

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
TALIA LUX (SBN 336074)
HAIG HOGDANIAN (SBN 334699)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

ADAM LLAMAS, individually, and on behalf
of other members of the general public
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

v.

STEUBER CORPORATION D/B/A
ALTAFOODCRAFT COFFEE AND
REFRESHMENT SERVICES, a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 21STCV25673

Assigned for All Purposes to:
Honorable Stuart M. Rice
Department 1

CLASS ACTION

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION
AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT, CONDITIONAL
CERTIFICATION, APPROVAL OF
CLASS NOTICE, SETTING OF FINAL
APPROVAL HEARING DATE;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

[Declaration of Proposed Class Counsel
(Douglas Han); Declaration of Proposed Class
Representative (Adam Llamas); Declaration
of Defense Counsel (Jim Hart); Declaration of
Philip Steuber; Declaration of Jodey
Lawrence; and [Proposed] Order filed
concurrently herewith]

Hearing Date: December 15, 2023
Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m.
Hearing Place: Department 1

Complaint Filed: July 13, 2021
Trial Date: None Set

1 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on December 15, 2023 at 10:30 a.m., or as soon as the
2 matter may be heard, before the Honorable Stuart M. Rice in Department 1 of the Los Angeles
3 County Superior Court (Spring Street Courthouse) located at 312 North Spring Street Los Angeles,
4 California 90012, Plaintiff Adam Llamas (“Plaintiff”) will and hereby does move for an order:

- 5 • Granting Preliminary Approval of the class action settlement described herein and
6 as set forth in the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice
7 (“Settlement Agreement,” “Settlement,” or “Agreement”), attached as **Exhibit 2** to
8 the declaration of Douglas Han, including, and not limited to, the means of
9 allocation and distribution of funds;
- 10 • Conditionally certifying the Class for settlement purposes only;
- 11 • Appointing Plaintiff as the class representative;
- 12 • Appointing Justice Law Corporation as Class Counsel;
- 13 • Approving the Court Approved Notice of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and
14 Hearing Date for Final Court Approval (“Class Notice”) attached as **Exhibit A** to
15 the Settlement Agreement;
- 16 • Directing the mailing of the Class Notice with a postage-paid return envelope to
17 the Class;
- 18 • Approving the proposed deadlines for the settlement administration process;
- 19 • Approving Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as the Administrator;
20 and
- 21 • Scheduling a hearing to consider whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement
22 Agreement, at which time the Court will also consider whether to grant Final
23 Approval of the requests for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel
24 Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, and
25 Administration Expenses Payment, and approval of the allocation of the Private
26 Attorney General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) Penalties.

27 ///

28 ///

1 This motion is based upon the following memorandum of points and authorities;
2 Declaration of Proposed Class Counsel (Douglas Han); Declaration of Proposed Class
3 Representative (Adam Llamas); Declaration of Defense Counsel (Jim Hart); Declaration of Philip
4 Steuber; Declaration of Jodey Lawrence; [Proposed] Order filed concurrently with this motion;
5 pleadings and other records on file with the Court in this matter; and such documentary evidence
6 and oral argument as may be presented at the hearing on this motion.

7
8 Dated: September 11, 2023

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

9
10 By: 
11 Douglas Han
12 *Attorney for Plaintiff*
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	10
II.	BACKGROUND	10
III.	INVESTIGATION/ LITIGATION HISTORY	10
a.	Discovery, Investigation, and the Parties' Staunchly Conflicting Positions	10
b.	The Parties Were Able to Reach an Agreement on Settlement of the Action	11
i.	The Parties Attended Mediation Which Led to the Settlement	11
ii.	The Settlement Was Reached as a Result of Arm's-Length Negotiations	11
iii.	The Settlement Is the Result of Thorough Investigation and Discovery	12
c.	Terms of the Proposed Settlement	12
i.	Deductions from the Settlement.....	12
ii.	Calculating Settlement Payments	12
iii.	Notice to the Class	13
iv.	Distribution of Funds	13
v.	Release of Claims	13
d.	Counsel for Both Parties Are Experienced in Similar Litigation	14
IV.	ARGUMENT	15
a.	Class Action Settlements Are Subject to Court Review	15
b.	The Proposed Settlement Is a Reasonable Compromise of Claims.....	15
i.	The Settlement Amount of \$900,000 Is Fair and Reasonable	16
ii.	The PAGA Penalties of \$50,000 Is Reasonable	17
c.	Discount Analysis Justifies the Settlement	18
d.	Conditional Certification of the Class Is Appropriate	19
i.	The Proposed Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous.....	19
ii.	Class Members Share a Well-defined Community of Interest	20

