

Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943)
Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
Selena Matavosian (SBN 348044)
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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

TERESA BOND, JESSE ZAMARRIPA,
individually, and on behalf of other members
of the general public similarly situated;
REYNEIRO LARIOS, individually, and on
behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant
to the California Private Attorneys General
Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HANGER, INC., an unknown business entity;
HANGER ORTHOPEDIC GROUP, INC., an
unknown business entity; HANGER
PROSTHETICS & ORTHOTICS, INC., a
Delaware corporation; HANGER
PROSTHETICS & ORTHOTICS WEST,
INC., a California corporation; HANGER
FABRICATION NETWORK, LLC, an
unknown business entity; and DOES 2
through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 34-2021-00303204-CU-OE-GDS

Honorable Lauri A. Damrell
Department 22

CLASS ACTION

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION
AND MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT,
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS, AND
INCENTIVE AWARDS; MEMORANDUM
OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT THEREOF**

[Declaration of Class Counsel
(Joanna Ghosh); Declarations of Class
Representatives (Teresa Bond, Jesse
Zamarripa, and Reyneiro Larios);
Declaration of Settlement Administrator
(Jennifer Beliveau); and [Proposed] Final
Approval Order and Judgment filed
concurrently herein]

Date: April 19, 2024
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Department: 22

Complaint Filed: June 23, 2020
FAC Filed: December 27, 2022
Trial Date: None Set

1 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on April 19, 2024 at 9:00 a.m., in Department 22 of the
2 above-entitled Court, located at 720 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California 95814, Plaintiffs Teresa
3 Bond, Reyneiro Larios, and Jesse Zamarripa (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) will and hereby do move
4 for an order granting final approval of:

5 1. The Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release
6 (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”) on the grounds that the Settlement is
7 fair, adequate, and reasonable because:

- 8 • A Net Settlement Amount of approximately **\$985,010.66** will be fully distributed to all
9 members of the Settlement Class who do not submit a timely and valid Request for
10 Exclusion (“Settlement Class Members”);
- 11 • **No Objections** were submitted to the settlement administrator, Simpluris, Inc.
12 (“Settlement Administrator” or “Simpluris”);
- 13 • **Two (2) Requests for Exclusion** were submitted to the Settlement Administrator;

14 2. Payment in the amount of **\$750,000.00** to Lawyers for Justice, PC (“Class
15 Counsel”), representing one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, for attorneys’ fees, which
16 is reasonable and justified on a percentage-basis and also based on a lodestar cross-check with a
17 multiplier of 1.30;

18 3. Payment in the amount of **\$24,994.34** to Class Counsel for reimbursement of
19 litigation costs and expenses;

20 4. Payment in the amount of **\$9,995.00** to the Settlement Administrator for
21 Administration Fees;

22 5. Payment in the amount of **\$10,000.00** each to Plaintiffs Teresa Bond, Jesse
23 Zamarripa, and Reyneiro Larios as Incentive Awards, for their time and effort in representing the
24 Class; and

25 6. Allocation of the penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004,
26 California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, in the amount of \$450,000.00, of which seventy-five
27 percent (75%), or **\$337,500.00**, will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development
28

Agency (“LWDA”) (“LWDA Payment”) and twenty-five percent (25%), or **\$112,500.00**, will be distributed to PAGA Group Members (“PAGA Group Member Amount”).

This Motion is made pursuant to Rule 3.769 and Rule 3.1113(e) of the California Rules of Court, which require approval by the Court of a class action settlement and permit the Court to extend the page limit for memoranda.

This motion is based upon the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities; the Declarations of Class Counsel (Joanna Ghosh), Class Representatives (Teresa Bond, Jesse Zamarripa, and Reyneiro Larios) and Settlement Administrator (Jennifer Beliveau of Simpluris) in support thereof; the pleadings and other records on file with the Court in this matter; and such evidence and oral argument as may be presented at the hearing on this Motion.

Dated: March 27, 2024

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

By: _____



Selena Matavosian
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	SUMMARY OF MOTION	1
II.	PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
III.	SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS AND PLAN OF DISTRIBUTION.	5
IV.	THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION PROCESS	7
V.	THE COURT SHOULD GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT.....	9
A.	The Settlement Resulted from Arm’s-Length Negotiations Based Upon Extensive Investigation and Informal Discovery.....	10
B.	The Risks Inherent in Continued Litigation Favor Final Approval of the Settlement.	13
C.	The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.	14
D.	The Class Was Represented by Competent Counsel.....	16
E.	There Are No Objections to the Settlement.....	16
VI.	THE ATTORNEYS’ FEES AWARD REQUESTED BY CLASS COUNSEL IS FAIR AND REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.	16
A.	Legal Standard for Attorneys’ Fees in a Class Action Settlement.....	16
B.	A Fee Award of a Percentage of the Entire Fund Is Appropriate.	18
C.	The Attorneys’ Fees Award Requested by Class Counsel Is Reasonable Based on the Factors Considered in Determination of Fee Awards.....	21
	1. Time & Labor.....	21
	2. The Skill Required to Perform Legal Services Properly.....	23
	3. The Value of the Settlement for the Class Members.....	23
	4. Whether the Fee Is Fixed or Contingent.....	24
	5. The Amount Involved and the Results Achieved.	25
	6. The Reputation and Ability of the Attorneys.	26
D.	The Lodestar Methodology Also Justifies Approval of the Requested Fees, Because Class Counsel Has Performed Work That Is of Significant Value	

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

Based On Reasonable Hours and Prevailing Hourly Rates of Compensation.
..... 26

1. The Number of Hours Spent on the Litigation was Reasonable..... 27

**2. The Fees Requested Represent a Reasonable Hourly Rate of
Compensation in Light of Class Counsel’s Efforts and Experience.
28**

**3. The Risks Involved, Skill Required, Complexity of the Matter, and
Results Obtained Warrant Upward Enhancement of the Lodestar. 29**

**VII. COSTS TO BE REIMBURSED TO CLASS COUNSEL ARE FAIR AND
REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED..... 32**

**VIII. THE ADMINISTRATION FEES ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE AND SHOULD
BE APPROVED..... 32**

**IX. THE REQUESTED INCENTIVE AWARDS ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE
AND SHOULD BE APPROVED. 33**

X. CONCLUSION 34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> (2000) 85 Cal.App.4 th 1135.....	10, 16
<i>Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.</i> (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195..	18
<i>Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert</i> (1980) 444 U.S. 472.....	18, 20
<i>Cates v. Chiang</i> (2013) 213 Cal.App.4 th 791.....	25
<i>Cellphone Termination Fee Cases</i> (2009) 180 Cal.App.4 th 1110.....	17
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> (2008) 162 Cal.App.4 th 43	9, 10, 18, 31
<i>Consumer Privacy Cases</i> (2009) 175 Cal.App.4 th 545.....	17
<i>County of San Bernardino</i> (C.D. Cal. 2006) 624 F.Supp.2d 1113.....	31
<i>Crampton v. Takegoshi</i> (1993) 17 Cal.App.4 th 308	19
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (1996) 48 Cal.App.4 th 1794.....	10, 16, 17
<i>Graham v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4 th 553.....	29
<i>Green v. Obledo</i> (1981) 29 Cal.3d 126.....	18
<i>In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc., Securities Litigation</i> (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 127	
F.Supp.2d 418.....	15
<i>In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litigation</i> (D. D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp. 494	18
<i>Ketchum v. Moses</i> (2001) 24 Cal.4 th 1122.....	17, 27, 28, 29, 30
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.</i> (2016) 1 Cal.5 th 480.....	17, 19, 26
<i>Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc.</i> (2000) 82 Cal.App.4 th 19	17, 20
<i>Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt v. Gaulty</i> (1989) 886 F.2d 268	18
<i>Serrano v. Priest</i> (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25.....	18
<i>Vasquez v. Superior Court</i> (1971) 4 Cal.3d 800	18
<i>Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.</i> (9th Cir. 1977) 557 F.2d 759	18, 19
<i>Vizcaino v. Microsoft</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 290 F.3d 1043.....	19
<i>Vo v. Las Virgenes Municipal Water Dist.</i> (2000) 79 Cal.App.4 th 440.....	27
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.</i> (2d Cir. 2005) 396 F.3d 96.....	31
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> (2001) 91 Cal.App.4 th 224.....	10, 16, 20, 21, 30, 31

