

COHELAN KHOURY & SINGER

Michael D. Singer (SBN 115301)

msinger@ckslaw.com

Marta Manus (SBN 260132)

mmanus@ckslaw.com

605 C Street, Suite 200

San Diego, California 92101

Tel. (619) 595-3001 / Fax (619) 595-3000

MESRIANI LAW GROUP, APLC

Rodney Mesriani (SBN 184875)

rodney@mesriani.com

510 Arizona Avenue

Santa Monica, California 90401

Tel. (310) 826-6300 / Fax (310) 820-1258

Attorneys for Plaintiffs CHRISTOPHER ORNELAS, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, and CHRISTOPHER NIETO, on behalf of himself and all others aggrieved

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CHRISTOPHER ORNELAS, on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated and
CHRISTOPHER NIETO, on behalf of
himself and all others aggrieved,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

TEKSYSTEMS, INC., a Maryland
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 19STCV39944

ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO:

The Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl
Department 12

CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**DECLARATION OF MARTA MANUS IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER
GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
AND PAGA ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Hearing Set By March 27, 2024 Order

Date: August 29, 2024

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Dept: SS12

Judge: Carolyn B. Kuhl

Complaint filed: November 6, 2019

Trial date: Not set

1 I, Marta Manus, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an associate with the law firm of Cohelan Khoury & Singer, co-counsel of
3 record for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class. I submit this Declaration in Support of Plaintiffs'
4 Motion for Order Granting Final Approval of Class and PAGA Action Settlement. The
5 following facts are within my personal knowledge and if called to testify I could and would
6 competently testify to them.

7 2. I am a 2008 California Western School of Law graduate and was admitted to the
8 California State Bar in December 2008. I am admitted to practice in all state courts in California
9 and in the all federal courts in California. Since my admission to the California State Bar, I have
10 been litigating employment class actions.

11 3. In 1981, Timothy D. Cohelan and Isam C. Khoury formed Cohelan & Khoury, a
12 Partnership of Professional Law Corporations, and within a few years began to focus on class
13 actions. Managing Partner Michael D. Singer joined Cohelan & Khoury in 2000, and in 2009,
14 Cohelan & Khoury became Cohelan Khoury & Singer. Our firm represents plaintiffs in
15 complex, class and representative action litigation, including wage and hour, labor and
16 employment, antitrust, consumer protection, construction defect and other public interest type
17 class and representative actions.

18 4. Michael D. Singer, Managing Partner, was admitted as a fellow to the College of
19 Labor and Employment Attorneys in 2020, and was named to the Daily Journal 2012, 2013, and
20 2018 list of Top California Labor and Employment Attorneys. He, along with Isam Khoury, a
21 founding Partner of the firm, and Partner Diana M. Khoury, have also been selected by their
22 peers based on ethics, experience and reputation as Super Lawyers in Civil Litigation by the
23 Southern California Super Lawyers Magazine for the years 2012 through the present.

24 5. Cohelan Khoury & Singer has been certified by the State Bar of California to
25 provide the Mandatory Continuing Legal Education activity titled "Litigating California Class
26 Actions" and has conducted MCLE certified seminars on this topic. Senior Partner, Timothy D.
27 Cohelan, is the author of Cohelan on California Class Actions (1997-2024, updated annually),
28 part of Thomson Reuters Expert Series. Mr. Singer is a contributing author on the CEB

publication California Wage and Hour Law: Compliance and Litigation (2010-2024, updated annually), in which he wrote the opening chapter overview on California Wage and Hour laws, including the public policy underpinnings for those laws, and the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) Claim chapter. He is also a contributing author to the CEB Practitioner (2020), including guidelines for oral argument and forms for PAGA litigation. Mr. Singer served as a columnist for the California State Bar, Litigation Section on wage and hour litigation and have contributed articles on wage and hour and class action issues through the years to numerous California publications.

6. Isam C. Khoury, Founding Partner, is a 1970 graduate of the University of California at San Diego and received a law degree from Hastings School of Law in 1973. Mr. Khoury is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted in 1974, the San Diego County Bar Association, Consumer Attorneys of San Diego and Consumer Attorneys of California. He has successfully litigated numerous complex civil matters to verdict, jury and non-jury. His main areas of practice include civil tort litigation, personal injury, business torts, antitrust and class action cases. In recent years, Mr. Khoury has emphasized wage and hour class action matters having assisted in the litigation to judgement or settlement of over 300 wage and hour class actions. He has been approved as a CLE lecturer and has participated in seminars on class action wage and hour issues, the complexities of mediation, and the procedural requirements involved in class action settlements.

7. Prior to COVID, Mr. Singer typically lectured several times per year for continuing education courses on wage and hour and class action issues at events in San Diego, Orange County, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. For over twelve years, he served as wage and hour amicus co-chair and liaison for the California Employment Lawyers Association, drafting, reviewing, and coordinating amicus filings on wage and hour issues in the California Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal.

8. Mr. Singer has been engaged in the practice of labor and employment law since 2000, handling well over 300 wage and hour class and PAGA actions and several individual labor cases. He has litigated several types of employment actions, including complex ERISA

1 employee welfare benefit plan cases, as well as wage and hour class actions before Federal and
2 State Courts in California. In 2014, Mr. Singer, and former Partner J. Jason Hill, tried a wage
3 and hour class action involving claims for illegally deducted wages and unreimbursed expenses
4 in the matter of *Dilts v Penske Logistics LLC, Inc.* Mr. Singer successfully appealed the trial
5 court ruling in *Dilts* finding state laws preempted by the FAAAA for truck drivers.

6 9. Mr. Singer has participated in over 50 appellate cases and argued writs and
7 appeals before several California District Courts of Appeal, successfully arguing the landmark
8 *Vaquero* appeal for plaintiffs in the Second District Court of Appeal, *Vaquero v. Stoneledge*
9 *Furniture, LLC* (2017) 9 Cal.App5th 98 (requiring employers separately pay commission sales
10 employees for rest periods). As lead counsel in *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*
11 [formerly reported at (2008) 165 Cal.App.4th 25], he argued before the Fourth District Court of
12 Appeal in May 2008 on transfer from the California Supreme Court, and co-authored the
13 briefing in the successful Supreme Court appeal. He has also argued federal appeals in the
14 Second, Third, and Ninth Circuit Courts of Appeals. In addition, he has drafted numerous
15 appellate briefs as the appellant, respondent, or amicus curiae in various employment class and
16 individual actions. Our firm has successfully tried multiple class cases, obtained appellate
17 reversals of class certification denials (*Hicks v. Kaufman and Broad*, (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th
18 908), and certified multiple consumer and wage and hour class actions.

19 10. Mr. Singer has drafted amicus letters on a range of issues, primarily for the
20 California Employment Lawyers Association (CELA), supporting publication or depublication
21 of Court of Appeal decisions. He has been primarily responsible for dozens of wage and hour
22 class actions, from drafting the complaint, through discovery, dispositive motions, settlement,
23 and settlement approval. Mr. Singer has also acted as lead appellate counsel in the following
24 class action and PAGA action cases: *Maldonado, et al. v. Fast Auto Loans, Inc. dba RPM*
25 *Lenders* (2021) 60 Cal. App. 5th 710 (2021); *Mondragon v. Santa Ana Healthcare & Wellness*
26 *Ctr., LP* (September 29, 2021, B307872) [nonpub. opn.]

27 11. Former Associate J. Jason Hill is a 1992 graduate of the University of Illinois at
28 Urbana-Champaign and holds a B.A. in Philosophy, Political Science and Communications. In

1 1995, he received his J.D. degree from California Western School of Law, where he was a
2 member of the Law Review an International Law Journal, as well as editor of the
3 Telecommunications Law Forum. Throughout his tenure at Cohelan Khoury & Singer, Mr. Hill
4 focused solely on class and representative employment and consumer actions. Prior to joining
5 Cohelan Khoury & Singer, he represented large institutional clients in a variety of civil
6 litigation settings, including insurance coverage, employment law, health care law, general and
7 professional liability, as well as, premises and product liability claims. Mr. Hill is also an
8 accomplished appellate practitioner and has briefed and/or argued over 40 matters in both state
9 and federal courts of appeal, yielding several published decisions on a range of legal issues.

10 12. As a part of our overall firm philosophy lawyers perform community service and
11 pro bono work. Firm volunteer work includes service through the Legal Aid at Work, San
12 Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program, the San Diego County Bar Foundation, and Consumer
13 Attorneys of San Diego. Mr. Singer has served on the Legal Aid at Work Board of Directors
14 since 2010. Mr. Cohelan served as the Chair of the San Diego Volunteer Lawyers Program from
15 2015-2018, and currently sits on the Board as past Chair. He completed 24 years of volunteer
16 judicial service as a Judge Pro Tem of the San Diego Superior Court. Partner Diana M. Khoury
17 has been a member of the San Diego County Bar Association, Consumer Attorneys of San
18 Diego, and Consumer Attorneys of California, serving and chairing various committees through
19 the years for these organizations. Partner Maggie Realin has volunteered at the Legal Aid
20 Society of San Diego where she advised clients on preparing and filing civil restraining orders
21 and answers to unlawful detainer, for which she was awarded a Wiley B. Manuel Award for Pro
22 Bono Legal Services in 2010. Partner Jeff Geraci is a past recipient of the Wiley W. Manuel
23 Award for Pro Bono Service. Our firm's pro bono victories include a settlement which prohibits
24 the City of San Diego from targeting homeless people for illegal lodging tickets under Penal
25 Code Section 467(j). (*Spencer v. City of San Diego*, USDC Case No 04CV-2314 BEN (WMC).)
26 The *Spencer* settlement had the effect of increasing the number of available shelter beds in San
27 Diego.

