hour matters. *Id.* ¶¶ 6-8; Declaration of Simon L. Yang (“Yang Decl.”) ¶¶ 4-6.

**B. Two-Way Costs and Other Risks Inherent in Litigation Favor Final Approval.**

To assess the fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of a class action settlement, the Court also should weigh the immediacy and certainty of substantial settlement proceeds against the risks inherent in continued litigation. *See also In re General Motors Corp.*, 55 F.3d 768, 806 (3d Cir. 1995) (“present value of the damages plaintiffs would likely recover if successful, appropriately discounted for the risk of not prevailing, should be compared with the amount of the proposed settlement”); *Girsh v. Jepson*, 521 F.2d 153, 157 (3d Cir. 1975); *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.*, 485 F. Supp. 610, 616-17 (N.D. Cal. 1979).

If Plaintiff pursued this case without settlement and failed to prevail, Plaintiff would have been potentially responsible for Defendant’s costs. Likewise, any other current or former employees that bring individual claims also would face the uncertainty of prevailing and the possibility of paying costs to Defendant. For that reason, many of these current and former employees likely would not pursue claims. This lawsuit thus achieves a true benefit for the Class that they otherwise might not get or even seek as individuals. Here, given that a fair and reasonable settlement has been reached, neither Plaintiff nor any of the Class Members will be required to pay for Defendant’s litigation costs.

The risks of this case were weighed by Class Counsel and should be considered a significant factor by the Court in its determination of final approval. Class Counsel obtained a significant settlement for the Class that resulted in a fair recovery which at the same time provides for finality and no risk of costs by the Class Members or Class Representative.

The Agreement also affords the Class prompt, fair relief while avoiding significant legal and factual battles that otherwise may have prevented the Class from obtaining any recovery at all. While Class Counsel believe the Class Members’ claims are meritorious and can be successfully litigated, they are experienced and fully understand the inherent risks and uncertainty involved with such matters as the resolution of class certification, the outcome of a potential trial, and the outcome of any appeals that would inevitably follow should the Class prevail at trial. Class Counsel has also assessed the same risks in connection with the current settlement. Because the settlement provides immediate and substantial

1 relief, without the attendant risks and delay of continued litigation—not to mention the threat of  
2 litigation fees and costs—Class Counsel believe that the settlement warrants the Court’s final approval.

3 **C. The Complexity, Expense, and Likely Duration of Continued Litigation Against**  
4 **Defendant Favor Final Approval.**

5 Another factor considered by courts in approving a settlement is the complexity, expense, and  
6 likely duration of the litigation. *See Officers for Justice*, 688 F.2d at 625; *Girsh*, 521 F.2d at 157. In  
7 applying this factor, courts weigh the benefits of settlement against the expense and delay involved in  
8 achieving a favorable result at trial. *Young v. Katz*, 447 F.2d 431, 433-34 (5th Cir. 1971).

9 As noted above, continued litigation could have led to appeals on several issues. On the other  
10 hand, the settlement that was reached provides to all Class Members—regardless of their means—fair  
11 relief in a prompt and efficient manner. Were the Court to deny final approval, the Class Members  
12 would be left without a remedy as a practical matter and courts would have to address the issues  
13 presented here in a piecemeal, costly, and time-consuming manner. The settlement in this case is  
14 therefore consistent with the “overriding public interest in settling and quieting litigation” that is  
15 “particularly true in class action suits.” *See Van Bronkhorst*, 529 F.2d at 950; *see also 4 Newberg* §  
16 11.41. Here, litigation of this case through trial and appeals would require extended litigation.

17 **D. The Opinion of Experienced Counsel Favors Final Approval.**

18 Class Counsel supports the settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, as in the best interest of  
19 the Class Members as a whole, and fair, reasonable, and adequate in view of PAGA’s purposes. Lee  
20 Decl. ¶ 5; Yang Decl. ¶ 2. Similarly, counsel for Defendant is in favor of this settlement. The  
21 endorsement of qualified and well-informed counsel of a settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate is  
22 entitled to significant weight by the Court in its final approval determination. *See Officers for Justice*,  
23 688 F.2d at 625; *Ellis*, 87 F.R.D. at 18; *Boyd*, 485 F. Supp. at 617; *Linney v. Cellular Alaska P’ship*, 151  
24 F.3d 1234, 1242 (9th Cir. 1998).