1	<i>Winslow v. Harold G. Ferguson Corp.</i> (1944) 25 Cal.2d 274.....	20
2	Statutes	
3	Cal. Lab. Code § 2698	1
4	Other Authorities	
5	A. Conte, <i>Attorney Fee Awards</i> (2d Ed., 1993)	19
6	<u>California Practice Guide</u> , <i>Civil Procedure Before Trial</i> , Chapter 14	17
7	Conte & Newberg, <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> (4th Ed., 2002) § 11.47.....	16, 25
8	Conte & Newberg, <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> (4th Ed., 2002) § 14.03	18
9	<i>Court Awarded Attorney Fees, Report of the Third Circuit Task Force</i> (October 8, 1985) 108	
10	F.R.D. 237	25
11	R. Pearle, <i>California Attorney Fee Awards</i> (CEB, 1993) § 7A	18
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION

Plaintiffs Teresa Bond, Jesse Zamarripa, and Reyneiro Larios (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) seek final approval of: (1) the Gross Settlement Amount of \$2,250,000.00¹; (2) attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$750,000.00 which is one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount², and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$24,994.34 (together, “Attorneys’ Fees and Costs”) to Lawyers for Justice, PC (“Class Counsel”); (3) Administration Fees in the amount of \$9,995.00 to Simpluris, Inc. (“Simpluris” or “Settlement Administrator”); (4) Incentive Awards in the amount of \$10,000.00 each to Plaintiffs Teresa Bond, Jesse Zamarripa, and Reyneiro Larios, for a combined amount of \$30,000.00; and (5) allocation of \$450,000.00 for penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA Allocation”).

Plaintiffs seek relief on behalf of the following Class:

All current and former hourly, non-exempt employees of Defendants in California at any time during the Class Period (“Class” or “Class Members”).³

This matter involved ongoing investigations, formal and informal discovery, review and analysis of a large volume of documents and data prior to and during mediation conducted by Jeffrey Krivis, Esq., and settlement negotiations thereafter. This matter has required 583.00 hours of attorney time by Class Counsel. As will be demonstrated herein, the request for attorneys’ fees, which represents one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, is fully supported by the use of the percentage-fee method. Courts have historically awarded fees of up to fifty percent (50%) of the recovery. The requested attorneys’ fees are also supported under the lodestar cross-check method.⁴

///

///

¹ Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release (“Settlement Agreement”), ¶ 7.q.

² The Settlement Agreement and Class Notice provide that Class Counsel will seek an award of up to 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount. However, Class Counsel only seeks attorneys’ fees equal to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount.

³ *Id.*, ¶ 7.f. “Class Period” is defined as the period from June 23, 2016 through September 8, 2022, subject to Paragraph 38 of the Settlement Agreement. *See id.*, ¶ 7.h.

⁴ Applying a modest multiplier of 1.30, the total enhanced lodestar fees are \$754,479.70, and Class Counsel seeks an attorneys’ fees award of \$750,000.00 (equal one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount).

1 Plaintiffs move for final approval of the Incentive Awards in the amount of \$10,000.00
2 each to Plaintiffs Teresa Bond, Jesse Zamarripa, and Reyneiro Larios, to compensate Plaintiffs for
3 the time and effort that they expended spearheading the lawsuits on behalf of the Class, PAGA
4 Group Members, and the State of California. Plaintiffs also move for final approval of the payment
5 to the Settlement Administrator in the amount of \$9,995.00 for Administration Fees. Plaintiffs also
6 move for final approval of the allocation of \$450,000.00 for the PAGA Allocation, of which
7 seventy-five percent (75%), i.e., \$337,500.00, will be paid to the California Labor Workforce and
8 Development Agency (“LWDA”) for its portion of the PAGA Allocation (“LWDA Payment”),
9 and twenty-five percent (25%) (“PAGA Group Member Amount”), i.e., \$112,500.00, will be
10 distributed to all current and former hourly, non-exempt employees of Defendants in California at
11 any time during the PAGA Period (“PAGA Group Members”).⁵

12 The requests for Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Enhancement Awards, Administration Fees,
13 and allocation for the PAGA Allocation were fully disclosed in the Notice of Class Action
14 Settlement (“Class Notice”) that was mailed to the Class Members. Most importantly, as of the
15 date of this Motion, *not a single Class Member has objected to any aspect of the Settlement,*
16 *including the requested Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Incentive Awards, Administration Fees, or*
17 *allocation for PAGA Allocation.*

18 The Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and is the product of arm’s-length, good-
19 faith negotiations by experienced counsel presided over by a highly-regarded mediator who is
20 experienced in mediating wage-and-hour class action lawsuits. Accordingly, the Court should
21 grant final approval of the Settlement, and award Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Incentive Awards,
22 Administration Fees, and PAGA Allocation in the amounts as fully disclosed to the Class and as
23 requested herein.

24 In order to efficiently present the Court with adequate information to determine whether to
25 grant final approval of the Settlement and award Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Incentive Awards,
26 Administration Fees, and PAGA Allocation, Plaintiffs also move for an order permitting the filing
27

28 ⁵ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 7.z. “PAGA Period” is defined as the period from April 5, 2020, through September 8, 2022. Subject to Paragraph 38 of the Settlement Agreement. See *id.*, ¶ 7.bb.

of this single consolidated memorandum, although it exceeds the page limit established by California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1113(d), instead of filing several separate motions.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants Hanger, Inc., Hanger Orthopedic Group, Inc., Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics, Inc., Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics West, Inc., and Hanger Fabrication Network, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) create prostheses, braces, supports, cranial helmets and other medical devices. Plaintiffs Teresa Bond, Reyneiro Larios, and Jesse Zamarripa are former employees of Defendants.

On June 23, 2020, Plaintiff Teresa Bond filed a Class Action Complaint for Damages in the Riverside County Superior Court, thereby commencing a putative class action entitled *Teresa Bond v. Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics, Inc., et al.*, Case No. RIC2002278 (the “*Bond* Action”).

On August 20, 2020, Defendants Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics, Inc. and Hanger P&O West filed an Answer to Plaintiff Teresa Bond’s Complaint for Damages in the *Bond* Action.

On September 9, 2020, Plaintiff Teresa Bond propounded multiple sets of discovery including Special Interrogatories (Set One) on Defendant Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics, Inc. and Special Interrogatories (Set One) on Defendant Hanger P&O West. Thereafter, on October 14, 2020, Defendants Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics, Inc. and Hanger P&O West responded to Plaintiff’s discovery requests. Class Counsel also prepared a *Belaire-West* notice.

On April 5, 2021, Plaintiff Reyneiro Larios provided written notice by online submission to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that were alleged to be violated (the “LWDA Notice”).

On June 25, 2021, Plaintiff Reyneiro Larios filed his Complaint for Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code § 2698 Et Seq. (“PAGA”), thereby commencing the above-captioned action entitled *Reyneiro Larios v. Hanger Inc., et al.*, Superior Court of California for the County of Sacramento (“Court”), Case No. 34-2021-00303203-CU-OE-GDS (the “*Larios* Action,” collectively with the *Bond* Action, the “Actions”).

On October 8, 2021, Defendants filed an Answer to Plaintiff Reyneiro Lario’s Complaint in the *Larios* Action.

1 Defendants have denied, and continue to deny, any liability and wrongdoing of any kind
2 associated with any of the allegations in the Actions, and further deny that the Actions are
3 appropriate for class treatment or representative adjudication for any purpose other than for
4 settlement purposes only.

5 On December 27, 2022, Plaintiff Reyneiro Larios filed a First Amended Class Action
6 Complaint for Damages and Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, California
7 Labor Code § 2698, *Et Seq.*, adding Teresa Bond and Jesse Zamarripa as named plaintiffs, adding
8 class causes of action, and adding Hanger Fabrication Network, LLC as an additional defendant
9 in the *Larios* Action (“Operative Complaint”).

10 Plaintiffs’ core allegation is that Defendants have violated the California Labor Code by
11 engaging in a uniform practice and procedure, with respect to Plaintiffs and the Class Members,
12 of, *inter alia*, failing to pay all overtime and minimum wages, failing to provide compliant meal
13 and rest periods and associated premium pay, failing to timely pay wages during employment and
14 upon termination of employment, failing to provide compliant wage statements, failing to maintain
15 requisite payroll records, and failing to reimburse necessary business expenses, and thereby
16 engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code
17 section 17200, *et seq.* and conduct that gives rise to penalties pursuant to PAGA. Plaintiffs
18 contend that they, and the Class Members, are entitled to, *inter alia*, unpaid wages, penalties
19 (including and not limited to, penalties pursuant to PAGA), and attorneys’ fees.