1	1.	Common Issues Predominate.....	20
2	2.	Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical of the Class Claims.....	20
3	3.	Plaintiff Is Adequate to Represent the Class.....	21
4	4.	Class Action is Superior for the Fair and Efficient Adjudication of	
5		this Controversy	21
6	e.	The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate	22
7	f.	Notice to the Class Complies with California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(f)	22
8	V.	CONCLUSION.....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Page(s)

Acosta v. TransUnion, LLC

(C.D. Cal. 2007) 240 F.R.D. 56418

Aguilar v. Cintas Corp. No. 2

(2006) 144 Cal.App.4th 12117

Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Management, LLC

(2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 52114

Bartold v. Glendale Federal Bank

(2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 81619

In re Beef Industry Antitrust Litigation

(5th Cir. 1979) 607 F.2d 16715

Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.

(N.D.Cal. 1979) 485 F.Supp.61012

Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court

(2012) 53 Cal.4th 100420

Capitol People First v. Department of Developmental Services

(2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 67620

Classen v. Weller

(1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 2720

Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.

(2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448.....18

Dunbar v. Albertson's Inc.

(2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 142217

Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.

(1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 179414, 22

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Espinoza v. Galardi South Enters.</i>	
(S.D.Fla. Jan. 11, 2016, No. 14-21244-CIV-GOODMAN) 2016 U.S.Dist.LEXIS.....	20
<i>In re General Motors Corp. Engine Interchange Litigation</i>	
(7th Cir. 1979) 594 F.2d 1106	18
<i>Ghazaryan v. Diva Limousine, Ltd.</i>	
(2008) 169 Cal.App.4th 1524	19
<i>Green v. Obledo</i>	
(1981) 29 Cal.3d 126	15
<i>Harris v. Superior Court</i>	
(2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 164	16
<i>Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp.</i>	
(2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 908	19
<i>Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.</i>	
(N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2009) No. 08-00844, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900	17
<i>Iowa Beef Processors, Inc. v. Meat Price Investigators Ass’n</i>	
(1981) 452 U.S. 905.....	15
<i>Jones v. JGC Dallas LLC</i>	
(N.D.Tex. Nov. 29, 2012, Civil Action No. 3:11-CV-2743-O) 2012 U.S.Dist.LEXIS	
185042.....	20
<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i>	
(2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116	15, 16
<i>Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.</i>	
(2000) 23 Cal.4th 429	19
<i>Linney v. Cellular Alaska Partnership</i>	
(9th Cir. 1998) 151 F.3d 1234	18

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i>	
(2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399	15, 16
<i>Nordstrom Com. Cases</i>	
(2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576	17
<i>Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court</i>	
(2004) 34 Cal.4th 319	16, 19, 20
<i>Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Mgmt.</i>	
(2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 1112	17
<i>Vasquez v. Superior Court</i>	
(1971) 4 Cal.3d 800	15
<i>Walsh v. IKON Office Solutions, Inc.</i>	
(2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1440	17
<u>Rules</u>	
California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769	15
California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769 (f)	22
California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769 (g).....	15
Federal Rule 23	15
<u>Statutes</u>	
Business & Professions Code § 17200	16
Code of Civil Procedure § 382.....	19, 22
Code of Civil Procedure § 877.6.....	16
Code of Civil Procedure § 1542.....	14
Labor Code § 201.....	17
Labor Code § 202.....	17
Labor Code § 203.....	17
Labor Code § 204.....	17

Statutes

Page(s)

Labor Code § 218.5.....	17
Labor Code § 221.....	17
Labor Code § 226.3.....	17
Labor Code § 226.7.....	17
Labor Code § 226(a)	17
Labor Code § 246.....	17
Labor Code § 510.....	17
Labor Code § 512 (a)	17
Labor Code § 558.....	17
Labor Code § 1174 (d).....	17
Labor Code § 1194.....	17
Labor Code § 1197.....	17
Labor Code § 1197.1.....	17
Labor Code § 1198.....	17
Labor Code § 2800.....	17
Labor Code § 2802.....	17

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 This motion seeks preliminary approval of a non-reversionary proposed wage-and-hour
3 class action settlement by Plaintiff on behalf of himself and all current and former hourly-paid or
4 non-exempt employees of Defendant Steuber Corporation d/b/a AltaFoodcraft Coffee and
5 Refreshment Services (“Defendant”) within the State of California at any time during the period
6 from January 13, 2017 to March 4, 2023 (“Class,” “Class Members,” and “Class Period”). At the
7 time of this filing, the number of Class Members is estimated to be two hundred (200), which was
8 confirmed by Defendant. (Declaration of Douglas Han In Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for
9 Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (“Han Decl.”), ¶¶ 8-9.)