25 **IV. The Proposed Payments and Procedures Should Be Approved.**

26 **A. The Proposed Procedure for Uncashed Settlement Checks Should Be Approved.**

27 As referenced in the Motion for Preliminary Approval, to the extent any uncashed settlement  
28 funds remain after 180 days, the Parties have agreed that the funds (upon the expiration date) would

1 escheat to the State Controller Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Participating Class Member.  
2 None of the settlement funds will revert to Defendant or be diverted to a *cy pres* recipient.

3 **B. The Requested Class Representative Service Award Should Be Approved.**

4 Class Representative Rodolfo Tellez requests a service award of \$5,000.00. Plaintiff met with  
5 Class Counsel to provide substantive information regarding Defendant's practices. Tellez Decl. ¶ 3.  
6 Plaintiff provided invaluable information, evidence, and documents that resulted in this settlement.

7 In addition to the invaluable services that Plaintiff provided and time Plaintiff devoted to the  
8 litigation on behalf of the Class, Tellez Decl. ¶ 3, Plaintiff took significant risks, both professionally and  
9 monetarily, in acting as Class Representative to seek benefits for the Class. Because the claims Plaintiff  
10 alleged involved the payment of costs to the prevailing party, Plaintiff could have possibly faced paying  
11 the costs of Defendant had he not prevailed in this action. Moreover, Plaintiff understood that an  
12 individual case would have resolved much faster than a class action and involved much less financial  
13 risk than a class action. Plaintiff nonetheless agreed to pursue this case on behalf of the Class. *Id.* ¶ 8.

14 Also, given that future employers are much less likely to hire individuals who have filed  
15 employment-related lawsuits, particularly cases of this nature, the Class Representative also faces  
16 significant risk in not being able to find suitable employment, all as a result of filing of this case against  
17 Defendant. Plaintiff took these risks upon himself to the benefit of the Class. Tellez Decl. ¶ 8. Class  
18 Members did not have to file individual lawsuits and bear the risks of payment of costs if they did not  
19 prevail, nor did they have to face the potential for retaliation and not getting future employment had they  
20 filed a lawsuit which is a public record. These are significant benefits that weigh in favor of granting the  
21 requested award. Moreover, this litigation has resulted in a significantly valuable benefit to the Class,  
22 and Plaintiff took on substantial risks in helping to get this financial benefit to the Class. As such, the  
23 award should be granted to Plaintiff for his commitment, dedication, and risks taken for this litigation.

24 Equally important, Plaintiff provided a general release and waiver of the protections of Civil  
25 Code section 1542. Tellez Decl. ¶ 9. This is a more extensive release than that provided by the Class at  
26 large and also supports the request for the award.<sup>3</sup>

27  
28 <sup>3</sup> Courts have routinely granted approval of settlements containing such incentive awards. *See Van*  
*Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*, 901 F. Supp. 294, 299-300 (N.D. Cal. 1995) (incentive award of

1           **C.       The Requested Attorneys’ Fees Should Be Approved.**

2                   **1.       The Percentage of the Fund Method Supports the Requested Fees.**

3           Class Counsel seeks a fee award calculated at 33⅓% of the total value of the settlement for the  
4 successful prosecution and resolution of this action. California state and federal courts have recognized  
5 that an appropriate method for determining award of attorneys’ fees is based on a percentage of the total  
6 value of benefits to class members by the settlement. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal. App. 4th  
7 224, 254 (2001); *Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal. 3d 25, 34 (1977) ; *Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert*, 444 U.S. 472,  
8 478 (1980); *Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.*, 557 F.2d 759, 769 (9th Cir. 1997). The purpose of this  
9 equitable doctrine is to avoid unjust enrichment to the Class and to “spread litigation costs  
10 proportionally among all the beneficiaries so that the active beneficiary does not bear the entire burden  
11 alone.” *Vincent*, 557 F.2d at 769.

12           The California Supreme Court has provided guidance regarding the award of attorneys’ fees in  
13 wage and hour class action settlements. Under California law, the award of attorneys’ fees in common  
14 fund wage and hour class action settlements should start with the percentage method. *See Laffitte v.*  
15 *Robert Half Int’l*, 1 Cal. 5th 480, 503 (2016) (“We join the overwhelming majority of federal and state  
16 courts in holding that when class action litigation establishes a monetary fund for the benefit of the class  
17 members, and the trial court in its equitable powers awards class counsel a fee out of that fund, the court  
18 may determine the amount of a reasonable fee by choosing an appropriate percentage of the fund  
19 created”). Under the percentage of the fund method, a court’s objective remains to “mimic the market”  
20 in fixing a reasonable fee. *See Gaskill v. Gordon*, 160 F.3d 361, 363 (7th Cir. 1998) (Posner, J.) (“When  
21 a fee is set by a court rather than by contract, the object is to set it at a level that will approximate what  
22 the market will set . . . . The judge, in other words, is trying to mimic the market in legal services.”).