20 The Parties have actively litigated the Actions since the *Bond* Action was commenced on
21 June 23, 2020 and the *Larios* Action was commenced on June 25, 2021. On May 4, 2022, the
22 Parties participated in a formal, full-day mediation conducted by Jeffrey Krivis, Esq., a well-
23 regarded mediator experienced in mediating complex labor and employment matters (the
24 “Mediator”). With the aid of the Mediator’s evaluation, the Parties ultimately reached the
25 Settlement described herein to resolve the Actions in their entirety.

26 On April 26, 2023, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action
27 Settlement and supporting documents (“Motion for Preliminary Approval”). On May 17, 2023,
28 the Court issued a tentative ruling in which it deemed the matter as complex and re-assigned the

case to Department 28 (“May 17, 2023 Tentative Ruling”). On May 18, 2023, the Court issued a Minute Order which affirmed the May 17, 2023 Tentative Ruling. On June 5, 2023, Plaintiffs filed the Motion for Preliminary Approval with the updated hearing date. On August 4, 2023, the Court issued a minute order in which it raised multiple points of inquiry with regard to the Motion for Preliminary Approval, requested supplemental briefing in regards to the Motion for Preliminary Approval to be filed by September 25, 2023, and continued the hearing on the Motion for Preliminary Approval to October 6, 2023. On September 15, 2023, Plaintiffs submitted supplemental briefing in support of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. On October 6, 2023, the Court issued a minute order continuing the hearing on the Motion for Preliminary Approval to October 20, 2023. On October 19, 2023, the Court issued a tentative ruling in which it granted Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval. On October 23, 2023, the Court entered an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (“Preliminary Approval Order”), thereby preliminarily approving the terms of the Settlement, the Class Notice, and the proposed administration procedures and associated deadlines.

Plaintiffs now move for final approval of the Settlement, Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Incentive Awards, Administration Fees, and allocation for PAGA Allocation.

III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS AND PLAN OF DISTRIBUTION

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Defendant has agreed to pay a Gross Settlement Amount of \$2,250,000.00 and the employer’s share of taxes and contributions in connection with the wages portion of Individual Settlement Shares (“Employer Taxes”) within thirty (30) calendar days after the Effective Date.⁶ Subject to approval by the Court, the Net Settlement Amount will be calculated by deducting the following amounts from the Gross Settlement Amount: (1) Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, consisting of attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$750,000.00 and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$24,994.34, to Class Counsel; (2) Incentive Awards in the amount of \$10,000.00 each to Plaintiffs Teresa Bond, Jesse Zamarripa, and Reyneiro Larios, for a combined amount of \$30,000.00; (3) Administration Fees in the amount of \$9,995.00 to Simpluris; and (4) PAGA Allocation in the amount of

⁶ Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 7.n & 11.a.

1 \$450,000.00.⁷ The Net Settlement Amount, which is estimated to be \$985,010.66, will be
2 distributed in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.⁸

3 The Settlement Administrator will determine each Settlement Class Member's *pro rata*
4 share of the Net Settlement Amount ("Individual Settlement Share"), according to the following
5 methodology: After Final Approval of the Settlement, the Settlement Administrator will divide the
6 final Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Settlement Class Members to yield the
7 "Final Workweek Value," and multiply each Settlement Class Member's individual Workweeks
8 by the Final Workweek Value to yield his or her Individual Settlement Share.⁹

9 The Settlement Administrator will determine each PAGA Group Member's *pro rata* share
10 of the PAGA Group Member Amount ("Individual PAGA Payment"), according to the following
11 methodology: the Settlement Administrator will divide the PAGA Group Member Amount by the
12 Workweeks of all PAGA Group Members during the PAGA Period to yield the "PAGA
13 Workweek Value," and multiply each PAGA Group Member's individual Workweeks during the
14 PAGA Period by the PAGA Workweek Value to yield his or her Individual PAGA Payment that
15 he or she may be eligible to receive under the PAGA Settlement.¹⁰

16 Class Members had sixty (60) calendar days from the initial mailing of the Class Notice
17 ("Response Deadline") to submit a Request for Exclusion, Notice of Objection and/or dispute of
18 the Workweeks.¹¹ The Response Deadline was March 25, 2024.¹² ***As of the date of this Motion,***
19 ***the Settlement Administrator has not received any written objections ("Notice of Objection")***
20 ***and only two (2) request to be excluded from the Class Settlement ("Requests for Exclusion").***

21 ¹³

22 Each Individual Settlement Share will be allocated as follows: twenty percent (20%) as
23 wages, which will be reported on an IRS Form W-2; and the remaining eighty percent (80%) as

24 ⁷ Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 12, 13, 14 & 15.

25 ⁸ This amount is higher than the amount stated in Paragraph 17 of the accompanying Declaration of Jennifer Beliveau Regarding
26 Notice and Settlement Administration ("Simpluris Declaration" or Simpluris Decl.") because the Settlement Administrator's
27 calculation assumes that Class Counsel will obtain litigation costs and expenses in the maximum amount of \$40,000.00, which is
28 allocated under the Settlement. However, Class Counsel seeks the amount of only \$24,994.34 for reimbursement of litigation costs
and expenses, and the difference of \$15,005.66 will remain part of the Net Settlement Amount.

⁹ Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 7.u & 16.b.

¹⁰ *Id.*, ¶¶ 7.s & 17. "PAGA Settlement" is defined as the settlement and resolution of Released PAGA Claims. *See id.*, ¶ 7.cc.

¹¹ *Id.*, ¶ 7.ll.

¹² Simpluris Decl., ¶ 11.

¹³ *Id.*, ¶¶ 13. Settlement Agreement, ¶ 7.x.

penalties, interest, and non-wage damages, which will be reported on an IRS Form 1099.¹⁴ Settlement Class Members will be issued payment of their Individual Settlement Share subject to reduction for the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wage portion of each Individual Settlement Share (the net payment is referred to as an "Individual Settlement Payment").¹⁵ Defendant will pay the Employer Taxes in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount.¹⁶ Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties and will be reported on an IRS Form-1099 (if applicable) by the Settlement Administrator.¹⁷

Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment checks will be negotiable for one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days from the date the checks are issued, and thereafter, shall be canceled.¹⁸ The funds associated with such cancelled checks will be transmitted to the *cy pres*, Saint John's Program for Real Change, in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure section 384.¹⁹ Settlement Class Members whose Individual Settlement Payment checks are cancelled shall, nevertheless, be bound by the Class Settlement and PAGA Members whose Individual PAGA Payment checks are cancelled shall, nevertheless, be bound by the PAGA Settlement.²⁰

IV. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION PROCESS

The Court-appointed Settlement Administrator, Simpluris, has taken all necessary steps to effectuate the notice and settlement administration process, as set forth in the Court's Preliminary Approval Order.

On November 22, 2023, Defendant's counsel provided Simpluris a Class Data and List containing each Class Member's and PAGA Group Member's last-known full name, mailing address, telephone number, Social Security Number, dates worked as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee of Defendants in California during the Class Period and PAGA Period (if applicable),

¹⁴ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 27.

¹⁵ *Id.*, ¶¶ 7.i & 27.

¹⁶ *Id.*, ¶¶ 7.n & 11.a.

¹⁷ *Id.*, ¶ 27.

¹⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 22.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.* "Class Settlement" is defined as the settlement and resolution of all Released Class Claims. *See id.*, ¶ 7.i.

and such other information as is necessary for the Settlement Administrator to calculate Workweeks during the Class Period and PAGA Period (“Class Data and List”).²¹ The Class Data and List contained data for seven hundred and sixty-five (765).²² Of the seven hundred and sixty-five (765) individuals, three (3) records were removed as they were determined to be outside the class period, one (1) record was combined as they were determined to be duplicative and three (3) were removed as they were determined to have zero (0) Workweeks.²³ Ultimately, there are seven hundred and fifty-eight (758) records representing one hundred five thousand two hundred eighty-nine and thirty-five (105,289.35) Workweeks.²⁴ The mailing addresses contained in the Class Data and List were processed and updated utilizing the National Change of Address Database (“NCOA”) maintained by the U.S. Postal Service.²⁵ The NCOA contains requested changes of address filed with the U.S. Postal Service. In the event that any individual had filed a U.S. Postal Service change of address request, the address listed with the NCOA would be utilized in connection with the mailing of the Class Notice.²⁶ Simpluris was able to locate one hundred and forty-three (143) updated addresses using NCOA prior to the mailing of the Class Notice.²⁷

On January 25, 2024, Simpluris mailed the Class Notice via U.S. First Class Mail, in English and Spanish, to all seven hundred and fifty-eight (758) individuals identified as Class Members.²⁸ Of the seven hundred and fifty-eight (758) Class Members, five hundred and fifty (550) were identified as PAGA Group Members.²⁹

A total of seventy-three (73) Class Notices were returned to Simpluris.³⁰ Of these, nine (9) were returned with a forwarding address and Simpluris promptly re-mailed the Class Notice to the provided forwarding address.³¹ If a Class Member’s Class Notice was returned by the USPS as undeliverable and without a forwarding address, Simpluris performed an advanced address search (i.e. skip trace) on all of these addresses by using Accurint, a reputable research tool owned by

²¹ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 6.