10 **II. BACKGROUND**

11 On April 30, 2021, Plaintiff provided written notice to the Labor and Workforce
12 Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendant. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 10; Exhibit 3.)

13 On July 13, 2021, Plaintiff filed a wage-and-hour class action lawsuit in the Superior Court
14 of California, County of Los Angeles, alleging nine (9) causes of action. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶
15 11; Exhibit 4.)

16 After engaging in discovery, appeals, investigations, and negotiations, the Parties remotely
17 attended mediation with the mediator Francis J. Ortman III on October 20, 2022. (Han Decl.,
18 *supra*, at ¶ 12.) While the Parties did not initially reach a settlement, continued negotiations with
19 the assistance of the mediator eventually resulted in the settlement of this matter. (*Ibid.*)

20 **III. INVESTIGATION/ LITIGATION HISTORY**

21 **a. Discovery, Investigation, and the Parties’ Staunchly Conflicting Positions**

22 After initiating this lawsuit, the Parties engaged in discovery. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 14.)
23 The Parties met and conferred and agreed to engage in an informal exchange of information and
24 then eventually remotely attended mediation. (*Ibid.*) The Parties engaged in appellate work after
25 Defendant’s motion to compel arbitration and stay proceedings was denied by the Court. (*Ibid.*)

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 Prior to the mediation, Defendant produced several documents relating to its policies,
2 practices, and procedures. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 15.) As part of Defendant’s production, Plaintiff
3 also reviewed time records, pay records, and information relating to the size and scope of the Class.
4 (*Ibid.*) Several putative class members were also located and interviewed to attain a better
5 understanding of the extent and frequency of the alleged day-to-day violations. (*Ibid.*)

6 Based on the information provided by Defendant and interviews with putative class
7 members, Plaintiff contends – and Defendant denies – Defendant: (1) failed to provide employees
8 with legally mandated meal and rest breaks; (2) failed to pay employees for all hours worked; (3)
9 failed to compensate employees because of unlawful rounding; (4) failed to include non-
10 discretionary bonuses and incentives in employees’ regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime
11 compensation and sick leave pay; (5) failed to reimburse employees for necessary business
12 expenses; (6) issued noncompliant wage statements; and (7) is liable for waiting time penalties.
13 (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 17-25.)

14 **b. The Parties Were Able to Reach an Agreement on Settlement of the Action**

15 **i. The Parties Attended Mediation Which Led to the Settlement**

16 The Parties attended mediation with an experienced mediator on October 20, 2022. (Han
17 Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26.) Under the auspices of the mediator, the Parties eventually reached a
18 settlement, the terms were memorialized in the Settlement Agreement. (*Id.* at ¶ 26; Exhibits 2, 5.)

19 **ii. The Settlement Was Reached as a Result of Arm’s-Length Negotiations**

20 The Settlement was reached because of arm’s-length negotiations. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶
21 29.) Though cordial and professional, the settlement negotiations have always been adversarial
22 and non-collusive in nature. (*Ibid.*) At the mediation, the Parties’ counsel conducted extensive
23 arm’s-length settlement negotiations until an agreement was eventually reached. (*Ibid.*)

24 Plaintiff and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of additional proceedings
25 necessary to continue the litigation through trial and through any possible appeals. (Han Decl.,
26 *supra*, at ¶ 30.) Plaintiff and Class Counsel also considered the uncertainty and risk of further
27 litigation, potential outcome, and difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation. (*Ibid.*) Thus,
28 Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe the Settlement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement

1 and is in the best interests of Class Members. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 30.)

2 **iii. The Settlement Is the Result of Thorough Investigation and Discovery**

3 The Parties investigated and evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and
4 defenses before reaching the Settlement and engaged in research and discovery to support the
5 Settlement. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 31.) The Settlement was only possible following significant
6 investigation and evaluation of the relevant policies and practices, permitting Class Counsel to
7 engage in a comprehensive analysis of liability and potential damages. (*Ibid.*) This case has
8 reached the stage where the Parties understand “the strength of the case; the reasonableness of the
9 settlement in light of the attendant risks of litigation, and in light of the best possible recovery”
10 sufficient to support the Settlement’s reasonableness, adequacy, and fairness. (Han Decl., *supra*,
11 at ¶ 31; *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.* (N.D.Cal. 1979) 485 F.Supp. 610, 617.)