28 ///

13. Cohelan Khoury & Singer has been certified Class Counsel in the following contested proceedings: *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield, et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 00700810; *Andino v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG11580548; *Arellano, et al. v. Container Connection of Southern California, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC500675; *BANK OF AMERICA WAGE AND HOUR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LITIGATION*, United States District Court, District of Kansas MDL Case No. 2138 (FLSA Condition Certification); *Czuchaj v. Conair Corporation*, United States District Court, Southern District of California Case No. 13CV1901; *Dilts, et al. v. Penske Logistics, L.L.C., et al.*, United States District Court, Southern District of California Case No. 08CV0318; *Englert, et al. v. AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., et al.*, Circuit Court of the Second Circuit, State of Hawaii Case No. 02-1-0074; *Evans v. Washington Mutual Bank*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 02CC15415; *Filion v. Ethan Allen Retail Inc.*, United States District Court, Southern District of California Case No. 05CV2340; *Gerard v. Les Schwab Tire Centers of California, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 2007-30000003; *Grana, et al. v. PICO Enterprises, Inc. dba Phyle Inventory Control Specialist and PICS L.A.S.C.* Case No. BC472891; *Gutierrez v. Save Mart Supermarkets* San Mateo County Superior Case No. CIV530955; *Wilcox v Albertsons*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. GIC833922; *Gonzalez, et al. v. Freedom Communications, Inc. d/b/a The Orange County Register*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 03CC08756; *Graham, et al. v. Overland Solutions, Inc.*, United States District Court, Southern District of California Case No. 10CV0672 (FLSA Conditional Certification); *Hicks v. Kaufman and Broad Home Corp.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. B198414; *Hohnbaum, et al. v. Brinker Restaurant Corporation, et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. GIC834348; *KEMP, et al. v. CSEA, et al.*, Circuit Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawaii Case No. 98-3815-08; *LIBERTY MUTUAL OVERTIME CASES*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. JCCP 4234; *Mitchell, et al. v. Acosta, Inc., dba Acosta Sales and Marketing Company*, United States District Court, Central District of California Case No.11CV07196 (FLSA Conditional Certification); *Santana v. Rady Children's Hospital-San Diego*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No.

37-2014-00022411; *Schaffer v. Rady Children's Hospital-San Diego*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 337-2015-00022978; *Schneider, et al. v. Catholic Healthcare West*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case No. CGC-10-506243; *Salucci v. Amada Senior Care, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 37-2015-00778081; *Smith v. California Pizza Kitchen*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2008-00083992; STEROID HORMONE PRODUCT CASES, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. JCCP 4363; *Stevenson Aibangbee v. Victoria Apartments, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC299498; *Swift v. Liebert Corp.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 00CC04588; *Sylvia, et al. v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Co Case No. 03CC05747; *Vaquero v. Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc., et al.*, United States District Court, Central District of California Case No. 12CV8590; *Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC522676; *Vazquez v. Kraft Heinz Foods Company*, United States District Court, Southern District of California Case No. 16-CV-02749; *Watson v. Raytheon Company*, United States District Court, Southern District of California Case No. 10CV0634; and *Weigle v. FedEx Ground Package System, Inc.*, United States District Court, Southern District of California Case No. 06CV1330, among others.

14. As Class and PAGA Representative Counsel, Cohelan Khoury & Singer has actively commenced, prosecuted and concluded over 300 state and federal class and representative actions.

15. Plaintiffs Christopher Ornelas and Christopher Nieto ("Plaintiffs") seek final approval of a \$179,000 non-reversionary wage and hour class and Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") settlement for a putative class of 25 non-exempt California employees of Defendant TEKsystems, Inc. ("TEKsystems" or "Defendant") employed as security system installers at any time during the period from November 6, 2015 through July 20, 2023 (the "Class Period") and 328 aggrieved employees employed by TEKsystems from July 23, 2020 through July 20, 2023 ("PAGA Period").

16. Support for the Settlement is strong. There are no objections, and with zero Class Members requesting exclusion, a participation rate of 100%. There is one dispute which is

1 under investigation, the results of which will be provide to the Court prior to the final approval
2 hearing. The 25 Participating Class Members can expect to receive an average estimated
3 payment of \$714, and highest payment of \$2,482.

4 17. The 328 Aggrieved Employees can expect to receive an average estimated
5 payment of \$57, and highest payment of \$296.

6 18. Class Representative Christopher Ornelas is estimated to receive \$270 and Class
7 Representative Christopher Nieto is estimated to receive \$100.

8 19. Defendant TEKsystems is a staffing and recruitment company that provided
9 services to meet its clients' needs. Among Defendant's clients are various residential and
10 commercial security companies.

11 20. Plaintiff Christopher Ornelas worked for TEKsystems in California as an hourly
12 non-exempt security system installer until approximately July 2016. Plaintiff Christopher Nieto
13 worked for TEKsystems in California as an hourly non-exempt security system installer from
14 May 2015 to May 2018 and from May 2019 to October 2021.

15 21. The proposed Class is comprised of 25 individuals employed by Defendant as
16 hourly paid, non-exempt "security system installers" in California at any time during the Class
17 Period, and who signed an arbitration agreement with Defendant. The Class Members worked a
18 combined 2,379 workweeks during the Class Period.

19 22. Aggrieved Employees were employed by Defendant during the PAGA Period.
20 There are 328 Aggrieved Employees that worked 9,892 Pay Periods during the PAGA Period.

21 23. On November 6, 2019, Plaintiff Christopher Ornelas commenced this action by
22 filing a Class Action Complaint in Los Angeles Superior alleging a cause of action for violation
23 of the UCL predicated on violations of the California Labor Code. On July 23, 2021, Plaintiff
24 Ornelas filed a First Amended Complaint adding Christopher Nieto as a named plaintiff and
25 alleging causes of action against TEKsystems for civil penalties under the PAGA for violations
26 of the California Labor Code.

27 24. The Court has not granted class certification. However, on May 10, 2021, the
28 Court granted TEKsystems's Motion to Deny Class Certification with respect to non-exempt

1 “security system installers” who were employed by TEKsystems at any time within the State of
2 California since November 6, 2015 and who signed an arbitration agreement with Defendant.

3 25. To prepare for mediation, Plaintiffs requested, and Defendant produced, key data
4 that included: (1) total number of putative class members; (2) aggregate number of workweeks
5 worked by putative class members through the date of mediation; (3) average hourly rate of
6 pay; (4) and the amount of reimbursements paid by Defendant to putative class members. In
7 addition, Defendant produced excel spreadsheet data containing Plaintiff Ornelas’s time records
8 (through Pay Period ending July 31, 2016).

9 26. After receipt of the data and an analysis of the information produced by,
10 Plaintiffs’ Counsel retained the services of a damages’ consultant to review the information and
11 data to assess violation rates for unpaid or underpaid expense reimbursements for tools,
12 mileage, and cell phone expenses, unpaid or underpaid wages, including overtime wages for all
13 hours worked including travel time between work appointments and hours worked taking
14 inventory, and PAGA civil penalties, and to extrapolate the damages to the putative Class.

15 27. On February 2, 2021, the Parties attended mediation with Honorable Wynne
16 Carvill (Ret.), an experienced and respected wage and hour mediator who was a presiding judge
17 in the Alameda County Superior Court from 2003 – 2019, serving in the Complex Litigation
18 division from 2012 – 2015. The Parties engaged in a day of serious, informed and lengthy
19 arms’-length negotiations, but were unable to reach a settlement at the mediation. Thereafter,
20 the Parties continued their settlement efforts and engaged in extensive post-mediation
21 settlement negotiations, which resulted in a Settlement in principle and a memorandum of
22 understanding executed in July of 2023. The Parties continued to negotiate all necessary terms
23 and entered the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice,
24 (“Agreement”), preliminary approved by the Court on March 27, 2024.

25 28. The Parties have agreed the Action be settled for the Gross Settlement Amount
26 of \$179,000.00 (“GSA”) which, subject to Court approval, includes: (a) attorneys’ fees of
27 \$59,660.70 (one-third of the GSA) to compensate Class Counsel for work performed and
28 remaining to be performed in securing final Court approval; (b) Class Counsel’s litigation

1 expenses of up to \$9,500.00; (c) Service Payments of \$5,000.00 each to Plaintiffs Christopher
2 Ornelas and Christopher Nieto in consideration of their initiation and prosecution of the action,
3 work performed, and risks undertaken for the payment of costs in the event the case was
4 unsuccessful, and benefits conferred on absent Class Members; (d) PAGA Payment of
5 \$75,000.00 of which \$56,250.00 (75%) will be paid to the LWDA, and \$18,750.00 (25%) will
6 be distributed to Aggrieved Employees; and (e) actual Administration expenses to ILYM of
7 \$7,000.00. In addition to the GSA, Defendant will pay the Employer Tax Obligations.

8 29. Plaintiffs have given gave written consent to apportion fees between Class
9 Counsel as follows: 60% to Cohelan Khoury & Singer, and 40% to Mesriani Law Group,
10 APLC.