²² Ibid.

²³ *Id.*, ¶ 6.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 7.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 8.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ *Id.*, ¶ 9.

³¹ Ibid.

Lexis-Nexis.³² Simpluris used the Class Member's name and previous address to locate a current address.³³ Through the advanced address searches, Simpluris was able to locate sixty (60) updated addresses and Simpluris promptly mailed a Class Notice to those updated addresses.³⁴ Ultimately, there are four (4) Class Notices that remain undeliverable.³⁵

As of the date of this Motion, the Settlement Administrator has not received any Notices of Objection and disputes to Workweeks, and received only two (2) Requests for Exclusion from Class Members Karen Sue Wilkinson and Bernard Asahina.³⁶

To date, there are seven hundred and fifty-six (756) Class Members who did not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion ("Settlement Class Members"), and who will be paid their portion of the Net Settlement Amount.³⁷ Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, the Net Settlement Amount of approximately \$985,010.66 will be distributed to Settlement Class Members in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.³⁸ The highest Individual Settlement Payment to a Settlement Class Member is currently estimated to be \$2,998.84 and the average Individual Settlement Payment is currently estimated to be \$1,283.08.³⁹ The highest Individual PAGA Payment to a PAGA Group Member is currently estimated to be \$332.81 and the average Individual PAGA Payment is currently estimated to be \$204.55.⁴⁰

V. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT.

The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether a class action settlement is fair and reasonable. *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 52. To determine whether the settlement is fair and reasonable, courts consider relevant factors such as:

the strength of plaintiffs' case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the

³² Simpluris Decl., ¶ 9.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 9.

³⁶ *Id.*, ¶¶ 12-14.

³⁷ *Id.*, ¶ 16.

³⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 17; see also, n.8, *supra*.

³⁹ *Id.*, ¶ 18. The actual average and highest Individual Settlement Payment to a Settlement Class Member will be larger than the amounts stated in the Simpluris Declaration because the Net Settlement Amount is larger due to Class Counsel's request for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in an amount that is less than \$40,000 (the difference between the amount sought and the amount authorized under the Settlement, \$15,005.66, will be part of the Net Settlement Amount). See n.8, *supra*.

⁴⁰ *Id.*, ¶ 21.

amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and views of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement.

Dunk v. Ford Motor Co. (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801. “The list of factors is not exclusive and the court is free to engage in a balancing and weighing of the factors depending on the circumstances of each case.” *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245. “Due regard should be given to what is otherwise a private consensual agreement between the parties.” *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801.

The proponent of the settlement has the burden to show that it is fair and reasonable. *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 245. At the final approval stage, a presumption of fairness exists where, as here: “(1) the settlement is reached through arm’s-length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small.” *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1802. In reviewing a class settlement, the court need not reach any ultimate conclusions on the issues of fact and law that underlie the merits of the dispute. *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1146. The inquiry is not whether the settlement agreement is the best one that class members could have possibly obtained, but whether the settlement, taken as a whole, is “fair, adequate, and reasonable.” *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 55. A settlement need not obtain 100 percent of the damages sought in order to be fair, reasonable, and ultimately, meaningful. *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 251. Even if the proposed settlement affords relief that is substantially narrower than it would be if the cases were to be successfully litigated, that is no bar to a class settlement because the public interest may indeed be served by a voluntary settlement in which each side gives ground in the interest of avoiding prolonged litigation. *Id.*

A. The Settlement Resulted from Arm’s-Length Negotiations Based Upon Extensive Investigation and Informal Discovery.

The Parties actively litigated the case since the *Bond* Action commenced on June 23, 2020. Class Counsel conducted significant investigation and formal and informal discovery into the facts

1 of the cases, to assess the veracity, strength, and scope of the claims, and was preparing for class
2 certification and trial prior to reaching the Settlement.⁴¹

3 The Parties conducted significant formal and informal discovery and investigation into the
4 facts of the cases.⁴² The information, documents, and data reviewed and analyzed by Class Counsel
5 included, and were not limited to, Plaintiffs' employment records, a sampling of Class Members'
6 time and pay data, and documents regarding Defendants' operations and employment practices,
7 policies, and procedures, among other information and documents.⁴³ Class Counsel developed
8 liability, damages, and penalties valuation models in the course of litigation and in connection with
9 mediation and settlement negotiations, and met and conferred with Defendants' counsel on
10 numerous occasions, e.g., to discuss issues relating to the pleadings, case management, discovery
11 and the production of information, documents, and data in the course of litigation and mediation
12 and settlement negotiations, and mediation and settlement.⁴⁴ Class Counsel propounded multiple
13 sets of written discovery requests on Defendant Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics, Inc., (Defendant
14 Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics, Inc., and Defendant Hanger P&O West, and reviewed Defendants
15 Hanger Prosthetics & Orthotics, Inc.'s and Hanger P&O West's objections and responses thereto.⁴⁵
16 Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed information, documents, and data obtained from Plaintiffs,
17 Defendants, and other sources.⁴⁶ Other work performed by Class Counsel included, and was not
18 limited to, case strategy and analysis; drafting, reviewing, and revising the pleadings, motion-
19 related papers, mediation brief, and settlement-related papers; and preparing for and attending
20 court proceedings and mediation and settlement negotiations, among other tasks.⁴⁷

21 After conducting formal and informal discovery and investigation into the facts of the
22 cases, the Parties participated in a formal, full-day mediation conducted on May 4, 2022 by Jeffrey
23 Krivis, Esq., a well-regarded mediator experienced in mediating complex labor and employment
24 matters.⁴⁸ Initially, the mediation was scheduled to occur on September 30, 2021, however, a few

25 _____
26 ⁴¹ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 6.

27 ⁴² Ibid.

28 ⁴³ *Id.*, ¶ 6.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ *Id.*, 8.

1 weeks prior to the scheduled mediation, Defendant canceled it, as such, the mediation was re-
2 scheduled and eventually took place on May 4, 2022.⁴⁹ In the course of mediation and settlement
3 negotiations, the Parties exchanged information, documents, and data, and discussed all aspects of
4 the cases, including and not limited to, the risks and delays of further litigation, the risks to the
5 Parties of proceeding with class certification and trial, the law relating to class certification,
6 manageability, off-the-clock theory, regular rate, meal and rest periods, representative PAGA
7 claims, and wage-and-hour law and enforcement, as well as the evidence produced and analyzed,
8 and the possibility of appeals, among other things.⁵⁰ During all settlement discussions, the Parties
9 conducted their negotiations at arm's length in an adversarial position.⁵¹ Arriving at a settlement
10 that was acceptable to the Parties was not easy.⁵² Defendants contended that individualized
11 questions of fact predominate over any common issues, and these issues would pose challenges to
12 class certification and representative adjudication.⁵³ Defendants and their counsel felt strongly
13 about Defendants' ability to avoid class certification and representative adjudication and prevail
14 on the merits, while Plaintiffs and Class Counsel believed that they would be able to obtain class
15 certification and prevail at trial.⁵⁴ After conducting significant formal and informal discovery and
16 investigations, settlement negotiations, and with the aid of the mediator's evaluation, the Parties
17 agreed that the cases were well-suited for settlement given the legal issues relating to Plaintiffs'
18 principal claims, as well as the costs and risks to the Parties that would attend further litigation.⁵⁵

19 The Settlement takes into account the strengths and weaknesses of each side's position and
20 the uncertainty of how the case might have concluded at certification, trial, and/or appeals. Class
21 Counsel analyzed a large volume of information, documents, and data obtained from Defendants,
22 Plaintiffs, and other sources, and performed research regarding applicable law, which is evolving
23 as it relates to class certification, manageability, off-the-clock theory, regular rate, meal and rest
24 periods, representative PAGA claims and penalties, wage-and-hour law and enforcement, Plaintiff

25
26 ⁴⁹ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 8

27 ⁵⁰ Ibid.