12 **c. Terms of the Proposed Settlement**

13 **i. Deductions from the Settlement**

14 The Parties agreed (subject to the Court’s approval) this action be settled and compromised
15 for the non-reversionary total sum of \$900,000 (“Gross Settlement Amount”) which includes: (1)
16 Class Counsel Fees Payment up to \$315,000 (35% of the Gross Settlement Amount); (2) Class
17 Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment up to \$25,000; (3) Class Representative Service Payment
18 up to \$10,000; (4) Administration Expenses Payment up to \$15,000; (5) PAGA Penalties up to
19 \$50,000; and (f) credit for \$156,000 already paid by Defendant. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 27.)

20 **ii. Calculating Settlement Payments**

21 After all Court-approved deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount, it is estimated
22 \$329,000 (“Net Settlement Amount”) will be paid to Participating Class Members – with a gross
23 *average* Individual Class Payment estimated at \$1,645. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 28.)

24 Participating Class Member will receive a proportionate share of the Net Settlement
25 Amount using the formula set forth in the Settlement Agreement. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26;
26 Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § 3.2.4.) Individual Class Payments will be allocated twenty percent (20%) to
27 the settlement of wages claims and eighty percent (80%) to the settlement of claims for interests
28 and penalties. (*Id.* at § 3.2.4.1.)

1 In addition, the portion of the PAGA Penalties that is to be paid to each Alleged Aggrieved
2 Employee shall be determined using the formula set forth in the Settlement Agreement. (Han
3 Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § 3.2.5.1.) Alleged Aggrieved Employees' portion of the
4 PAGA Penalties will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties. (*Id.* at § 3.2.5.2.)

5 **iii. Notice to the Class**

6 Not later than fifteen (15) days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the
7 Settlement, Defendant will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26;
8 Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § 4.2.) No later than fourteen (14) days after receiving the Class Data, the
9 Administrator will send the Class Notice to all Class Members identified in the Class Data via
10 first-class United States Postal Service mail. (*Id.* at § 7.4.2.)

11 **iv. Distribution of Funds**

12 The Gross Settlement Amount will be funded pursuant to the timeline and manner set forth
13 in the Settlement. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at §§ 4.3., 4.4.) Uncashed settlement
14 checks will be paid to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund. (*Id.* at § 4.4.3.)

15 **v. Release of Claims**

16 Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and
17 funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all
18 Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their former and present representatives,
19 agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from the
20 Released Class Claims. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § 5.2.)

21 Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and
22 funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, the
23 LWDA, State of California, and all Alleged Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release, on behalf
24 of themselves and their former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators,
25 successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims. (Han Decl., *supra*,
26 at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § 5.3.)

27 ///

28 ///

1 Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and
2 funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments,
3 Plaintiff and his respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs,
4 administrators, successors, and assigns generally, release and discharge Released Parties from
5 Plaintiff's Release. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § 5.1.) In addition, Plaintiff
6 expressly waives and relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of
7 the Civil Code. (*Id.* at § 5.1.1.)

8 With regards to class action releases, “[A] court may release not only those claims alleged
9 in the complaint and before the court, but also claims which ‘could have been alleged by reason of
10 or in connection with any matter or fact set forth or referred to in’ the complaint.”” (*Amaro v.*
11 *Anaheim Arena Management, LLC* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 521, 537.) The scope of the releases in
12 this case are acceptable because they are limited to the scope of the allegations in the operative
13 complaints. Moreover, the released claims are “‘based on *the identical factual predicate* as that
14 underlying the claims in the settled class action.”” (*Ibid.*) In other words, the released claims do
15 not “‘go beyond the scope of the allegations in the operative complaint’”” (*Ibid.*)

16 **d. Counsel for Both Parties Are Experienced in Similar Litigation**

17 The Parties' counsel are experienced in wage-and-hour employment law and class actions.
18 (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 2-7; Exhibit 1.) Class Counsel have prosecuted numerous cases on behalf
19 of employees for Labor Code violations and are experienced and qualified to evaluate the class
20 claims, settlement versus trial on a fully informed basis, and viability of the defenses. (*Ibid.*) This
21 experience instructed Class Counsel on the risks and uncertainties of further litigation and guided
22 their determination to endorse the Settlement.¹ (*Ibid.*)

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ¹ The final factor mentioned in *Dunk* – the number of objectors – is not determinable until
27 the Class Notice has been provided to the Class, and they have had an opportunity to respond. This
28 information will be provided to the Court in conjunction with the Motion for Final Approval of
Class Action Settlement.