11 30. After approved deductions, the estimated \$17,839.30 Net Settlement Amount
12 (“NSA”) will be distributed pro rata to Participating Class Members by dividing the number of
13 weeks each Class member worked during the Class Period by the number of Work Weeks all
14 Class Members worked during the Class Period and multiplying that number by the Net
15 Settlement Amount.

16 31. Participating Class Members will receive an estimated \$7.50 for each Workweek
17 worked during the Class Period (\$17,839.30 GSA / 2,379 Workweeks), and will receive average
18 estimated payments of \$714, and highest payment of \$2,482. (Rounded to nearest dollar).

19 32. Aggrieved Employees will divide the 25% (\$18,750.00) PAGA payment based
20 on the number of pay period worked in the PAGA Period in relation to the total number of pay
21 period worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period. Aggrieved Employees
22 will receive an estimated \$1.90 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period (\$18,750 /
23 9,892 pay periods), with an average payment of \$57, and highest payment of \$296. (Rounded to
24 nearest dollar).

25 33. Twenty percent (20%) of each Participating Class Member’s Individual Class
26 Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the “Wage Portion”). The Wage
27 Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form. Eighty
28 percent (80%) of each Participating Class Member’s Individual Class Payment will be allocated

1 to settlement of claims for penalties (the “Non-Wage Portion”). The Non-Wage Portions are not
2 subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. The Individual PAGA
3 Payments to Aggrieved Employees will be apportioned as one-hundred percent (100%)
4 penalties and reported on IRS 1099 Forms.

5 34. Settlement Payment checks uncashed 180 days after the date of issuance will be
6 transmitted to the State of California, Controller’s Office, Unclaimed Property Division in the
7 name of the Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee.

8 35. The Settlement was preliminarily approved on March 27, 2024.

9 36. On June 4, 2024, after receiving a data file from Defendant, and searching the
10 National Change of Address database and updating Class Member addresses, the Settlement
11 Administrator mailed a Class Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, informing
12 them of (1) the pendency of the Action; (2) proposed settlement terms; (3) automatic payment
13 of Settlement shares if exclusion not requested; (4) released claims; (5) right to object or request
14 exclusion, and (6) and the date, time and place of the final approval hearing.

15 37. The Class response to the Settlement was extremely favorable. No objections and
16 zero requests for exclusion were received.

17 38. Nothing has changed since Preliminary Approval to negate the presumption of
18 fairness. Class Counsel remains convinced the Settlement is in the Class’ best interest.

19 39. Class Counsel requests attorneys’ fees of \$59,660.70, one-third of GSA, and
20 litigation costs of \$9,500.00 (actual costs are \$12,418.22).

21 40. To bring this matter to final approval, Class Counsel have expended 255.2 hours,
22 a \$170,700.00 lodestar, and actual litigation expenses in the amount of \$12,418.22, as shown in
23 the below Consolidated Summary of Class Counsel’s Time & Costs Chart, as well as Exhibit
24 1(A-D), a true and correct copy of Cohelan Khoury & Singer’s Time Records for each attorney
25 that worked on this case and Exhibit 2, a true and correct copy of Cohelan Khoury & Singer’s
26 Itemized Costs.

27 ///

28 ///

ATTORNEYS PARAPROFESSIONALS	YEAR ADMITTED	HOURS	HOURLY RATE	TOTAL
COHELAN KHOURY & SINGER				
Isam C. Khoury, Founding Partner	1974	12.2	\$925	\$11,285.00
Michael D. Singer, Managing Partner	1984	12.5	\$995	\$12,437.50
Marta Manus, Associate	2008	42.3	\$700	\$29,610.00
J. Jason Hill, Former Associate	2011	99.6	\$700	\$69,720.00
Amber Worden, Certified Paralegal	N/A	20.9	\$200	\$4,180.00
Matthew Atlas, Paralegal	N/A	16.7	\$175	\$2,922.50
TOTAL:		204.2		\$130,155.00
MESRIANI LAW GROUP, APLC				
Rodney Mesriani, Principal Partner		51.0	\$795	\$40,545.00
TOTAL:		51.0		\$40,545.00
Total Aggregate Hours: 255.2			Total Lodestar: \$170,700.00	
LITIGATION EXPENSES				
Cohelan Khoury & Singer				\$12,186.62
Mesriani Law Group, APLC				\$231.60
TOTAL COSTS				\$12,418.22

41. Class Counsel's request for one-third of the common fund is in the mid-range of fee awards which commonly range from 20% to 50%, and fair compensation for undertaking complex, risky, time-consuming litigation on a contingent basis, and for the results achieved. California state and federal courts routinely approve fee requests equal to or greater than Class Counsel's request.

California cases: *Parker v. City of L.A.*, 44 Cal. App. 3d 556, 567-68 (1974) (33.3%); *Tokar v. GEICO*, No. GIC 810166 (San Diego County Super. Ct. July 9, 2004) (approving award of attorney's fees of 33-1/3% of recovery in a wage and hour class action); *Marroquin v. Bed Bath & Beyond*, No. RG04145918 (Alameda County Super. Ct. June 22, 2004) (in a wage and hour class action, 33.3%); *Crandall v. U-Haul Int'l, Inc.*, No. BC178775 (Los Angeles County Super. Ct. Aug. 17, 2001) (in a wage and hour class action, 40%); *Davis v. The Money*

1 *Store, Inc.*, No. 99AS01716 (Sacramento County Super. Ct. Dec. 26, 2000) (in a wage and hour
2 class action, awarding 33.3% of \$6,000,000 settlement); *Kenemixay v. Nordstrom, Inc.*, (L.A.
3 County Super. Ct., No. BC318850) (50% award); *Albrecht v. Rite Aid Corp.*, No. 729219 (San
4 Diego County Super. Ct.) (35% award) *Estrada, Alvarez vs. Burrtec Waste Group, Inc., et al.*,
5 San Diego Super. Ct., Case No. 37-2011-00096268-CU-OE-CTL (Hon. Joel M. Pressman –
6 approving attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$2,789,000 in a pre-certification meal violation class
7 action); *White v. Edco Disposal Corp., et al.*, San Diego Super. Ct., Case No. 37-2011-
8 00088803-CU-OE-CTL (Hon. Judith Hayes – approving attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of
9 \$3,500,000 in a pre-certification meal violation class action).

10 **Federal cases:** *Wren v. RGIS Inventory Specialists*, No. C-06-05778 JCS, 2011 WL
11 1230826, at *28 (N.D. Cal. April 1, 2011) (approving fee that amounted to 42% of common
12 fund in wage and hour class action); *Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing*, 266 F.R.D. 482, 491-93
13 (wage-and-hour action putative class-action settlement where court approved award of
14 attorneys’ fees in the amount of 33.3% of the common fund); *In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.*,
15 526 F. Supp. 494 (D.D.C. 1981) (45%); *Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film*
16 *Corp.*, 480 F. Supp. 1195(S.D.N.Y. 1979), aff’d, 622 F.2d 1106 (2d Cir. 1980) (in a Sherman
17 Act case, approximately 53%); *In re Heritage Bond*, 2005 WL 1594389, at *20 (C.D. Cal. June
18 10, 2005) (award of attorneys’ fees of one-third of \$27,783,000-the Settlement Fund is fair and
19 reasonable); *Fernandez v. Victoria Secret Stores, LLC*, No. CV 06-04149 MMM (SHx), 2008
20 WL 8150856, at *16 (C.D. Cal. July 21, 2008) (awarding 34% in fees of common fund); *Martin*
21 *v. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc.*, No. C06-6883 VRW, 2008 WL 5478576, at *8 (N.D. Cal.
22 Dec. 31, 2008) (truck driver meal break class action where the court approved attorneys’ fees of
23 1/3 of common fund); *Singer v. Becton Dickinson & Co.*, No. 08-CV-821-IEG (BLM), 2010
24 WL 2196104, at *8 (S.D. Cal. Jun. 1, 2010) (noting 33.33% common fund award for wage and
25 hour class settlement “falls within the typical range of 20% to 50% awarded in similar cases”).

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

42. Since 2020, Cohelan Khoury & Singer has been awarded one-third of a common fund in many class and representative action settlements, including, among others:

a) *Hubbard v. Caliber Home Loans, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 2018-01017838 (Hon. Glenda Sanders – approving attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$175,000 settlement in a PAGA action).

b) *Redin v. Accountabilities Professional Group, Et al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 2017-00929734 (Hon. Glenda Sanders –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$255,000 settlement in Class action).

c) *White v. Sacramento Regional Transit District*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 234-2018-00240461 (Hon. David D. Alba –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$385,000 settlement in Class action).

d) *Burris v. Resort Vacations, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00997260 (Hon. Randall J. Sherman –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$1,485,000 settlement in Class action).

e) *Jimenez v. Reyes Holdings, LLC, et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00051577 (Hon. Joel R. Wohfeil –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$650,000 settlement in Class and Representative action).

f) *Santos, et al. v. National General Management Corp.*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS 1918865 (Hon. David Cohn –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$680,000 settlement in PAGA action).

g) *Loreto v. General Dynamics Information Technology, Inc.*, USDC Southern District of California, Case No. 3:19-cv-01366-GPC-MSB (Hon. Gonzalo P. Curiel –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$900,000 settlement in a pre-certification wage and hour class action).

h) *Romanov v. Amazon Services LLC.*, USDC Central District of California, Case No. 2:20-cv-02692-SB-KS (Hon. Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr. – approving attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$700,000 settlement in a pre-certification wage and hour class action).

i) *Olson v. Wrike, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV366599 (Hon. Patricia M. Lucas – approving attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$2,000,000 settlement in a pre-certification wage and hour class action).

j) *Gutierrez v. Kite Electric Incorporated*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01133960 (Hon. Peter J. Wilson – approving attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$458,991 settlement in a pre-certification wage and hour class action).

k) *Ramos Gonzalez v. Staff Pro, LLC, et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00044561 (Hon. Joel R. Wohfeil –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$1,500,000 settlement in Class and Representative action).

l) *Dolan v. Abacus Data Systems, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00051447 (Hon. Katherine Bacal –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$600,000 settlement in Class and Representative action).

m) *Lopez, et al. v. Pacific Gas and Electric Company.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-17-562970 (Hon. Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$350,000 settlement in Class and Representative action).