28 ⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

Larios and Plaintiff Bond's claims and allegations, and Defendants' defenses thereto, as well as facts discovered.⁵⁶ The Settlement was based on this large volume of facts, evidence, and investigation.⁵⁷ Additionally, Class Counsel have extensive experience in handling complex wage-and-hour actions, including significant experience in employment class action litigation.⁵⁸

B. The Risks Inherent in Continued Litigation Favor Final Approval of the Settlement.

The Settlement, which provides for a Gross Settlement Amount of \$2,250,000.00, represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the cases, given the risks inherent in litigating class and representative claims through certification proceedings, trial, and/or appeals.⁵⁹ The Settlement was calculated using information and data uncovered through extensive case investigation, formal and informal discovery, and the exchange of information in the context of mediation and ongoing settlement negotiations.⁶⁰ Had the action not settled, Defendants would have vigorously challenged class certification, manageability of representative adjudication, and liability. Defendants contended that individualized questions of fact predominated over any common issues, and these issues would pose challenges to certification and representative adjudication. Defendants would have likely argued again at trial, if any, that Plaintiffs' claims were not appropriate for class-wide and/or representative adjudication. On the other hand, Defendants also faced the risk of the Court certifying a class and allowing a jury to decide Plaintiffs' claims on a class-wide or representative basis. Additionally, preparation for trial would have been expensive for all parties.

It is preferable to reach an early resolution of a dispute because such resolutions save time and money that would otherwise go to litigation. If this matter had settled after further litigation, the settlement amount would have taken into account the additional costs incurred, and there might have been less money available for Class Members, PAGA Group Members, and the State of California after all was said and done. This is not just an abstract contention. The risks and

⁵⁶ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 7.

⁵⁷ *Id.*, ¶¶ 6-8.

⁵⁸ *Id.*, ¶¶ 14-21.

⁵⁹ *Id.*, ¶¶ 8 & 24.

⁶⁰ *Id.*, ¶¶ 8-11.

1 expenses of further litigation outweighed any benefit that might have been gained otherwise. These
2 risks of further litigation include a determination that the claims were unsuitable for class treatment
3 and/or representative adjudication, failure to obtain certification, class de-certification after
4 certification of a class, allowing a jury to decide the claims asserted in the cases, and the real
5 possibility of no recovery after years of litigation. Additionally, the Parties were moving into the
6 phase of the litigation where they would have to conduct a significant amount of additional
7 discovery, including and not limited to, depositions of Defendants' Person Most Knowledgeable
8 designees, expert witnesses, and percipient witnesses, such as managers, supervisors, and other
9 current and former employees throughout the State of California. Additional discovery would have
10 certainly arisen, which would have cost the Parties additional time and money. In contrast, the
11 Settlement provides real and significant benefits for the Class Members, the PAGA Group
12 Members, and the State of California here and now, while avoiding the further expenses, risks, and
13 delay of prolonged litigation with only the possibility of recovery.

14 It would be grossly inefficient for such a large class of current and former employees to
15 bring individual actions to recover from Defendants for the alleged violations of wage-and-hour
16 laws. Moreover, the potential individual recovery that could be obtained by a Class Member would
17 not be significant enough to provide him or her with the incentive to sue. By granting final approval
18 of the Settlement, the Court can approve a resolution that provides a certain and substantial
19 recovery for Class Members, the State of California, and PAGA Group Members.

20 **C. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.**

21 The Settlement, which provides for a Gross Settlement Amount of \$2,250,000.00,
22 represents a fair, reasonable, and adequate resolution of the cases. The Settlement was calculated
23 using information and data uncovered through extensive case investigation, formal and informal
24 discovery, and the exchange of information in the context of preparing for mediation and
25 conducting ongoing settlement negotiations. The Settlement takes into account the potential risks
26 and rewards inherent in any case and, in particular, in this matter. Moreover, considering all of
27 the facts in the cases, the Gross Settlement Amount represents a considerable recovery.

28 ///

Even after deducting attorneys' fees in the amount of \$750,000.00, litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$24,994.34, Incentive Awards in the combined amount of \$30,000.00, Administration Fees in the amount of \$9,995.00, and the PAGA Allocation of \$450,000.00 from the Gross Settlement Amount of \$2,250,000.00, the Net Settlement Amount is currently estimated to be \$985,010.66.⁶¹ Under the Settlement Agreement, the Gross Settlement Amount will be fully paid out, in accordance with the terms of the Settlement. As discussed in Section III, *supra*, each Settlement Class Member will be paid a *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount, based on the number of Workweeks credited to him or her, and each PAGA Group Member will be paid a *pro rata* share of the PAGA Group Member Amount, based on the number of Workweeks during the PAGA Period credited to him or her.⁶² To date, there are seven hundred and fifty-six (756) Settlement Class Members, representing ninety-nine and seventy-four percent (99.74%) of the Class Members.⁶³ The highest Individual Settlement Payment to a Settlement Class Member is currently estimated to be \$2,998.84 and the average Individual Settlement Payment is currently estimated to be \$1,283.08.⁶⁴ The highest Individual PAGA Payment to a PAGA Group Member is currently estimated to be \$332.81 and the average Individual PAGA Payment is currently estimated to be \$204.55.⁶⁵ These are significant individual recoveries, particularly in light of the risks of litigation.

At the final approval stage, "[a]n allocation formula need only have a reasonable, rational basis [to warrant approval], particularly if recommended by experienced and competent class counsel." *In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc., Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 127 F.Supp.2d 418, 429-30. The *pro rata* allocation here is a fair and reasonable way to distribute the Net Settlement Amount. In light of the above considerations, Class Counsel believes that the Settlement as a whole is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interest of the Class Members, the State of California, and PAGA Group Members.⁶⁶ Although the recommendations of Class Counsel are not conclusive, the Court can properly take the recommendations into

⁶¹ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 17; see also, n.8, *supra*.

⁶² Settlement Agreement, ¶ 16.

⁶³ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 16.

⁶⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 18; see n.39, *supra*.

⁶⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 21.

⁶⁶ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 24.

account, particularly if Class Counsel appears to be competent, has experience with this type of litigation, and significant discovery and investigation have been completed, as is the case here. Conte & Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* (4th Ed., 2002) § 11.47. Accordingly, the Court should grant final approval of the Settlement.

D. The Class Was Represented by Competent Counsel.

Class Counsel has extensive experience in employment class action law and complex wage-and-hour litigation.⁶⁷ Lawyers for Justice, PC has been appointed class counsel in numerous complex wage-and-hour cases, and has recovered millions of dollars for individuals in California.⁶⁸ Both parties' counsel were capable of assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the Class Members' claims against Defendant and the benefits of the Settlement under the circumstances of the case and in the context of a private, consensual settlement agreement.

E. There Are No Objections to the Settlement.

The Settlement has been well received by the Class – *not a single Class Member objected to the Settlement.*⁶⁹ Specifically, no objections have been made as to the Gross Settlement Amount or requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Incentive Awards, Administration Fees, or the allocation for PAGA Allocation. California courts have consistently found that a small number of objectors indicates the class' support for a settlement and strongly favors final approval. *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 250-51 (final approval granted despite 20 objectors); *7-Eleven Owners, supra*, 85 Cal.App.4th at 1152-53 (final approval granted despite 9 objectors).

Here, the lack of any objections speaks volumes about the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of this Settlement. Accordingly, the Settlement as a whole is presumed to be fair, reasonable, and adequate, and the Court should grant final approval of the Settlement in its entirety. *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1802.

VI. THE ATTORNEYS' FEES AWARD REQUESTED BY CLASS COUNSEL IS FAIR AND REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.

A. Legal Standard for Attorneys' Fees in a Class Action Settlement.

⁶⁷ Ghosh Decl., ¶¶ 14-21.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 9.

1 Trial courts have “wide latitude” in assessing the value of attorneys’ fees and their
2 decisions will “not be disturbed on appeal absent a manifest abuse of discretion.” *Lealao v.*
3 *Beneficial Cal., Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 41; *Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122,
4 1132 (The “experienced trial judge is the best judge of the value of professional services rendered
5 in his court[.]”); *Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* (2009) 180 Cal.App.4th 1110, 1118. Where
6 the amount of a settlement is a “certain easily calculable sum of money,” California courts may
7 calculate attorneys’ fees as a reasonable percentage of the settlement. Weil and Brown, California
8 Practice Guide, *Civil Procedure Before Trial*, Chapter 14, § 14:145; see also *Laffitte v. Robert*
9 *Half Int’l Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503; *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1808. The percentage-
10 of-the-benefit approach is preferred in class and representative actions because “it better
11 approximates the workings of the marketplace than the lodestar approach.” *Lealao, supra*, 82
12 Cal.App.4th at 49.