23           First, the fee award representing 33⅓% of the fund clearly falls within that range and is  
24 consistent with other rulings of other courts and comprehensive surveys of class action settlements and

25 \$50,000); *In re Dun & Bradstreet Credit Servs. Customer Litig.*, 130 F.R.D. 366, 374 (S.D. Ohio 1990)  
26 (two incentive awards of \$55,000, and three incentive awards of \$35,000); *Brotherton v. Cleveland*, 141  
27 F. Supp. 2d 907, 913-14 (S.D. Ohio 2001) (granting a \$50,000 incentive award); *Enter. Energy Corp. v.*  
28 *Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.*, 137 F.R.D. 240, 251-52 (S.D. Ohio 1991) (\$50,000 awarded to each  
class representative); *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476, at \*51-52 (N.D. Cal. Jan.  
27, 2007) (awarding \$25,000 incentive award in FLSA overtime wages class action); *Cook v. Niedert*,  
142 F.3d 1004, 1016 (7th Cir. 1998) (affirming \$25,000 incentive award to class representative).

1 fee awards. Attorneys' fees awards of 35% of the fund are within the expected range in the "market in  
2 legal services. See Fitzpatrick, *An Empirical Study of Class Action Settlements and Their Fee Award*, 7  
3 J. Empirical Leg. Stud. 811, 833 (2010) (analyzing 444 cases between 2006-2007 and concluding that  
4 "[m]ost fee awards were between 25 percent and 35 percent").<sup>4</sup>

5 Second, the results delivered by Class Counsel also support the requested percentage of the fund.  
6 Here, Plaintiff and his counsel secured a \$92,110.00 settlement and zero Class Members chose to opt  
7 out. Zero chose to object.

8 Third, "the response of the class members to attorneys' fee notice, though not decisive, is  
9 relevant to the ... reasonable determination" regarding fees. *Swedish Hospital v. Shalala*, 1 F.3d 1261,  
10 1272 (D.C. Cir. 1993). A positive response rate tends to suggest that the court's "approximation of the  
11 market" for fees is well supported. *Id.* at 1269. Here, the Class Notice specifically notified the Class that  
12 Class Counsel would be seeking \$30,703.33 in attorneys' fees. Again, there were no objections.

13 Fourth, it is recognized that one of the primary factors justifying an enhanced attorney's fees  
14 reward is the attendant risks inherent in the litigation. As observed in *City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.*:

15 No one expects a lawyer whose compensation is contingent upon his success to charge, when  
16 successful, as little as he would charge a client who had agreed to pay for his services, regardless  
17 of success. Nor, particularly in complicated cases producing large recoveries, is it just to make a  
18 fee depend solely on the reasonable amount of time expended.

19 495 F.2d 448, 470 (2d Cir. 1974). Here, it is clear that a settlement fund of \$92,110.00 has been created.  
20 For Class Counsel, the fees here were wholly contingent in nature and the case presented far more risk  
21 than the usual contingent fee case. Among the risks was the cost inherent in class action litigation, as  
22 well as a long battle with a corporate Defendant who had retained a premier and highly experienced  
23 defense firm. For such reasons, Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees in the amount of \$30,703.33  
24 is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

25 <sup>4</sup> Such a fee award mimics the market and "is supported by the fact that typical contingency fee  
26 agreements provide that class counsel will recover 33% if the case is resolved before trial and 40% if the  
27 case is tried." *Fernandez v. Victoria Secret Stores LLC*, 2008 WL 8150856, at \*16 n.59 (C.D. Cal. July  
28 21, 2008) (citing Brickman, *Effective Hourly Rates of Contingency-Fee Lawyers: Competing Data and  
Non-Competitive Fees* (Fall 2003) 81 Wash U. L. Q. 653, 659 n. 11). Indeed, a fee award of 35% of the  
fund is consistent with "empirical studies [that] show that ... fee awards in class actions average around  
one-third of the recovery." *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal. App. 4th 43, 66 n.11 (2008).