1 n) *Popal v. Wells Fargo Bank, National Associate*, San Diego County Superior
2 Court, Case No. 37-2020-00038101 (Hon. Gregory W. Pollack –attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of
\$3,000,000 settlement in Class and Representative action).

3 o) *Randolph v. Konica Minolta Business Solutions U.S.A., Inc.*, Sacramento County
4 Superior Court, Case No. 34-2018-00237087 (Hon. Lauri A. Damrell – attorneys’ fees of 33-
1/3% of \$325,000 settlement in Class and Representative action).

5 p) *Sanchez, et al. v. Renzenberger, Inc. et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court,
6 Case No. 19STCV46131 (Hon. Yvette M. Palazuelos – attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of
\$2,400,000 settlement in Class and Representative action).

7 q) *De Benning v. Costco Wholesale Corporation*, Sacramento County Superior
8 Court, Case No. 34-2021-00309030 (Hon. Gregory W. Pollack – attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of
\$9,000,000 settlement in Class and Representative action).

9 r) *Tam v. Q Tech Corporation*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
10 21STCV18635 (Hon. Elihu M. Berle – attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of \$650,000 settlement in
Class and Representative action).

11 s) *Mireles v. Lodi Memorial Hospital Association, Inc., et al.*, San Joaquin County
12 Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2020-0004458 (Hon. Erin Guy Castillo – attorneys’
fees of 35% of \$1,500,000 settlement in PAGA action).

13 t) *Foley, et al. v. Yuen;s Enterprise Obe, Inc., et al.*, San Bernardino County
14 Superior Court, Case No. CIVDSI912925 (Hon. Jessica Morgan – attorneys’ fees of 33-1/3% of
\$2,824,090.50 settlement in Class and Representative action action).

15 43. Class Counsel’s lodestar is \$170,700.00, \$111,039.30 greater that the \$59,660.70
16 fee award sought. If the fee award were calculated using the lodestar, rather than the common
17 fund method, no multiplier would be needed.

18 44. If this were non-representative litigation, the customary fee would be a
19 contingent percentage basis in the range of one-third to 40% of recovery. Class Counsel’s fee
20 request is in line with, if not lower than, awards in similar cases. This also supports the request.

21 45. Unlike Defense counsel, who are regularly paid a fair-market hourly rate, Class
22 Counsel received no compensation, and no reimbursement of expenses, since the case began.
23 The contingent representation, and risks of the litigation which could result in no fee being
24 possible, fully warrant approval of the fee request.

25 46. Based on my experience, the experience of my firm, and my research, Class
26 Counsel’s skill and experience support their hourly rates and are in line with rates typically
27 approved in California wage and hour class actions.

28 ///

47. Class Counsel's skill and experience support their hourly rates and are in line with rates typically approved in California wage and hour class actions and previously awarded to Class Counsel in many courts, including this one. Cohelan Khoury & Singer's practice is limited to litigating class and representative actions on behalf of employees and consumers, and the firm has been appointed Class Counsel or co-Class Counsel in over 300 such cases.

48. Class Counsel's skill and experience support their hourly rates: **Cohelan Khoury & Singer**: Founding Partner, Isam C. Khoury - \$925; Managing Partner, Michael D. Singer - \$995; Associate, Marta Manus - \$700; Former Associate, J. Jason Hill - \$700; **Mesriani Law Group, APLC**: Principal Partner, Rodney Mesriani - \$795. In fact, the Laffey Matrix would actually provide for a rate increase: Founding Partner, Isam C. Khoury - \$1,057 (20+ years out of law school); Managing Partner, Michael D. Singer - \$1,057 (20+ years out of law school); Associate Attorney, Marta Manus - \$878 (11-19 years out of law school); Former Associate, J. Jason Hill - \$1,057 (20+ years out of law school); **Mesriani Law Group, APLC**: Principal Partner, Rodney Mesriani - \$1,057 (20+ years out of law school). Attached as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of the Laffey Matrix (accessed August 6, 2024, available at <http://www.laffeymatrix.com/see.html>).

49. The Settlement allows Class Counsel to recover up to \$9,500.00 in costs. As counsel's actual costs of \$12,418.22 exceeded this amount, the request remains \$9,500.00. These costs were reasonable and necessary. Attached as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of Cohelan Khoury & Singer's Itemized Costs.

50. Plaintiffs seeks a \$5,000 service payment each for the risks they took, the work they did, and the money their efforts will confer on the Class based on the lawsuit they filed against TEKsystems. Plaintiffs estimates they spent more than forty hours working on this case with their attorneys, which they detail in their declaration. Plaintiffs also executed a general release in conjunction with the Settlement.

51. Class Counsel have achieved enhancement awards for Plaintiffs of \$10,000 or more in cases of similar value. Thus, this Court should award Plaintiffs \$5,000 each (\$10,000 total) in recognition of their service to the Class and general release.

53. The LWDA was provided with the Motion for Preliminary Approval and the Agreement. The LWDA raised no objection. On the same date this motion and its supporting documents are filed with the Court, they will be served upon Defendant and provided to the LWDA via the LWDA's website, using the appropriate intake form. Attached as Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of the LWDA Confirmation of Receipt of the Preliminary Approval Motion dated January 17, 2024; Exhibit 5 is a true and correct copy of the LWDA confirmation of Receipt of the Final Approval Motion.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and this declaration is executed August 7, 2024, in San Diego, California.


Marta Manus

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1-A

**ATTORNEY TIME
ISAM C. KHOURY**

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – ISAM C. KHOURY

Date	Activity	Time
1/24/20	status update Jnt statement	0.3
6/17/20	status update on PAGA rep adequacy issues SC statement	0.3
6/24/20	status update on document requests	0.4
8/11/20	re: update for client and mediation potential	0.3
11/24/20	status update on mediation and mediator selection	0.2
2/1/20	edit brief and discuss damage calcs and mediator's suggestion re opening demand	1.2
2/2/20	mediation	5.0
3/11/20	status update on PAGA claim	0.4
5/11/20	status update on amended and new PAGA plaintiff	0.3
9/17/21	update on coordination motion	0.2
11/29/21	Status update on coordination motion	0.3
12/10/21	mediation prep, review consultant damage model. File review	2.0
2/14/22	update re: CMC and Viking issue	0.3
3/4/22	CMC update and court's discussion	0.5
5/8/23	review draft MOU email comments to MM	0.5
	TOTAL	12.2

EXHIBIT 1-B

**ATTORNEY TIME
MICHAEL D. SINGER**

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – MICHAEL D. SINGER

Date	Activity	Time
12/1/20	Status review .5	0.5
2/2/21	Prepare for mediation 2.0; Mediation 4.0	6.0
4/26/21	Review and revise oppo to MTD cert 5.0	5.0
9/22/21	Status review .5	0.5
10/19/21	Status review .5	0.5
	TOTAL	12.5

EXHIBIT 1-C

**ATTORNEY TIME
MARTA MANUS**

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – MARTA MANUS

Date	Activity	Time
8/09/22	Confer with AW re case status	0.2
8/09/22	Review case file	0.5
8/12/22	Confer w/MDS re case status	0.1
8/12/22	Draft stipulation re: stay	0.2
8/12/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
8/22/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
8/24/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
8/25/22	Draft joint CMC statement	0.2
8/31/22	Confer with MDS/ICK	0.1
8/31/22	Status conference	1.0
8/31/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
9/01/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
9/20/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
10/13/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
10/14/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
10/14/22	Teleconference with Kevin Sullivan	0.3
10/19/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
10/24/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
10/25/22	CMC	0.8
11/11/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
12/01/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
12/07/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
12/08/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
12/14/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
12/20/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
12/21/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
12/23/22	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
1/03/23	Telephone call to plaintiffs	0.2
1/03/23	Email plaintiffs	0.1
1/03/23	Review damages calculations	1.0
1/10/23	Confer with MDS re damages	0.1
1/10/23	Review mediation status	0.2
2/17/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
2/20/23	Email Michael Kun	0.1
2/20/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
2/22/23	Teleconference with Kevin Sullivan	0.2
2/22/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/13/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – MARTA MANUS