1 **IV. ARGUMENT**

2 **a. Class Action Settlements Are Subject to Court Review**

3 California Rules of Court, rule 3.769 requires court approval for class action settlements.²
4 “Before final approval, the court must conduct an inquiry into the fairness of the proposed
5 settlement.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.769(g).) Rule 3.769 further requires a noticed motion for
6 preliminary approval of class settlements:

7 (a) A settlement or compromise of an entire class action, or a cause of action in
8 a class action, or as to a party, requires the approval of the court after
9 hearing.

10 (c) Any party to a settlement agreement may serve and file a written notice of
11 motion for preliminary approval of the settlement. The settlement
12 agreement and proposed notice to class members must be filed with the
13 motion, and the proposed order must be lodged with the motion.

14 Courts have discretion to approve settlements that are fair, not collusive, and consider “all
15 the normal perils of litigation as well as the additional uncertainties inherent in complex class
16 actions.” (*In re Beef Industry Antitrust Litigation* (5th Cir. 1979) 607 F.2d 167, 179, cert. den. *sub*
17 *nom. Iowa Beef Processors, Inc. v. Meat Price Investigators Ass’n* (1981) 452 U.S. 905.)

18 **b. The Proposed Settlement Is a Reasonable Compromise of Claims**

19 An understanding of the amount in controversy is an important factor in whether the
20 settlement “of the class members’ claims is reasonable in light of the strengths and weaknesses of
21 the claims and the risks of the particular litigation.” (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168
22 Cal.App.4th 116, 129; see also *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186
23 Cal.App.4th 399, 409.) The most important factor in this regard is ““the strength of the case for
24 plaintiffs on the merits, balanced against the amount offered in settlement.”” (*Kullar*, at p. 130;
25 see also *Munoz*, at p. 409.)

26 ///

27 ///

28 ² The California Supreme Court has also authorized California’s trial courts to use Federal Rule 23 and cases applying it for guidance in considering class issues. (See *Vasquez v. Superior Court* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 800, 821; see *Green v. Obledo* (1981) 29 Cal.3d 126, 145-146.) Where appropriate, the Parties cite Federal Rule 23 and federal case law in addition to California law.

1 *Kullar* instructs the court is not to “decide the merits of the case or to substitute its
2 evaluation of the most appropriate settlement for that of the attorneys.” (*Kullar v. Foot Locker*
3 *Retail, Inc.*, *supra*, 168 Cal.App.4th at p. 133.) *Kullar* does not require a statement of the maximum
4 amount the class could recover if plaintiff prevailed on all his claims, provided there is a record
5 that allows “‘an understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of
6 outcomes of the litigation.’” (*Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles*, *supra*, 186
7 Cal.App.4th at p. 409.) “[A]s the court does when it approves a settlement as in good faith under
8 Code of Civil Procedure § 877.6, the court must at least satisfy itself that the class settlement is
9 within the ‘ballpark’ of reasonableness.” (*Kullar*, at p. 133.)

10 **i. The Settlement Amount of \$900,000 Is Fair and Reasonable**

11 The Settlement Agreement was only possible following significant investigation and
12 evaluation of the relevant policies and procedures, as well as the data produced, as referenced in
13 Section III above, permitting Class Counsel to engage in a comprehensive analysis of liability and
14 potential damages. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 31.)

15 The claims are predicated on the purported: (1) failure to properly calculate and pay
16 overtime wages; (2) failure to pay minimum wages; (3) failure to provide meal and rest breaks and
17 consistently pay applicable premium wages; (4) failure to timely pay wages; (5) failure to issue
18 compliant wage statements; (6) failure to reimburse business expenses; (7) violation of PAGA;
19 and (8) violation of Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶
20 32.) Defendant vehemently denies the theories of liability. (*Id.* at ¶ 33.)