13 California law provides that an attorneys’ fees award should be equivalent to fees paid in
14 the legal marketplace for the result achieved and risk incurred. *Id.* at 47-50; *Laffitte v. Robert Half*
15 *Int’l, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503. In *Lealao*, the court held that when an action leads to a
16 recovery that can be “monetized” with a reasonable degree of certainty, the trial court should
17 “ensure that the fee awarded is within the range of fees freely negotiated in the legal marketplace
18 in comparable litigation.” *Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 50. Fee awards that are too small will
19 “chill the private enforcement essential to the vindication of many legal rights and obstruct the
20 representative actions that often relieve the courts of the need to separately adjudicate numerous
21 claims.” *Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 53.

22 “The ultimate goal . . . is the award of a ‘reasonable’ fee to compensate counsel for their
23 efforts, irrespective of the method of calculation.” *Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175
24 Cal.App.4th 545, 557-58 (quoting *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Superior Court, supra*, 126 Cal.App.4th
25 at 1270). It is not an abuse of discretion to choose one method over another as long as the method
26 chosen is applied consistently using percentage figures and/or rates that accurately reflect the
27 marketplace. In cases where class members present claims against a settlement amount and the
28

1 settlement agreement provides that the defendant agrees to paying the attorneys a percentage of
2 the same, use of that percentage method is appropriate. *Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 32.

3 Historically, courts have awarded fees as high as fifty percent (50%) of the settlement,
4 depending on the circumstances of the case. Conte & Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* (4th
5 Ed., 2002) § 14.03; *see also In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.* (D.D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp. 494
6 (awarding attorneys' fees in the amount of 45% of the settlement amount of \$7.3 million); *Beech*
7 *Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.* (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195 (awarding
8 approximately 53% of the settlement amount as attorneys' fees). California courts routinely
9 approve class action attorneys' fees awards "averag[ing] around one-third of the recovery."
10 *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 n.11 (lower court found 20 to 40 percent
11 range of contingency fee in marketplace was appropriate in class actions); *see also Laffitte*, 1
12 Cal.5th at 488 & 506 (approving fee award of 1/3 of common fund of \$19 million).

13 **B. A Fee Award of a Percentage of the Entire Fund Is Appropriate.**

14 California and federal courts have long recognized that an appropriate method for
15 determining the award of attorneys' fees is based on a percentage of the total value of benefits
16 made available to class members by the settlement. *Laffitte*, 1 Cal.5th at 503; *Boeing Co. v. Van*
17 *Gemert* (1980) 444 U.S. 472, 478; *Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt v. Gaulty* (9th Cir. 1989) 886
18 F.2d 268, 272; *Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.* (9th Cir. 1977) 557 F.2d 759, 769; *Serrano v.*
19 *Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 34.⁷⁰ The purpose of this equitable doctrine is to spread litigation costs
20 proportionally among all the beneficiaries so that the active beneficiary does not bear the entire
21 burden alone. *See Vincent, supra*, 557 F.2d at 769.

22 When a litigant's efforts result in a settlement from which others may derive benefits, the
23 litigant may require the passive beneficiaries to compensate those whose efforts brought about the
24 settlement. *See, R. Pearle, California Attorney Fee Awards* (CEB, 1993) § 7A, p. 5-7 (permitting
25 attorneys' fees and costs to be paid out of the settlement or directly on behalf of the other parties
26 enjoying the benefit of the settlement). Both state and federal courts have embraced this doctrine.

27
28 ⁷⁰ The California Supreme Court has urged trial courts to consider class action federal authority. *Green v. Obledo* (1981) 29 Cal.3d 126, 146; *Vasquez v. Superior Court* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 800, 821.

1 See *Serrano*, *supra*, 20 Cal.3d at 35; *Crampton v. Takegoshi* (1993) 17 Cal.App.4th 308, 317;
2 *Vincent*, *supra*, 557 F.2d at 769.

3 The propriety of calculating and awarding attorneys' fees as a percentage of a monetary
4 settlement that has, by litigation, been preserved or recovered for the benefit of others, has been
5 confirmed by the California Supreme Court. *Laffitte*, *supra*, 1 Cal.5th 480 at 486 & 506. The
6 California Supreme Court has taken the position that "[t]rial courts have discretion to conduct a
7 lodestar cross-check on a percentage fee," "they also retain the discretion to forgo a lodestar cross-
8 check and use other means to evaluate the reasonableness of a requested percentage fee[.]" and
9 "[t]he percentage [...] method survives in California." *Id.* (internal quotes omitted).

10 Courts have consistently recognized that class and representative action litigation is
11 increasingly necessary to protect the rights of individuals whose injuries and/or damages are too
12 small to economically justify legal action on an individual basis. Accordingly, in determining a
13 reasonable fee award, courts award fees to serve as an economic incentive for lawyers to pursue
14 such litigation in order to achieve increased access to the judicial system for meritorious claims
15 and to enhance deterrents to wrongdoing. This is especially true in situations where multiple
16 similar alleged wrongs would not be economically feasible to pursue individually, such as here.
17 See A. Conte, *Attorney Fee Awards* (2d Ed., 1993) 104, at 6.

18 When the case was originally filed, not only was it inescapably contingent, but the prospect
19 of a long, drawn-out battle with a defendant represented by experienced counsel, was almost a
20 certainty. By taking on this "battle" on a contingency basis, Class Counsel risked substantial
21 economic loss if the results were not successful. This substantial risk is the reason that the courts
22 approve the use of the percentage method when a settlement is obtained by the efforts of class
23 counsel. See *Vizcaino v. Microsoft* (9th Cir. 2002) 290 F.3d 1043, 1048-49 (discussing the risks
24 of engaging in litigation without certainty of compensation).

25 Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will pay a Gross Settlement
26 Amount of \$2,250,000.00 on a non-reversionary basis. The requested attorneys' fees are one-third
27 (1/3) of the total value of the monetary settlement. In light of Class Counsel's successful
28 prosecution and resolution of the case, the requested attorneys' fees are appropriate and reasonable.

Compensating class counsel in class litigation on a percentage basis makes good sense because: (1) it is consistent with the private marketplace where contingent fee attorneys are customarily compensated on such a basis; (2) it aligns the interests of class counsel and absent class members in achieving the maximum possible resolution of the case; and (3) it encourages the most efficient and expeditious resolution of the litigation by providing an incentive for early, yet reasonable, settlement. The requested attorneys' fees in this matter satisfy all of those factors and should be approved on a percentage basis.

The percentage method is consistent with, and is intended to mirror, the practice in the private marketplace where contingent-fee attorneys typically negotiate percentage-fee arrangements with their clients. Named plaintiffs' agreement to pay a contingent fee is powerful evidence of a reasonable fee. One of the best ways to demonstrate the value of counsel's work to the class is to review the consideration agreed to be paid by the named plaintiffs. If the named plaintiffs have employed counsel on a contingency-fee basis, it would indeed be inequitable for the members of the class, who will enjoy the benefits of the settlement without incurring the risks of bringing the claim, to pay less than the named plaintiffs.

Furthermore, a percentage-fee award is not dependent on a determination of the actual amount claimed by those entitled—it is the creation of the settlement that is the crucial fact. In *Winslow v. Harold G. Ferguson Corp.*, the California Supreme Court expressly held that “it is equitable that [the attorney's] compensation and expenses should come from the entire fund saved for all classes concerned before it is distributed.” *Winslow v. Harold G. Ferguson Corp.* (1944) 25 Cal.2d 274, 284. Likewise, *Lealao* expressly held that a percentage-based fee “may be calculated on the basis of the total fund made available rather than the actual payments made to the class.” *Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 51; *see also Boeing, supra*, 444 U.S. at 478 (“a litigant or a lawyer who recovers” a settlement “for the benefit of persons other than himself or his client is entitled to a reasonable attorneys' fee from the fund as a whole”).

In *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, in determining reasonable attorneys' fees, the Court of Appeal valued a settlement based on the total value of the settlement made available to class members by the efforts of counsel, decided in favor of granting fees as a

percentage of the total value of the settlement, and rejected an objection that the fees be awarded based on the exact amount claimed by class members. *Id.* at 247.

Class Counsel has obtained a substantial recovery on behalf of Plaintiffs, the Class, PAGA Group Members, and the State of California, and the results achieved justify an attorneys' fees award that is the equivalent of the standard market fee and that is consistent with the contingency-fee agreement entered into by and between Plaintiffs and Class Counsel. Thus, the requested attorneys' fees are appropriate.

C. The Attorneys' Fees Award Requested by Class Counsel Is Reasonable Based on the Factors Considered in Determination of Fee Awards.