Date	Activity	Time
3/17/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/28/23	Draft PMQ deposition notice	1.1
3/28/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/29/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/29/23	Teleconference with Kevin Sullivan	0.2
3/29/23	Confer with MDS re settlement negotiations	0.2
3/30/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/31/23	Teleconference with Kevin Sullivan	0.2
4/06/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
4/11/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
4/11/23	Teleconference with Kevin Sullivan	0.2
4/12/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
4/17/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
4/18/23	Teleconference with Kevin Sullivan	0.1
4/21/23	Teleconference with Kevin Sullivan	0.2
4/24/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
4/28/23	Email plaintiffs	0.2
4/28/23	Telephone call with Chris Nieto	0.2
5/03/23	Telephone call with Chris Ornelas	0.2
5/05/23	Draft MOU	1.2
5/05/23	Confer with ISK	0.1
5/11/23	Email Kevin Sullivan re: MOU	0.1
5/24/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
6/06/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
6/14/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
6/27/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
6/29/24	Draft revised MOU	0.3
6/29/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
7/25/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
8/04/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
8/10/23	Draft settlement agreement	4.5
8/17/23	Draft settlement agreement	1.2
8/18/23	Draft settlement agreement	0.7
8/18/23	Email Kevin Sullivan re: draft SA	0.1
9/19/23	Email Kevin Sullivan re: draft SA	0.1
9/27/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
10/11/23	Email Kevin Sullivan re: draft SA	0.1
10/17/23	Email Kimberly Sutherland	0.1

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – MARTA MANUS

Date	Activity	Time
10/26/23	Email Kevin Sullivan re: draft SA	0.1
11/01/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
11/10/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
11/22/23	Draft revised settlement agreement	0.6
11/22/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
12/05/23	Draft revised settlement agreement	0.4
12/05/23	Email Kevin Sullivan re: SA	0.2
12/06/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
12/07/23	Email Plaintiff	0.1
12/12/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
12/12/23	Status conference	1.0
12/19/23	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
12/19/23	Draft MPA	1.0
1/02/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
1/15/24	Draft MPA	4.0
1/16/24	Telephone call to Sullivan	0.1
1/16/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
1/16/24	Draft MPA	1.2
3/12/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/18/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/19/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/24/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/25/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/26/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.1
3/27/24	Hearing on MPA	0.7
3/28/24	Email plaintiffs re: preliminary approval	0.1
4/01/24	Email settlement administrator	0.2
4/08/24	Email settlement administrator	0.1
4/17/24	Email settlement administrator	0.1
4/24/24	Email settlement administrator	0.1
5/28/24	Email settlement administrator	0.2
5/29/24	Email Kevin Sullivan	0.2
5/30/24	Email Kevin Sullivan and admin	0.2
5/31/24	Telephone call with Sullivan	0.2
5/31/24	Email settlement administrator	0.1
6/03/24	Email settlement administrator	0.2
7/25/24	Draft MFA	3.2
8/6/24	Review/Revise MFA	2.0

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – MARTA MANUS

Date	Activity	Time
8/29/24	Final Approval Hearing	1.0
	TOTAL	42.3

EXHIBIT 1-D

ATTORNEY TIME

J. JASON HILL

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – J. JASON HILL

Date	Activity	Time
11/1/19	Email to MA re additions to draft class complaint 0.3; emails with MDS re complaint 0.2; draft class complaint 3.7; research re correct legal entity and emails with staff re same 0.3	4.5
11/4/19	Email staff re final draft of complaint 0.1	0.1
11/6/19	Review AW email re record request and respond 0.1; review MA email re filed complaint and assignment 0.1	0.2
11/8/19	Review and approve record request 0.1	0.1
11/18/19	Review drafts of ESI & Catalyst and respond to AW email 0.2	0.2
11/22/19	Review Court re complex designation 0.2; review MDS email re ISC continuance 0.1	0.3
12/11/19	Review AW email re defense counsel and respond 0.1	0.1
12/12/19	Review AW email re SC Stmt and respond 0.1; Review and approve Pltf SC Stmt and request for continuance and proposed order 0.1	0.2
12/13/19	Review Defense notice of appearance 0.1	0.1
12/17/19	Email staff re ISC continuance 0.1; email to client Ornelas 0.1	0.2
12/19/19	Review and approve notice of jury fees 0.1	0.1
1/7/20	Review AW email re record request response 0.1	0.1
1/8/20	Review and approve notice of entry of order cont SC 0.1; email Defense re record request 0.1	0.2
1/13/20	Review Defense email re representation 0.1; emails with Mesriani re second representation 0.1	0.2
1/21/20	Review and revise draft of Jt Initial SC Stmt 0.3; email Defense re draft stmt 0.1	0.4
1/23/20	Review Defense email re revisions to SC Stmt 0.1; review and revise SC Stmt 0.2; email Defense re changes 0.1	0.4
1/24/20	Review Defense email re revisions to SC Stmt and respond 0.1; review revised SC Stmt 0.1	0.2
1/30/20	Revise draft of privacy notice 0.2; email Defense re privacy notice 0.1	0.3
1/31/20	Review Defense email re arb agreement 0.1; review template arb agreement 0.2; email staff re conformed complaint 0.1; prepare for and attend status conference 4.5; email to staff re SC 0.1	5.0
2/3/20	Email Defense re arb agreement 0.2; email MDS and ICK re arb agreement 0.1	0.3
2/4/20	Review order authorizing electronic service 0.2	0.2
2/17/20	Review Defense email re arb agreement 0.1	0.1
3/23/20	Review AW email to Defense re Eservice agreement in light of stay at home order 0.1	0.1
4/16/20	Email Defense re arb agreement and potential mediation 0.2	0.2
6/16/20	Review draft of Jt SC stmt and revise 0.3; email Defense re draft statement and arb agreement 0.1; review Defense response 0.1	0.5
6/17/20	Emails with Defense re revisions to SC Stmt 0.3; review revised statement 0.2	0.5

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – J. JASON HILL

Date	Activity	Time
6/24/20	Prepare for and attend SC 0.5; email Staff re same 0.1; email Defense re mediation and arb agreement 0.2	0.8
6/25/20	Review and approve notice of dates following SC 0.1	0.1
7/15/20	Emails with AW re Defendant's Answer to complaint 0.2	0.2
7/27/20	Email Defense re arb agreement and informal production 0.3; draft initial discovery 2.4; email to staff re discovery 0.1	2.8
8/6/20	Email to staff re finalized discovery 0.1; Emails with Defense re discovery, arb agreement, and scheduling telecon 0.3	0.4
8/10/20	Telecon with Defense 0.5	0.5
9/8/20	Review Defense email re discovery extension and respond 0.1	0.1
9/30/20	Emails with Defense re discovery extension and scheduling telecon 0.3	0.3
10/7/20	Emails with MDS re mediation 0.2	0.2
10/13/20	Review Defense email re telecon and respond 0.1	0.1
10/14/20	Emails with Defense re telecon 0.2; telecon with Defense 0.5; review Defense email following telecon 0.1	0.8
10/19/20	Telecon with PCM/potential witness 0.8; email to PCM/potential witness 0.2	1.0
10/27/20	Review Defense email re discovery extension 0.1	0.1
11/10/20	Emails with Defense re scheduling telecon 0.3	0.3
11/12/20	Emails with AW re discovery extension 0.1	0.1
11/13/20	Telecon with Defense 0.5; emails with ICK re Defense telecon 0.2	0.2
11/14/20	Emails with ICK re Defense telecon 0.2	0.2
11/23/20	Email Defense re mediator 0.1	0.1
11/24/20	Emails with Defense re mediator 0.2; emails with ICK and MDS re mediator 0.2	0.4
12/1/20	Emails with Defense re scheduling mediation 0.2	0.2
12/3/20	Emails with Defense re discovery extension 0.2	0.2
12/9/20	Review documents from mediator's office 0.1	0.1
12/24/20	Emails with AW re mediation attendance 0.2; review AW email to client Ornelas re mediation 0.1	0.3
1/11/21	Review MA emails re mediation attendance 0.1	0.1
1/19/21	Email Defense re status of informal production 0.1	0.1
1/20/21	Emails with AW re cert deadline 0.1	0.1
1/21/21	Review AW and Defense emails re stip cont cert deadline 0.1; review stipulation and proposed order to cont cert deadline 0.2	0.3
1/25/21	Emails with Defense re informal doc production 0.2	0.2
1/26/21	Review BV email re costs 0.1	0.1
1/27/21	Email MA re docs to consultant 0.1; review emails between MA and consultant 0.2; review Defense email re opening demand 0.1	0.4
1/28/21	Review emails from mediator's office and respond 0.2	0.2
1/29/21	Review emails from mediator's office and AW/MA re mediation attendance and respond 0.2; review consultant email 0.1; email to client Ornelas 0.3; emails with Defense re expense reimbursement policy 0.1;	3.1