21 While Plaintiff believes the case is suitable for certification, uncertainties with respect to
22 certification are always present. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 34.) As the California Supreme Court
23 ruled in *Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319, class certification is
24 always a matter of the trial court’s sound discretion. (*Ibid.*) Decisions following *Sav-On Drug*
25 *Stores, Inc.* have reached different conclusions concerning certification of wage-and-hour claims.³
26 (*Ibid.*) Thus, the calculations for potential damages were discounted.

27
28 ³ (See e.g. *Harris v. Superior Court* (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 164 [reversing decertification
of class claiming misclassification and ordering summary adjudication in favor of employees],

1 **ii. The PAGA Penalties of \$50,000 Is Reasonable**

2 The provisions of the Labor Code potentially triggering PAGA penalties in this case
3 include Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512(a),
4 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 44.) Defendant
5 asserted, regardless of the results of the underlying causes of action, PAGA penalties are not
6 mandatory but permissive and discretionary. (*Ibid.*) Defendant also maintained it had a strong
7 argument it would be unjust to award maximum PAGA penalties given the law’s current unsettled
8 state concerning PAGA penalties. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 44; *Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Mgmt.*
9 (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 1112 [reducing penalties by 30% under this authority].) Furthermore,
10 Defendant argued without stacking and limited to the initial violation, the PAGA penalties would
11 be limited to about **\$13,500** (135 employees x \$100 penalty for initial violation) on the low end
12 and **\$94,500** (135 employees x \$100 penalty for initial violation x 7 theories of recovery) on the
13 high end. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 45-47.)

14 Plaintiff recognized the risk that any PAGA award could be reduced. (Han Decl., *supra*,
15 at ¶ 48.) Many of the causes of action brought were also duplicative of the statutory claims. (*Ibid.*)
16 Allocating \$50,000 to PAGA civil penalties was reasonable given that Defendant is also paying
17 an additional \$850,000 in the class settlement. (*Ibid.*) When PAGA penalties are negotiated in
18 good faith and “there is no indication that [the] amount was the result of self-interest at the expense
19 of other Class Members,” such amounts are reasonable.⁴ (*Ibid.*)

20 Considering the defenses, supporting evidence, and position that the case is not suitable for
21 class treatment, the Settlement Agreement is reasonable, adequate, and fair.

22 _____
23 review granted Nov. 28, 2007, (2007) 171 P.3d 545 [not cited as precedent, but rather for
24 illustrative purposes only]; *Walsh v. IKON Office Solutions, Inc.* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1440
25 [affirming decertification of class claiming misclassification]; *Aguiar v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2006)
26 144 Cal.App.4th 121 [reversing denial of certification]; *Dunbar v. Albertson’s Inc.* (2006) 141
27 Cal.App.4th 1422 [affirming denial of certification].)

28 ⁴ (*Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.* (N.D.Cal. Apr. 3, 2009, No. CV-08-0844 EDL) 2009
U.S.Dist.LEXIS 33900, at *24; see e.g. *Nordstrom Com. Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576, 579,
“[T]rial court did not abuse its discretion in approving a settlement which does not allocate any
damages to the PAGA claims”.)

c. Discount Analysis Justifies the Settlement

Excluding the civil penalties, which could be completely discretionary, the total estimated potential exposure, assuming certification and prevailing at trial, would be about **\$2,664,636.73** on the low end and around **\$2,933,294.66** on the high end. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 49.)

Category	Potential Exposure	Certification Risk	Merits Risk	Realistic Exposure
Rest Break Premiums	\$474,705.04	65%	60%	\$66,458.71
Meal Break Premiums	\$558,730.34	55%	50%	\$125,714.33
Overtime/Minimum Wage: Off-the-Clock Work	\$537,019.67 to \$805,677.60	50%	50%	\$134,254.92 to \$201,419.40
Rounding	\$4,913.23	25%	45%	\$2,026.71
Regular Rate	\$3,938.05	25%	35%	\$1,919.80
Unreimbursed Business Expenses	\$136,710	20%	65%	\$38,278.80
Wage Statement Penalty	\$330,750	30%	30%	\$163,067.50
Waiting Time Penalty	\$617,870.40	30%	30%	\$302,756.50
MAXIMUM TOTAL EXPOSURE	\$2,664,636.73 to \$2,933,294.66⁵			\$834,477.27 to \$901,641.75⁶

The realistic recovery for this case is about **\$834,477.27** on the low end and **\$901,641.75** on the high end. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 58.) The Gross Settlement Amount is about thirty percent (30.68%) of the maximum potential exposure and around ninety-nine percent (99.82%) of the maximum realistic exposure at trial, which is an excellent settlement. (*Ibid.*)