In *Camden I Condominium Association, Inc. v. Dunkel*, the court identified twelve factors to be considered in determining whether fee awards are reasonable: (1) the time and labor required; (2) the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved; (3) the skill required to perform the legal services properly; (4) the preclusion of other employment by the attorney due to the acceptance of the case; (5) the customary fee; (6) whether the fee is fixed or contingent; (7) time limitation imposed by the client or the circumstances; (8) the amount involved and results obtained; (9) the experience, reputation and ability of the attorney; (10) the undesirability of the case; (11) the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client; and (12) awards in similar cases. *Camden I Condominium Association, Inc. v. Dunkel* (11th Cir. 1991) 946 F.2d 768, 772.

Each and every one of these factors favors the attorneys' fees sought here; however, some of the most relevant factors to this Court's fee determination will be addressed herein. The award of attorneys' fees in the amount of \$750,000.00 (which is one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount) is commensurate with the time, effort, and expense dedicated to the cases, the contingent nature of Class Counsel's fee and the risks taken in commencing the cases, the skill and determination required, the results that Class Counsel have achieved, and the value of the settlement that Class Counsel have obtained for the Class Members.

1. *Time & Labor.*

Class Counsel used its experience and skills, and dedicated the full extent of resources, to litigate and bring this matter to a successful conclusion on behalf of the Class. Moreover, as

demonstrated in the supporting declarations, Class Counsel have extensive experience in the handling of class actions and complex litigation cases.⁷¹

As outlined in the Declaration of Joanna Ghosh, Class Counsel has fully and actively participated in litigation of the Actions.⁷² Prior to commencing the lawsuit, Class Counsel had conducted a significant amount of investigation into the factual and legal issues, Defendant's business, and its operations and employment policies, practices, and procedures.⁷³ During the litigation of the Actions, Class Counsel had the opportunity to interview Plaintiffs and other Class Members; reviewed and analyzed a large volume of pages of information, documents and data obtained from Defendant, Plaintiffs, and other sources; and prepared liability, damages, penalties, and valuation calculations.⁷⁴ Class Counsel also met and conferred with Defendant's counsel over the issues relating to pleadings, discovery, and the production of information, documents and data, among other things; engaged in settlement negotiations with Defendant's counsel; and prepared for and attended court proceedings, mediation, and settlement negotiations.⁷⁵

Class Counsel has dedicated staffing and monetary resources necessary to prosecute this matter diligently and with maximum efficiency and has fully and actively participated in the litigation process. The Task and Time Chart, which is attached as "**EXHIBIT A**" to the accompanying Declaration of Joanna Ghosh, sets forth in detail the hours that Lawyers for Justice, PC has spent performing tasks on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class.⁷⁶ The Task and Time Chart is thorough and comprehensive, and was prepared so that the Court can peruse it without having to set forth each and every task in the body of this Motion. The Court is respectfully referred to the chart, which sets forth the history of the work performed by Class Counsel, commencing with the pre-filing analysis and research, and continuing up to settlement and final approval. Class Counsel has spent 583.00 hours performing tasks and to obtain a significant recovery on behalf of Plaintiffs, the Class, the PAGA Members, and the State of California.⁷⁷ These hours were required to bring

⁷¹ Ghosh Decl., ¶¶ 14-21.

⁷² *Id.*, Exh. A.

⁷³ *Id.*, ¶ 5.

⁷⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 6.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Id.*, Exh. A.

⁷⁷ *Id.*, ¶¶ 11-13.

1 this matter to its successful conclusion. In light of the value of time expended and the carrying of
2 costs involved in litigating this case, the requested attorneys' fees are fair, adequate, and
3 reasonable.

4 **2. The Skill Required to Perform Legal Services Properly.**

5 The skill required to properly litigate the cases is evident not only in the results achieved,
6 but in the steps necessary to reach those results. Defendants retained well-respected counsel to
7 represent its defenses. More specifically, Defendants and their counsel felt very strongly about
8 Defendants' ability to obtain a denial of certification and to prevail on the merits. Plaintiffs and
9 Class Counsel believed that they would have obtained class certification and prevailed at trial.

10 Class Counsel undertook significant investigation, analysis, and research prior to filing this
11 case, during the litigation, and prior to mediation. Class Counsel took steps to prepare the matter
12 for class certification and representative adjudication and had every intention of taking the case to
13 trial on a class-wide basis if Defendants did not offer an appropriate class-wide settlement. Despite
14 all of the obstacles that had to be overcome, as demonstrated in the Declaration of Joanna Ghosh,
15 Class Counsel used its extensive experience in the handling of class actions and complex wage-
16 and-hour litigation matters in order to obtain the Settlement with maximum efficiency.⁷⁸

17 **3. The Value of the Settlement for the Class Members.**

18 The Settlement represents an excellent resolution of the Actions, given the risks inherent
19 in litigating the cases through certification proceedings, trial, and/or appeals. Had the case not
20 settled, Defendants would have vigorously challenged certifiability, manageability of
21 representative adjudication, and liability. Defendants, however, faced risks if the Court certified a
22 class and allowed a jury to decide the claims. Additionally, preparing the cases for trial would have
23 been expensive for the Parties.

24 The Settlement at this stage is preferred over continued litigation because such resolutions
25 save time and money that would otherwise go to litigation. The risks and expenses of further
26 litigation outweighed any benefit that might have been gained otherwise. The Settlement provides
27 an immediate recovery, as opposed to an uncertain result in the future after prolonged litigation
28

⁷⁸ Ghosh Decl., ¶¶ 14-21.

1 involving expert discovery, trial preparation, class certification proceedings, and appellate review
2 of those proceedings. The Settlement offers present relief and/or recovery to Settlement Class
3 Members, the State of California, and PAGA Group Members while avoiding the further expense,
4 risk, and delay in obtaining possible recovery at an unknown time in the future.

5 As a result of this litigation and settlement negotiations, Defendants agreed to pay a Gross
6 Settlement Amount of \$2,250,000.00 to settle the matter. After deducting the attorneys' fees
7 (\$750,000.00), litigation costs and expenses (\$24,994.34), Incentive Awards (combined,
8 \$30,000.00), Administration Fees (\$9,995.00), and PAGA Allocation (\$450,000.00) from the
9 Gross Settlement Amount, it is currently estimated that the Net Settlement Amount is
10 approximately \$985,010.66.⁷⁹ The Net Settlement Amount will be fully distributed in accordance
11 with the terms of the Settlement. The highest Individual Settlement Payment to a Settlement Class
12 Member is currently estimated to be \$2,998.84 and the average Individual Settlement Payment is
13 currently estimated to be \$1,283.08.⁸⁰ The highest Individual PAGA Payment to a PAGA Group
14 Member is currently estimated to be \$332.81 and the average Individual PAGA Payment is
15 currently estimated to be \$204.55.⁸¹ The Settlement offers significant monetary relief to the
16 Settlement Class Members, the State of California, and PAGA Group Members.

17 **4. Whether the Fee Is Fixed or Contingent.**

18 Plaintiffs entered into contingency fee agreements with Class Counsel, and the
19 representation of the Class provided by Class Counsel has been wholly contingent. Class Counsel
20 took on the case without knowing whether any recovery would be obtained. Class Counsel has
21 invested 583.00 hours of time to obtain relief on behalf of Plaintiffs, Class Members, the State of
22 California, and PAGA Group Members.⁸² Class Counsel has also incurred litigation costs and
23 expenses in the amount of \$24,994.34.⁸³

24 Class Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any
25 compensation until recovery is obtained.⁸⁴ Class Counsel is well-experienced in wage-and-hour

26 ⁷⁹ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 17; see also, n.8, *supra*.

27 ⁸⁰ *Id.*, ¶ 18; see also, n.39, *supra*.

⁸¹ *Id.*, ¶ 21.

28 ⁸² Ghosh Decl., ¶¶ 11, Exh. A.

⁸³ *Id.*, ¶ 22.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

class action and complex litigation and used that experience to obtain a great result.⁸⁵ The skill and determination that Class Counsel has shown, along with the results obtained, justify the requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Considering the amounts requested, the work performed, and the risks incurred, the requested fees and costs are reasonable and should be awarded.

In determining the reasonableness of a fee award in a class action settlement, whether or not representation is provided on a contingency basis is an important factor:

A contingent fee must be higher than a fee for the same legal services paid as they are performed. The contingent fee compensates the lawyer not only for the legal services he renders but for the loan of those services. A lawyer who both bears the risk of not being paid and provides legal services is not receiving the fair market value of his work if he is paid only for the second of these functions. If he is paid no more, competent counsel will be reluctant to accept fee award cases.