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – J. JASON HILL

Date	Activity	Time
	review expense policy 0.2; emails with mediator re scheduling telecon 0.1; telecon with consultant 0.5; review damage model from consultant 0.8; telecon with PCMs 0.8	
1/30/21	Telecon with PCMs 0.5; Email to mediator 0.2; revise mediation brief 2.8	3.5
2/1/21	Emails with MDS and ICK re mediation and call to mediator 0.2; emails with ICK, mediator, and defense re brief exchange 0.3; emails with AW re brief exchange 0.1; review Defendant mediation brief 0.7; telecon with mediator 0.5; emails with ICK and MDS re telecon and damages 0.3; email to Defense attaching brief 0.1	2.2
2/2/21	Emails with ICK and MDS re mediation 0.1; prepare for and attend mediation 6.0; review mediator email following mediation 0.1	6.2
2/3/21	Review mediator email re discovery 0.1	0.1
2/4/21	Draft second set of discovery 2.5; review and approve declaration in support of additional discovery 0.2; emails with mediator email re discovery 0.2	2.9
2/8/21	Email consultant 0.1	0.1
2/10/21	Review email from mediator 0.1; emails with ICK and MDS re mediator email 0.1; telecon with mediator 0.5; email ICK and MDS re mediator telecon 0.1	0.8
2/11/21	Emails with mediator 0.1	0.1
2/18/21	telecon with client Ornelas re potential new rep 0.5	0.5
2/19/21	Email to client Ornelas 0.1	0.1
2/20/21	Emails with client Ornelas 0.2	0.2
2/23/21	Review emails from client Ornelas and PNC Nieto and respond 0.2; review Defense email re discovery extension and respond 0.1	0.3
2/24/21	Telecon with PNC Nieto 0.5; email to ICK and MDS re Nieto 0.3	0.8
2/25/21	Emails with MDS and staff re PNC Nieto 0.4; review representation agreement for Nieto 0.2; email Nieto re rep agmt 0.3	0.9
3/2/21	Review Defense email re discovery extension and respond 0.1; emails with Defense re scheduling telecon 0.1; telecon with Defense 0.2; telecon with Nieto 0.3; email staff re adding in Nieto as Plaintiff and next steps 0.2	0.9
3/3/21	Review drafts of stipulation and proposed order cont cert deadline 0.2; emails with AW re Nieto 0.1; telecon with Nieto 0.1; email defense re cont cert deadline 0.1	0.5
3/4/21	Emails with AW re Nieto docs 0.1	0.1
3/5/21	Email client Nieto 0.1; emails with staff re Nieto records 0.2; emails to defense Nieto record request 0.1	0.4
3/8/21	Review email from client Nieto 0.1; review Nieto Addendum 0.1; email staff re Nieto PAGA notice 0.2	0.3
3/9/21	Review Defense email re discovery extension and cert deadline continuance 0.1	0.1

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – J. JASON HILL

Date	Activity	Time
3/12/21	Review Defense email re changes to stipulation to cont cert deadline and respond 0.1; review and revise Nieto PAHA notice 0.6; review Defense email re motion to deny certification and respond 0.2; emails with MDS re certification issue 0.2; emails with MDS re reimbursement policy 0.2; emails with MA re Nieto PAGA notice 0.2	1.5
3/15/21	Emails with Defense re joint post to Court 0.1	0.1
3/16/21	Review Defense email re Discovery extension 0.1; Emails with AW re defense disc extension request 0.1	0.2
3/17/21	Review Defendant's motion to deny class certification 1.9; review MDS email re motion to deny class certification 0.2	2.1
3/18/21	Review Nieto employment docs 0.7; email to ICK and MDS re absence of arb agmt for Nieto 0.1	0.8
3/22/21	Review Defendant's responses to second set of discovery 1.7	1.7
3/24/21	Emails with Defense re Nieto and discovery responses 0.3; review Nieto arb agmt 0.1; emails with AW re cont cert deadline 0.1	0.5
3/25/21	Respond to Defense email re Nieto 0.1	0.1
3/30/21	Review Nieto doc production from Defense 0.6; email MDS and KDRLR re Nieto Arb agmt 0.2	0.8
3/31/21	Emails with AW re post to court re cert deadline 0.4; review Defense response to message posted to Court 0.1; review MDS response to email re Nieto arb agmt 0.1	0.6
4/1/21	Review Court response to post re cert deadline 0.1	0.1
4/6/21	review and revise draft of declaration re filing of cert deadline 0.3; email Defense re declaration and meet and confer 0.2	0.5
4/7/21	Emails with Defense rescheduling telecon 0.2; emails with AW re revision to declaration 0.2	0.4
4/9/21	Telecon with Defense 0.5; emails with Defense following telecon 0.4	0.9
4/13/21	Review Court order re Class certification motions 0.2	0.2
4/21/21	Emails with AW re oppo to motion to deny certification 0.2	0.2
4/22/21	Email defense re continuing oppo to motion to deny cert 0.1; emails with MA re stip re Briefing on motion to deny certification 0.1; review stipulation and proposed order 0.2	0.4
4/23/21	Emails with Defense re Mtn Deny Cert Oppo continuance 0.2	0.2
4/24/21	Research case law for re Mtn Deny Cert Oppo 1.2	1.2
4/25/21	Revise draft of Mtn Deny Cert Oppo 3.0; email MDS re oppo 0.1	3.1
4/26/21	Revise draft of Mtn Deny Cert Oppo 1.1; emails with AW re Schenck Dec objections and exhibit redactions 0.2; review Schenck objections and proposed order re objections 0.3; review and revise declaration ISO oppo 0.3	1.9
5/5/21	Review Defendant's Reply to Motion to Deny Certification 1.5	1.5
5/6/21	Review AW email re SC stmt and respond 0.2; Review and revise draft of Jt SC Stmt for 5/11/21 0.3; emails with Defense re SC Stmt revisions 0.2	0.7

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – J. JASON HILL

Date	Activity	Time
5/10/21	Review tentative ruling on Motion to Deny Class Cert 0.3; email MDS re tentative ruling 0.1; prepare and attend hearing on Motion to Deny Class Cert 1.0; email to ICK and MDS re hearing 0.1	1.5
5/11/21	Emails with RCK re FAC 0.5; review drafts of stipulation and proposed order re FAC 0.2;	0.7
5/14/21	Emails with RCK re FAC 0.1	0.1
5/17/21	Review draft of FAC 0.8	0.8
5/18/21	Email to Defense re FAC 0.1; emails with MDS and RCK re FAC 0.5	0.6
5/19/21	Review Defendant's notice of ruling 0.1; email Defense re meet and confer 0.3; review Defendant's comments to FAC 0.4	0.8
5/24/21	Revise draft of FAC 0.5; email Defense re revisions 0.1	0.6
5/25/21	Review email from client Ornelas and respond 0.1	0.1
5/28/21	Emails with defense re revisions to FAC 0.2; further review FAC 0.3	0.5
6/1/21	Emails with mediator 0.2; revise FAC 0.3; email Defense re FAC 0.1	0.6
6/3/21	Email to Defense re FAC 0.1	0.1
6/15/21	Review email from Defense re revisions to stipulation and proposed order re FAC and respond 0.1; review revisions to Stip and proposed order 0.2	0.3
6/16/21	Email Defense re revisions to stipulation and proposed order re FAC 0.1; emails with staff re stipulation and FAC drafts 0.2	0.3
6/17/21	emails with staff re stipulation and FAC drafts 0.2; review MA email to Defense re FAC 0.1	0.3
6/22/21	Email Defense re FAC and Stipulation and proposed order re leave to file 0.1	0.1
6/25/21	Telecon with Defense 0.3; email to staff re FAC 0.1; Emails with Defense re revisions to FAC 0.2	0.5
6/30/21	Emails with AW re FAC 0.2	0.2
7/13/21	Email Defense re FAC and stip re FAC 0.1	0.1
7/23/21	Review Defendant's notice of related case 0.1; email ICK and MDS re related case 0.1; emails with counsel in Rios case 0.2; emails with MA re leave to file FAC 0.1; review Rios ROA 0.1	0.6
7/27/21	Review and approve notice of entry of order re FAC 0.1	0.1
7/29/21	Email Defense re Rios case 0.1; Email Rios counsel 0.1	0.2
8/25/21	Review Defendant's Answer to FAC 0.4	0.4
8/27/21	Emails with AW re cert deadline continuance 0.2	0.2
8/30/21	Emails with Rios counsel 0.3	0.3
8/31/21	Review email from Rios counsel 0.1; review Rios complaint and answer 0.6; Telecon with Rios counsel 0.5; email to Rios counsel following telecon 0.3; review Rios Petition for Coordination 0.8	2.3
9/2/21	Review AW email re notice of petition 0.1; review MDS re concerns re Petition for Coordination and respond 0.1; review notice of submission of petition 0.1; email Rios counsel re statements in Petition 0.1	0.4
9/3/21	Review email from Rios counsel re SOL 0.2	0.2

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – J. JASON HILL

Date	Activity	Time
9/13/21	Review Defendant's Opposition to Petition for Coordination 0.7	0.7
9/16/21	Emails with AW re response to Petition for Coordination 0.3; review draft of statement in support of Petition 0.2	0.5
9/17/21	Emails with AW re response to Petition for Coordination 0.1	0.1
9/21/21	Emails with AW re stip to cont cert deadline 0.1; review stipulation and proposed order to cont cert deadline 0.2	0.3
9/23/21	Emails with AW re stip to cont cert deadline 0.2	0.2
9/28/21	Email to Defense re Rios 0.1; emails with AW re cert deadline 0.3; review draft of declaration re cert filing 0.2	0.6
9/29/21	Review Defendant's response to declaration re cert filing 0.2; review Defense email re Rios 0.1	0.3
10/13/21	Review Order re Cert Filing Deadline 0.2	0.2
11/2/21	Review Defendant's Opposition to Stay 0.3	0.3
11/9/21	Prepare for and attend OSC re stay pending Petition for Coordination 0.5; email Defense following hearing 0.2	0.7
11/10/21	Review AW email re Coordination motion judge assignment 0.1	0.1
11/12/21	Review Defendant's Opposition to Petition for Coordination 0.5	0.5
11/17/21	Emails with staff re Joinder to petition for coordination 0.1	0.1
11/19/21	Emails with AW re Joinder to petition for coordination 0.2; review draft of notice of statement ISO petition 0.2	0.4
11/29/21	Prepare for and appear at Hearing on Petition for Coordination 1.0; email to TC/ICK/MDS re same 0.1	1.1
11/30/21	Review notice of ruling on Petition for Coordination 0.1; Emails with Rios counsel re ruling on Petition for Coordination 0.1	0.2
12/9/21	Email to Defense re denial if petition and scheduling telecon 0.1	0.1
1/10/22	Review Defense letter re stay pending Viking River	0.2
1/14/22	Emails with AW re statement re coordination for case review hearing 0.1	0.1
1/19/22	Emails with Defense re stay pending Viking River 0.2	0.2
1/20/22	Emails with Defense re stay and joint message posting to Court 0.3	0.3
1/24/22	Review MDS email re stay 0.1	0.1
1/28/22	Review Order Re Stay 0.1	0.1
2/3/22	Emails with Defense re Jt SC Stmt 0.3; review draft of Jt SC Stmt 0.2; emails with MDS re mediation and cert deadline 0.1	0.6
2/10/22	Prepare for and attend status conference 0.5	0.5
2/11/22	Email to TC/ICK/MDS re status conference recap 0.2	0.2
2/14/22	Review email from MDS re PAGA Stay; emails with AW re Discovery 0.3; review drafts of RPD 3 and revisions to privacy notice 0.7	1.0
2/15/22	Revise draft of RPD3 0.4; emails with AW re discovery 0.4; review draft of PMK depo notice 0.3; email Defense re PMK depo notice 0.2; email ICK/MDS re arb agreement re PAGA actions 0.2	1.5
2/22/22	Emails with Defense re joint message to court 0.2	0.2

Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944
ATTORNEY TIME – J. JASON HILL

Date	Activity	Time
2/25/22	Review court messages re IDC 0.1; emails with AW re IDC conflict 0.3; emails with MDS re appearance for IDC 0.1	0.5
3/1/22	Review and approve Notice of remote appearance 0.1	0.1
3/4/22	Prepare for and attend IDC 0.5; email to TC/ICK/MDS re same 0.3	0.3
3/7/22	Review Defense email re settlement demand and respond 0.5	0.5
3/11/22	Emails with Defense re settlement demand and respond 0.6	0.6
3/16/22	Review and approve notice of dates following IDC 0.1	0.1
3/17/22	Review court message re SC continuance 0.1	0.1
3/21/22	Emails with AW re Motions to Compel 0.4	0.4
3/22/22	Review Defendant's objections to RPD3 0.3	0.3
3/24/22	Review drafts of MTC SRog, Set 2 (Nos. 7-8) 0.4; review AW email re MTC and meet and confer 0.1	0.5
4/4/22	Emails with clients Ornelas and Nieto re status of case 0.1	0.1
4/6/22	Emails with AW re MTC and PMK depo notice 0.2	0.2
4/11/22	Review AW email re MTC hearing date 0.1	0.1
4/22/22	Review court message re continuance of MTC hearing and SC 0.1	0.1
4/23/22	Telcon with client Ornelas 0.5; telecon with client Nieto 0.5	1.0
4/25/22	Email Defense re settlement demand 0.4	0.4
5/9/22	Review Stip re stay and approve 0.2; emails with AW re stip 0.1; email Defense re Stip 0.1	0.4
	TOTAL	99.6

EXHIBIT 2

COHELAN KHOURY SINGER
Litigation Costs
Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944

443

<u>Date</u>	<u>Payee</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Amount</u>
11/5/2019	Clerk of the Court	Filing/Complex Fee	\$1,435.00
11/6/2019	Express Network	Court Services	\$35.00
11/25/2019	Express Network	Summons and Complaint	\$175.00
12/12/2019	Express Network	Status Conference Statement	\$59.00
12/19/2019	Clerk of the Court	Jury Fees	\$150.00
12/19/2019	Express Network	Proof of Service of Summons	\$35.00
12/20/2019	Express Network	Notice of Posting Jury Fees	\$35.00
1/8/2020	Express Network	Ntc. Of Entry of Order Cont. SC	\$92.00
1/24/2020	Express Network	Joint Status Conference Statement	\$104.00
5/7/2020	Case Anywhere	2/7/20-4/30/20	\$111.60
6/17/2020	Express Network	Joint Status Conference Statement	\$75.00
6/25/2020	Express Network	Notice of Dates Following SC	\$35.00
8/17/2020	Case Anywhere	5/1/20-7/31/20	\$138.00
11/16/2020	Case Anywhere	8/1/20-10/31/20 CKS	\$150.00
12/15/2020	J.A.M.S.	Mediation Fee	\$2,700.00
1/21/2021	Express Network	Stipulation	\$90.00
2/21/2021	Case Anywhere	8/1/20-10/31/20 Mesriani	\$120.00
2/21/2021	Case Anywhere	8/1/20-10/31/20 CKS	\$138.00
3/12/2021	LWDA	PAGA Fee	\$75.00
4/7/2021	Express Network	Declaration	\$90.00
4/26/2021	Express Network	P's & A's; Dec.; Objection; Prop. Order	\$81.50
5/5/2021	Case Anywhere	5/1/20-7/31/20 Mesriani	\$120.00
5/5/2021	Case Anywhere	8/1/20-10/31/20 Mesriani	\$120.00
5/6/2021	Express Network	Joint Status Conference Statement	\$59.00
5/11/2021	LASC	Minute Order	\$7.00
5/13/2021	Express Network	2/1-4/30/21 CKS	\$192.00
5/13/2021	Case Anywhere	2/1-4/30/21 Mesriani	\$120.00
7/15/2021	Express Network	Stipulation	\$113.00
7/23/2021	Express Network	First Amended Complaint	\$67.00
7/27/2021	Express Network	Courtesy Copy	\$90.00
8/18/2021	Case Anywhere	5/1-7/31/21 CKS	\$162.00
9/28/2021	One Legal	Declaration	\$16.68
9/28/2021	One Legal	Declaration	\$16.68
11/12/2021	Case Anywhere	8/1/21-10/31/21 Mesriani	\$120.00
11/12/2021	Case Anywhere	8/1/21-10/31/21 CKS	\$126.00
11/19/2021	Express Network	NTC	\$98.00
2/4/2022	One Legal	Joint Status Conference Report	\$16.68
2/14/2022	Case Anywhere	11/1/21-1/31/22 CKS	\$120.00
2/14/2022	Case Anywhere	11/1/21-1/31/22 Mesriani	\$120.00
3/1/2022	One Legal	Notice; Proof of Service	\$16.68
3/16/2022	One Legal	Notice	\$17.19

COHELAN KHOURY SINGER
Litigation Costs
Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944

443

<u>Date</u>	<u>Payee</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Amount</u>
5/16/2022	Case Anywhere	2/1/22-4/30/22 Mesriani	\$120.00
5/16/2022	Case Anywhere	2/1/22-4/30/22 CKS	\$150.00
5/25/2022	LASC	Stipulation and Order	\$5.00
8/16/2022	One Legal	Notice of Appearance	\$17.19
8/19/2022	Case Anywhere	5/1/22-7/31/22 CKS	\$120.00
8/19/2022	Case Anywhere	5/1/22-7/31/22 Mesriani	\$120.00
8/25/2022	One Legal	Status Conference Statement	\$17.19
8/29/2022	One Legal	Notice; Proof of Service	\$17.19
11/15/2022	Case Anywhere	8/1/22-10/31/22 CKS	\$144.00
3/1/2023	Case Anywhere	11/1/22-1/31/23 Mesriani	\$120.00
3/1/2023	Case Anywhere	8/1/22-10/31/22 Mesriani	\$120.00
3/1/2023	Case Anywhere	11/1/22-1/31/23 CKS	\$120.00
4/24/2023	One Legal	Stipulation and Order	\$38.25
5/10/2023	Case Anywhere	2/1-4/30/23 CKS	\$138.00
6/29/2023	Case Anywhere	2/1-4/30/23 Mesriani	\$120.00
7/25/2023	One Legal	Stipulation and Order	\$38.25
8/11/2023	LASC	Stipulation and Order	\$4.00
8/15/2023	Case Anywhere	5/1-7/31/23 Mesriani	\$120.00
8/24/2023	Case Anywhere	5/1-7/31/23 CKS	\$132.00
9/27/2023	One Legal	Status Report	\$17.66
10/2/2023	One Legal	Status Report	\$51.48
10/18/2023	LASC	Minute Order	\$1.00
11/21/2023	Case Anywhere	8/1/23-10/31/23 CKS	\$126.00
11/21/2023	Case Anywhere	8/1/23-10/31/23 Mesriani	\$120.00
12/7/2023	One Legal	Joint Status Conference Report	\$17.66
12/8/2023	Express Network	Joint Status Conference Statement	\$61.00
1/18/2024	One Legal	Proof of Service; Stip and Order	\$51.48
1/18/2024	One Legal	Preliminary Approval Mtn. (Courtesy Copy)	\$77.21
1/18/2024	One Legal	Preliminary Approval Mtn. Filing Fee/efile	\$81.48
1/18/2024	One Legal	Stipulation and Order; POS	\$40.30
2/1/2024	One Legal	Notice	\$19.71
2/7/2024	Case Anywhere	11/1-1/31/24 CKS	\$192.00
3/28/2024	One Legal	Notice; Proof of Service	\$19.71
3/28/2024	One Legal	Notice; Proof of Service	\$51.48
3/28/2024	LASC	Order	\$5.40
4/3/2024	Case Anywhere	11/1-1/31/24 Mesriani	\$120.00
5/8/2024	Case Anywhere	2/1-4/30/24 Mesriani	\$120.00
5/8/2024	Case Anywhere	2/1-4/30/24 CKS	\$138.00
est.	Case Anywhere	5/1/24-7/31/24 Mesriani	\$120.00
est.	Case Anywhere	5/1/24-7/31/24 CKS	\$138.00
est.	Case Anywhere	8/1-10/31/24 Mesriani	\$120.00