1                               **2.       The Lodestar Cross-Check Supports the Requested Fees.**

2               The amount requested is reasonable for an additional reason. While the primary method  
3 employed to determine fees is the percentage method, courts have discretion to use the lodestar method  
4 to “cross-check” the amount of fees calculated by way of percentage. The *Laffitte* court emphasized,  
5 however, that “the lodestar calculation, when used in this manner, does not override the trial court’s  
6 primary determination of the fee as a percentage of the common fund and thus does not impose an  
7 absolute maximum or minimum on the potential fee award.” *Laffitte*, 1 Cal. 5th at 505 (emphasis  
8 added); *In re Rite Aid Corp. Secs. Litig.*, 396 F.3d 294, 306-307 (3d Cir. 2005) (“[The lodestar cross-  
9 check does not trump the primary reliance on the percentage of common fund method”).

10              Courts find reasonable multipliers in a lodestar cross-check can “range from 2 to 4 or even  
11 higher.” *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 224, 255 (2001).<sup>5</sup> Indeed, the intermediate  
12 court in *Laffitte*—after finding that “2 to 4” is a reasonable range for multipliers on a cross-check—  
13 affirmed a 2.13 multiplier. *Laffitte*, 231 Cal. App. 4th at 881-82.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, the Ninth Circuit has cited  
14 with approval a comprehensive study of fees awarded by the percentage method showing that the  
15 majority of multipliers awarded are “in the 1.5-3.0” range. *See Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d  
16 1043, 1051 (9th Cir. 2002) (affirming a multiplier of 3.65 in an employment class action case and  
17 analyzing the multiplier awarded in over 30 cases).<sup>7</sup>

18              With respect to Class Counsel’s lodestar, at least 61.9 hours were expended by just one of the  
19 three Class Counsel litigating this case through preliminary approval only. Yang Decl. ¶ 8, Ex. A.  
20 Courts are quite liberal in the evidence required to prove an attorney’s hours. Detailed time records are

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 <sup>5</sup> *Accord Chavez*, 162 Cal. App. 4th at 60 (applying a 2.5 multiplier on a lodestar cross-check); *Sutter*  
23 *Health Uninsured Pricing Cases*, 171 Cal. App. 4th 495, 512 (2009) (applying a 2.52 multiplier on a  
cross-check); *City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders*, 203 Cal. App. 3d 78 (1988) (affirming a 2.34  
multiplier without remand).

24 <sup>6</sup> The intermediate court opinion was affirmed in full upon review by the California Supreme Court.

25 <sup>7</sup> Federal district courts applying California law have likewise routinely approved cross-check  
26 multipliers between 2.0 and 3.0 in employment cases. *See, e.g., Willner v. Manpower Inc.*, 2015 WL  
27 3863625, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. June 22, 2015) (affirming a 2.10 multiplier on settlement of California Labor  
Code violations); *Dyer v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 303 F.R.D. 326, 334 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (approving  
attorneys’ fees that resulted in lodestar multiplier of 2.83); *Hopkins v. Stryker Sales Corp.*, 2013 WL  
28 496358, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013) (approving a multiplier of 2.76 in settlement of Labor Code  
violations). Other courts have found even higher multipliers to be reasonable by comparison to other  
cases. *See Craft v. County of San Bernardino*, 624 F. Supp. 2d 1113, 1125-26 (C.D. Cal. 2008)  
(approving a 5.2 multiplier after surveying a large body of cases affirming a higher multiplier).

1 not required; an attorney's testimony alone may suffice: "Testimony of an attorney as to the number of  
2 hours worked on a particular case is sufficient evidence to support an award of attorney fees, even in the  
3 absence of detailed time records." *Martino v. Denevi*, 182 Cal. App. 3d 553, 559 (1986).

4 Reasonable hours include, in addition to time spent during litigation, the time spent before the  
5 action is filed, including time spent interviewing the clients, investigating the facts and the law, and  
6 preparing the initial pleadings. *New York Gaslight Club, Inc. v. Carey*, 447 U.S. 54, 62 (1980). The fee  
7 award should also include fees incurred to establish and defend the attorneys' fee claim. *Serrano v.*  
8 *Unruh*, 32 Cal. 3d 621, 639 (1982). The hours for which Plaintiff's Counsel seeks compensation involve  
9 only these types of tasks. Thus, the number of hours for which fees are sought is reasonable.