The only question at preliminary approval is whether the settlement is within the range of possible approval. (*In re General Motors Corp. Engine Interchange Litigation* (7th Cir. 1979) 594 F.2d 1106, 1124; *Acosta v. TransUnion, LLC* (C.D. Cal. 2007) 240 F.R.D. 564, 575.) “The fact that a proposed settlement may only amount to a fraction of the potential recovery does not, in and of itself, mean that the proposed settlement is grossly inadequate and should be disapproved.” (*Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.* (2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448, 455; see also *Linney v. Ceullar Alaska Partnership* (9th Cir. 1998) 151 F.3d 1234, 1242, “[I]t is the very uncertainty of outcome in

⁵ (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 35-43.)

⁶ (*Id.* at ¶¶ 50-57.)

1 litigation and avoidance of wasteful and expensive litigation that induce consensual settlements.
2 The proposed settlement is not to be judged against a hypothetical or speculative measure of what
3 might have been achieved by the negotiators”). This settlement is in line with the realistic exposure
4 if Plaintiff prevailed at trial and provides a significant recovery for Class Members.

5 **d. Conditional Certification of the Class Is Appropriate**

6 Code of Civil Procedure section 382 “authorizes class actions ‘when the question is one of
7 a common or general interest, of many persons, or when the parties are numerous, and it is
8 impracticable to bring them all before the court.’” (*Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court*,
9 *supra*, 34 Cal.4th at p. 326.) California courts certify class actions if plaintiff identifies “both [1]
10 an ascertainable class and [2] a well-defined community of interest among class members.” (*Ibid.*)

11 The Class is ascertainable and numerous as to make it impracticable to join all Class
12 Members, and there are common questions of law and fact that predominate over any questions
13 affecting any individual Class Member. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 59.) Plaintiff contends his claims
14 are typical of the claims of the Class, and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the
15 interests of the Class. (*Ibid.*) Plaintiff asserts the prosecution of separate actions by individual
16 Class Members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications. (*Ibid.*)

17 **i. The Proposed Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous**

18 “Ascertainability is required in order to give notice to putative class members as to whom
19 the judgment in the action will be res judicata.” (*Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp.* (2001)
20 89 Cal.App.4th 908, 914.) “A class is ascertainable if it identifies a group of unnamed plaintiffs
21 by describing a set of common characteristics sufficient to allow a member of that group to identify
22 himself or herself as having a right to recover based on the description.” (*Bartold v. Glendale*
23 *Federal Bank* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 816, 828.) The proposed class must also be sufficiently
24 numerous. (*Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429, 435.)

25 This case involves approximately two hundred (200) Class Members, meaning the Class is
26 sufficiently numerous. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 60; *Ghazaryan v. Diva Limousine, Ltd.* (2008) 169
27 Cal.App.4th 1524, 1531, n.5 [finding a proposed class of “as many as 190 current and former
28 employees” is sufficiently numerous].)

1 **ii. Class Members Share a Well-defined Community of Interest**

2 The community of interest requirement “embodies three factors: (1) predominant common
3 questions of law or fact; (2) class representatives with claims or defenses typical of the class; and
4 (3) class representatives who can adequately represent the class.” (*Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v.*
5 *Superior Court, supra*, 34 Cal.4th at p. 326.) “[T]he community of interest requirement for
6 certification *does not mandate that class members have uniform or identical claims.*” (*Capitol*
7 *People First v. Department of Developmental Services* (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 676, 692 (emphasis
8 in original).) Rather, courts focus on the defendant’s internal policies and “pattern and practice . .
9 . in order to assess whether that common behavior toward similarly situated plaintiffs renders class
10 certification appropriate.” (*Ibid.*) The application of each of these factors is discussed below.

11 **1. Common Issues Predominate**

12 The “common issues” requirement “involves analysis of whether the proponent’s ‘theory
13 of recovery’ is likely to prove compatible with class treatment.” (*Capitol People First v.*
14 *Department of Developmental Services, supra*, 155 Cal.App.4th at p. 690.) In other words, courts
15 determine whether the elements necessary to establish liability are susceptible to common proof,
16 even if the class members must individually prove their damages. (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
17 *Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1024). These types of claims are regularly granted class
18 certification when the plaintiff can present evidence of common policies. (See, e.g., *Jones v. JGC*
19 *Dallas LLC* (N.D.Tex. Nov. 29, 2012, Civil Action No. 3:11-CV-2743-O) 2012 U.S.Dist.LEXIS
20 185042 [certified collective action involving 190 dancers]; *Espinoza v. Galardi South Enters.*
21 (S.D.Fla. Jan. 11, 2016, No. 14-21244-CIV-GOODMAN) 2016 U.S.Dist.LEXIS 2904 [court
22 certified class of dancers on state law claims].)