COHELAN KHOURY SINGER
Litigation Costs
Ornelas, et al. v. Teksystems, Inc.
L.A.S.C. Case No. 19STCV39944

443

<u>Date</u>	<u>Payee</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<i>est.</i>	<i>Case Anywhere</i>	<i>8/1-10/31/24 CKS</i>	<i>\$120.00</i>
<i>est.</i>	<i>Case Anywhere</i>	<i>11/1-1/31/25 Mesriani</i>	<i>\$120.00</i>
<i>est.</i>	<i>Case Anywhere</i>	<i>11/1-1/31/25 CKS</i>	<i>\$120.00</i>
<i>est.</i>	<i>Case Anywhere</i>	<i>2/1-4/30/25 Mesriani</i>	<i>\$120.00</i>
<i>est.</i>	<i>Case Anywhere</i>	<i>2/1-4/30/25 CKS</i>	<i>\$120.00</i>
<i>est.</i>	<i>Case Anywhere</i>	<i>5/1-7/31/25 Mesriani</i>	<i>\$120.00</i>
<i>est.</i>	<i>Case Anywhere</i>	<i>5/1-7/31/25 CKS</i>	<i>\$120.00</i>
<i>est.</i>	<i>One Legal</i>	<i>Final Approval Mtn. (Courtesy Copy)</i>	<i>\$77.21</i>
<i>est.</i>	<i>One Legal</i>	<i>Final Approval Mtn. Filing Fee/efile</i>	<i>\$81.48</i>
	In House	Postage	\$56.03
	In House	Photocopies (557@.25)	\$139.25
	Total:		\$12,186.62

EXHIBIT 3

LAFFEY MATRIX

[History](#)
[Case Law](#)
[See the Matrix](#)
[Contact us](#)
[Home](#)

			Years Out of Law School *				
Year	Adjustmt Factor**	Paralegal/ Law Clerk	1-3	4-7	8-10	11-19	20 +
6/01/23- 5/31/24	1.059295	\$239	\$437	\$538	\$777	\$878	\$1057
6/01/22- 5/31/23	1.085091	\$225	\$413	\$508	\$733	\$829	\$997
6/01/21- 5/31/22	1.006053	\$208	\$381	\$468	\$676	\$764	\$919
6/01/20- 5/31/21	1.015894	\$206	\$378	\$465	\$672	\$759	\$914
6/01/19- 5/31/20	1.0049	\$203	\$372	\$458	\$661	\$747	\$899
6/01/18- 5/31/19	1.0350	\$202	\$371	\$455	\$658	\$742	\$894
6/01/17- 5/31/18	1.0463	\$196	\$359	\$440	\$636	\$717	\$864
6/01/16- 5/31/17	1.0369	\$187	\$343	\$421	\$608	\$685	\$826
6/01/15- 5/31/16	1.0089	\$180	\$331	\$406	\$586	\$661	\$796
6/01/14- 5/31/15	1.0235	\$179	\$328	\$402	\$581	\$655	\$789
6/01/13- 5/31/14	1.0244	\$175	\$320	\$393	\$567	\$640	\$771
6/01/12- 5/31/13	1.0258	\$170	\$312	\$383	\$554	\$625	\$753
6/01/11- 5/31/12	1.0352	\$166	\$305	\$374	\$540	\$609	\$734
6/01/10- 5/31/11	1.0337	\$161	\$294	\$361	\$522	\$589	\$709
6/01/09- 5/31/10	1.0220	\$155	\$285	\$349	\$505	\$569	\$686
6/01/08- 5/31/09	1.0399	\$152	\$279	\$342	\$494	\$557	\$671
6/01/07-5/31/08	1.0516	\$146	\$268	\$329	\$475	\$536	\$645
6/01/06-5/31/07	1.0256	\$139	\$255	\$313	\$452	\$509	\$614
6/1/05-5/31/06	1.0427	\$136	\$249	\$305	\$441	\$497	\$598
6/1/04-5/31/05	1.0455	\$130	\$239	\$293	\$423	\$476	\$574
6/1/03-6/1/04	1.0507	\$124	\$228	\$280	\$405	\$456	\$549
6/1/02-5/31/03	1.0727	\$118	\$217	\$267	\$385	\$434	\$522
6/1/01-5/31/02	1.0407	\$110	\$203	\$249	\$359	\$404	\$487
6/1/00-5/31/01	1.0529	\$106	\$195	\$239	\$345	\$388	\$468
6/1/99-5/31/00	1.0491	\$101	\$185	\$227	\$328	\$369	\$444
6/1/98-5/31/99	1.0439	\$96	\$176	\$216	\$312	\$352	\$424
6/1/97-5/31/98	1.0419	\$92	\$169	\$207	\$299	\$337	\$406
6/1/96-5/31/97	1.0396	\$88	\$162	\$198	\$287	\$323	\$389
6/1/95-5/31/96	1.032	\$85	\$155	\$191	\$276	\$311	\$375
6/1/94-5/31/95	1.0237	\$82	\$151	\$185	\$267	\$301	\$363

The methodology of calculation and benchmarking for this Updated Laffey Matrix has been approved in a number of cases. See, e.g., DL v. District of Columbia, 267 F.Supp.3d 55, 69 (D.D.C. 2017)

* $i_c \frac{1}{2}$ Years Out of Law School $i_c \frac{1}{2}$ is calculated from June 1 of each year, when most law students graduate. $i_c \frac{1}{2}$ 1-3" includes an attorney in his 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of practice, measured from date of graduation (June 1). $i_c \frac{1}{2}$ 4-7" applies to attorneys in their 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th years of practice. An attorney who graduated in May 1996 would be in tier $i_c \frac{1}{2}$ 1-3" from June 1, 1996 until May 31, 1999, would move into tier $i_c \frac{1}{2}$ 4-7" on June 1, 1999, and tier $i_c \frac{1}{2}$ 8-10" on June 1, 2003.

** The Adjustment Factor refers to the nation-wide Legal Services Component of the Consumer Price Index produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT 4

From: [DIR PAGA Unit](#)
To: [Matthew Atlas](#)
Subject: [External] Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission
Date: Wednesday, January 17, 2024 4:33:47 PM

01/17/2024 04:32:50 PM

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_labor.ca.gov_Private-5FAttorneys-5FGeneral-5FAct.htm&d=DwIFaQ&c=euGZstcaTDllvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpqnVfiiMM&r=CkmVEddukKLexsqU9o1LOYeca1vZAEc-MO6PZ1f0-Jc&m=xbyKhgaoN2kn23iZFvPkGGzYJOZ7YuzImD6CvvoE3uKEKV42FDawpRxqFERbvIg4&s=0Q6a_dE5mgmQTNG_2ScON_nUsW9yNUS1LSLkM6RM414&e=



Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) – Filing

Proposed Settlement of PAGA case

PAGA Number (LWDA-CM-) : *

*Please enter only the eight digit number after "LWDA-CM-" in the following format, "XXXXXX-XX".
[Search for PAGA Case number](#)*

The timing of the deposit of settlement checks is governed by the provisions of the State Administrative Manual. This ministerial, administrative act of depositing a settlement check mandated by state procedures should not be construed as nor does it constitute an unconditional, voluntary and/or absolute acceptance of settlement proceeds or approval of the terms of any settlement agreement or judgment related to that check.

Your Information (Person Who is Filing)

Your First Name *

Your Last Name *

Your Email Address *

Your Street Name, Number and Suite/Apt *

Your Mobile Phone Number

Your City *

Your Work Phone Number

Your State *



Your Zip/Postal Code *

Court and Hearing Information

Court *

Los Angeles Superior Cour

Court Case Number *

19STCV39944

Hearing Date (if any)

03/27/2024

Hearing Time

10:00 a.m.

Hearing Location

Number of aggrieved employees *

316

Gross settlement amount *

179,000

Gross penalty amount *

75,000

Penalties to LWDA *

56,250

Date of proposed settlement *

03/27/2024

Proposed Settlement and Other Documents

Proposed Settlement *

Choose File 1. NOM.pdf

Other Attachment (if any)

Choose File 2. PA.pdf

Other Attachment (if any)

[Remove](#)

Choose File 3. Singer Dec.pdf

Other Attachment (if any)

[Remove](#)

Choose File 4. Mesriani Dec.pdf

Other Attachment (if any)

[Remove](#)

Choose File 5. Nieto Dec.pdf

Other Attachment (if any)

[Remove](#)

Choose File 6. Ornelas Dec.pdf

Other Attachment (if any)

[Remove](#)

Choose File 7. ILYM Dec.pdf

Other Attachment (if any)

[Remove](#)

Choose File 8. Order.pdf

Should you have questions regarding this online form, please contact PAGAInfo@dir.ca.gov

IMPORTANT NOTICE OF REDACTION RESPONSIBILITY: All filers must redact: Social Security or taxpayer identification numbers; personal addresses, personal telephone numbers, personal email addresses, dates of birth; names of minor children; & financial account numbers. This requirement applies to all documents, including attachments.

☒ **I understand that, if I file, I must comply with the redaction rules consistent with this notice.**

[Previous Page](#)

[Submit](#)

EXHIBIT 5