10 A reasonable hourly rate is the prevailing rate charged by attorneys of similar skill and  
11 experience in the relevant community. *PLCM Group, Inc. v. Drexler*, 22 Cal. 4th 1084, 1095 (2000).  
12 The court may consider other factors when determining a reasonable hourly rate, *e.g.*, the attorney's skill  
13 and experience, the nature of the work performed, the relevant area of expertise and the attorney's  
14 customary billing rates. *Flannery v. California Highway Patrol*, 61 Cal. App. 4th 629, 632-33 (1998).

15 Mr. Yang's hourly rate is \$725. Yang Decl. ¶ 7. Plaintiff's Counsel's skill and experience justify  
16 the requested rate. As shown in the supporting declarations, Plaintiff's Counsel has significant  
17 experience in the area of employment and wage and hour class and representative actions. Plaintiff's  
18 Counsel's practices focus on representing employees in employment matters, particularly wage and hour  
19 cases on a contingency basis. Lee Decl. ¶¶ 6-8; Yang Decl. ¶¶ 4-6.

20 Based on the rates and 61.9 hours for just one of the three Class Counsel through preliminary  
21 approval, the lodestar through the finalization of this settlement will be approximately \$44,877.50. Yang  
22 Decl. ¶ 8. The lodestar exceeds the requested attorneys' fees and results in a negative multiplier of  
23 approximately 0.68. Again, the requested fees are reasonable and fair, based on the factors described  
24 above. The cross-check also supports the requested fees.

25 **D. The Court Should Approve the Request for Reimbursement of Costs.**

26 The request for reimbursement of costs, in the amount of \$5,909.03 is fair and reasonable. As set  
27 forth in Plaintiff's counsel's declaration, the costs were all directly incurred in the prosecution of this  
28 action. Lee Decl. ¶ 9, Ex. A. As such, this request should be approved.

1           **E.     The Administrator’s Fees and Costs Should Be Approved.**

2           Pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, the fees and costs of the Administrator, Phoenix  
3 Administrators, are to be paid out of the class settlement funds. As shown in the Declaration of Kevin  
4 Lee, the settlement administration fees expended in this matter amount to a total of \$4,000.00, which is  
5 less than the amount that was agreed upon by the Parties. Admin Decl. ¶ 15. For such reasons, it is  
6 requested that the Administrator’s fees be approved.

7           **V.     Notice to the LWDA Has Been Provided.**

8           On September 20, 2022, Plaintiff uploaded the Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary  
9 Approval of Class Action Settlement to the LWDA’s website. Lee Decl. ¶ 10, Ex. B. Concurrent with  
10 the filing of this motion, Plaintiff also has uploaded the final approval motion to the LWDA. *Id.*

11                           **CONCLUSION**

12           Plaintiff respectfully submits that the standards for final approval have been met and the terms of  
13 the Agreement are fair, adequate, and reasonable. Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the  
14 Court enter an Order in the form proposed and submitted.

15 DATED: February 15, 2023

DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.

16 By: \_\_\_\_\_

Simon L. Yang

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

STATE OF CALIFORNIA ]  
 ]ss.  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ]

On February 16, 2023, I served the following document(s) described as:

- 1. PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**
- 2. DECLARATION OF LARRY W. LEE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**
- 3. DECLARATION OF SIMON L. YANG IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**
- 4. [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT**
- 5. DECLARATION OF KEVIN LEE WITH RESPECT TO NOTICE AND SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION**
- 6. DECLARATION OF RODOLFO TELLEZ IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Justin T. Campagne  
[jcampagne@campagnelaw.com](mailto:jcampagne@campagnelaw.com)  
 Campagne & Campagne  
 1685 North Helm Avenue  
 Fresno, California 93727  
*Attorneys for Defendant Sun Valley Raisins, Inc.*

    X     BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: by personally sending a true and correct copy of the above-described document(s) to the party(ies) listed above or on the attached mailing list from the e-mail server diversitylaw.com, to the electronic transmission address of the recipient(s) indicated above or on the attached mailing list. I certify that said electronic transmission was completed and that all pages were received by the party(ies) identified herein or on the attached mailing list.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
2 above is true and correct. Executed on February 16, 2023, at Los Angeles, California.

3   
4 \_\_\_\_\_  
Erika Mejia