23 Plaintiff asserts common issues of fact and law predominate as to each of the claims
24 alleged. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 61.) Plaintiff contends all Class Members were subject to the same
25 or similar employment practices, policies, and procedures described in detail above. (*Ibid.*)

26 **2. Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical of the Class Claims**

27 Typical claims rely on legal theories and facts that are substantially like those of other class
28 members. (*Classen v. Weller* (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 27, 46.)

1 Plaintiff is a former employee of Defendant and alleges he and Class Members were employed
2 by the same company and injured by the common policies and practices related to the claims
3 described above. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 62; Declaration of Adam Llamas Re Adequacy In Support
4 of Motion for Preliminary Approval (“Llamas Decl.”), ¶¶ 2-8, 12-15.) Plaintiff seeks relief for
5 these claims and derivative claims on behalf of the Class. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 62; Llamas Decl.,
6 *supra*, at ¶¶ 2-8, 12-15.) Thus, the claims arise from the same employment practices and are based
7 on the same legal theories applicable to the Class. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 62; Llamas Decl., *supra*,
8 at ¶¶ 2-8, 12-15.)

9 **3. Plaintiff Is Adequate to Represent the Class**

10 Plaintiff has proven to be an adequate class representative. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 63;
11 Llamas Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 9-11, 16-20.) Plaintiff conducted himself diligently and responsibly in
12 representing the Class in this litigation, understands the fiduciary obligations, and actively
13 participated in the prosecution of this case. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 63; Llamas Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶
14 9-11, 16-20.) Plaintiff spent time in meetings and conferences with Class Counsel to provide them
15 with a complete understanding of the work experience and environment. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶
16 63; Llamas Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 9-11, 16-20.) Plaintiff also has no interest averse to the interests of
17 the other Class Members. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 63; Llamas Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 9-11, 16-20.)

18 **4. Class Action Is Superior for the Fair and Efficient Adjudication** 19 **of this Controversy**

20 A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of
21 this controversy. Plaintiff contends the joinder of all Class Members is impractical and that class
22 treatment will permit many similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims for
23 settlement purposes simultaneously in a single forum without the duplication of effort and expense
24 that numerous individual actions would necessitate. Because several Class Members are also
25 current employees, Plaintiff believes fear of retaliation further supports the superiority of class-
26 wide relief as this fear often discourages current employees from seeking legal redress.

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

f. Notice to the Class Complies with California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(f)

California Rules of Court, rule 3.769(f), provides:

If the court has certified the action as a class action, notice of the final approval hearing must be given to class members in the manner specified by the court. The notice must contain an explanation of the proposed settlement and procedures for class members to follow in filing written objections to it and in arranging to appear at the settlement hearing and state any objections to the proposed settlement.

The Class Notice meets all these requirements. The Class Notice advises Class Members of their right to participate in the Settlement, how and when to object to or request exclusion from the Settlement, and date, time, and location of the Final Approval Hearing.

Plaintiff submits the Settlement is in the Class's best interests. Under the applicable class action criteria and guidelines, the Settlement should be preliminarily approved by the Court, Class should be conditionally certified for settlement purposes, and Class Notice should be approved.

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: D. Han
Douglas Han
Attorney for Plaintiff

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE
1013A(3) CCP**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101, Pasadena, CA 91103 and my electronic service address is jtorrez@justicelawcorp.com

On December 15, 2023, I served the foregoing document described as

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION, APPROVAL OF CLASS NOTICE, SETTING OF FINAL APPROVAL HEARING DATE; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF

for the following case: **Llamas v. Steuber Corporation d/b/a AltaFoodcraft Coffee and Refreshment Services**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA Case No.: CM-830930-21**
Court Case No.: 21STCV25673
Los Angeles County Superior Court

on interested parties in this action by electronically submitting as follows:

State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814


[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Pursuant to California Senate Bill No. 836, I caused the documents described above to be electronically submitted by and through the procedure stated on the website of the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

[X] STATE

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

Executed on December 15, 2023, at Pasadena, California.



Jessica Torrez