Cates v. Chiang (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th 791, 823 (internal quotes and citations omitted). Class Counsel litigated the case on a contingency basis with all of the concomitant risk factors inherent in such an uncertain undertaking. Had Class Counsel not been successful, the time that Class Counsel have devoted to litigating the case would have been for naught, and would not have produced any fee or any reimbursement of costs or expenses.

5. The Amount Involved and the Results Achieved.

The results achieved, in light of the difficulties inherent in similar cases and the specific difficulties faced in this matter, are considerable. The Settlement has yielded a positive response from the Class Members—no Class Members objected to the Class Settlement.⁸⁶

The court in *Camden* noted that, “a key element of the common fund case is that fees are [...] taken from the fund [...] and a common fund is itself the measure of success ... [and] represents the benchmark on which a reasonable fee will be awarded.” *Camden*, 946 F. 2d 768, fn. 28 (citing *Court Awarded Attorney Fees, Report of the Third Circuit Task Force* (October 8, 1985) 108 F.R.D. 237 and Newberg, *Attorney Fee Awards* § 2.07 (1986)).

Here, the results achieved and obtained on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class are reasonable in light of the risks inherent in further litigating this matter. Class Counsel's efforts have resulted

⁸⁵ Ghosh Decl., ¶¶ 14-21.

⁸⁶ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 13.

in a settlement that provides for a Gross Settlement Amount of \$2,250,000.00.⁸⁷ The Gross Settlement Amount will be fully paid out, in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. The highest Individual Settlement Payment to a Settlement Class Member is currently estimated to be \$2,998.84 and the average Individual Settlement Payment is currently estimated to be \$1,283.08.⁸⁸ The highest Individual PAGA Payment to a PAGA Member is currently estimated to be \$332.81 and the average Individual PAGA Payment is currently estimated to be \$204.55.⁸⁹

6. The Reputation and Ability of the Attorneys.

Lawyers for Justice, PC is a recognized class action law firm that employed its attorneys' knowledge, skills, and experience in bringing this matter to a successful conclusion. Class Counsel has years of complex and class action litigation experience, has recovered millions of dollars on behalf of thousands of individuals in California, and has successfully handled numerous significant wage-and-hour class action and complex cases.⁹⁰

D. The Lodestar Methodology Also Justifies Approval of the Requested Fees, Because Class Counsel Has Performed Work That Is of Significant Value Based On Reasonable Hours and Prevailing Hourly Rates of Compensation.

While the percentage-of-the-benefit approach is endorsed as the better approximation of the workings of the marketplace than the lodestar approach, courts may also use the lodestar method to "cross-check" the results of the other. See *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal.5th at 505 (explaining that "[a] lodestar cross-check is simply a quantitative method for bringing a measure of the time spent by counsel into the trial court's reasonableness determination"); see also, e.g., *Vizcaino*, 290 F.3d at 1050 ("[W]hile the primary basis of the fee award remains the percentage method, the lodestar may provide a useful perspective on the reasonableness of a given percentage award."). Importantly, "the lodestar calculation . . . does not override the trial court's primary determination of the fee as a percentage" of the settlement amount and "does not impose an absolute maximum or minimum on the potential fee award." *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal.5th at 505.

///

⁸⁷ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 10.

⁸⁸ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 18; see n.39, *supra*.

⁸⁹ *Id.*, ¶ 21.

⁹⁰ Ghosh Decl., ¶¶ 14-21.

The lodestar is calculated based on reasonable hours at reasonable prevailing hourly rates for the attorneys. *Ketchum, supra*, 24 Cal.4th at 1131-32. Under California law, counsel is entitled to compensation for every hour reasonably spent on the matter. *Id.* at 1133.

1. The Number of Hours Spent on the Litigation was Reasonable.

The reasonableness of hours is assessed by “the entire course of the litigation, including pretrial matters, settlement negotiations, discovery, litigation tactics, and the trial itself[.]” *Vo v. Las Virgenes Municipal Water Dist.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 440, 447.

As discussed above, the case was highly contested and required a significant amount of time and labor. Defendants made it clear very early on that it disputed all of the allegations of the case and disputed that the matter was appropriate for class or representative treatment. Defendants raised affirmative defenses and denied liability, and the pursuit of this case involved gathering and analyzing data not only from Defendants but also from the Class Members. The handling of the case involved a great amount of effort, and also required and involved the exercise of a high level of skill, which Class Counsel has as a result of its extensive experience in employment class actions and complex wage-and-hour litigation. Long and difficult battles would have followed as the cases moved toward certification and trial, including taking and defending depositions of Defendants’ Person Most Knowledgeable designees, percipient witnesses, and experts, propounding additional discovery requests and conducting additional document production, and engaging in extensive motion practice. As Class Counsel geared up for these battles, Class Counsel undertook intense preparation in an attempt to resolve the entire matter through mediation.

Class Counsel had to bring together a large volume of information, documents and data that were obtained from Defendants, Plaintiffs, and through other sources. Class Counsel conducted extensive review and analysis of the information, documents and data to strategize the action and to prepare for mediation and engage in settlement discussions.

As discussed above in Part VI.C.1, *infra*, attached to the Declaration of Joanna Ghosh is a task and time chart that sets forth in detail the numerous tasks that Class Counsel performed on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class, and the time required for completing those tasks.⁹¹ The chart

⁹¹ Ghosh Decl., Exh. A.

demonstrates that Class Counsel has spent a total of 583.00 hours litigating the cases and finalizing the Settlement.⁹² In light of the facts and circumstances of the cases, as well as the results that Class Counsel has achieved on behalf of Plaintiffs, Class Members, the PAGA Group Members, and the State of California, Class Counsel has spent a reasonable number of hours on this matter. In addition, Class Counsel will continue to perform work on this matter through the date of final approval and in connection with the implementation of the Settlement.

**2. The Fees Requested Represent a Reasonable Hourly Rate of Compensation
in Light of Class Counsel's Efforts and Experience.**

Both California and federal courts recognize that attorneys should be compensated for providing representation on a contingency basis and for taking on the risks associated with said representation, as well as being provided with financial incentives to enforce important rights and protections like those at issue in this action. See *Ketchum, supra*, 24 Cal.4th at 1132-33. In awarding attorneys' fees, the aim is to mirror "the established practice in the private legal market of rewarding attorneys for taking the risk of nonpayment by paying them a premium over their normal hourly rates for winning contingency cases." See *id.*

Class Counsel has been actively involved in this matter, prior to its commencement and all the way up to the present, and Class Counsel's dedication to providing representation in these cases has precluded other employment. Here, Class Counsel bore the risk that, despite all of its efforts and skills employed, there may be no recovery. Ultimately, Class Counsel was successful in reaching a settlement of \$2,250,000.00.

As set forth in the Declaration of Joanna Ghosh, the professional backgrounds and experience of Class Counsel support reasonable rates of compensation between \$575 and \$1,495 per hour for services provided by Class Counsel, for a blended rate of \$800.⁹³ Lawyers for Justice, PC has been awarded attorneys' fees, compensating the firm at the blended rate of at least \$800 per hour for legal service performed, by courts of this state.⁹⁴ While the circumstances of every

⁹² Ghosh Decl., ¶¶ 11-13, Exh. A.

⁹³ *Id.*, ¶ 12 & 13.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

case are unique, the fact remains that the work performed and efforts undertaken by Class Counsel on behalf of the Class Members justify the requested attorneys' fees.

3. The Risks Involved, Skill Required, Complexity of the Matter, and Results Obtained Warrant Upward Enhancement of the Lodestar.

Even when courts have opted to award fees in cases based on time reasonably expended on the action, courts have generally awarded these fees based on the actual time expended (the lodestar) in conjunction with a multiplier of between 2 and 4. *Kerr v. Screen Extras Guild, Inc.* (9th Cir. 1975) 526 F.2d 67. Such a multiplier is warranted in this case.

Courts frequently apply multipliers to enhance the lodestar to reflect the risks involved, the complexity of the litigation, and the other relevant facts. *Vizcaino*, 290 F.3d at 1051; *Graham v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 553, 579 ("One of the most common fee enhancers [...] is for contingency risk."). Such an enhancement "mirrors the established practice in the private legal market of rewarding attorneys for taking the risk of nonpayment by paying them a premium over their normal hourly rates for winning contingency cases." *Vizcaino*, 290 F.3d at 1051; *accord Ketchum*, 24 Cal.4th at 1132-33. A risk multiplier also serves to bring the financial incentives for enforcing important rights "into line with incentives [attorneys] have to undertake claims for which they are paid on a fee-for-services basis." *Ketchum*, 24 Cal. 4th at 1132.

In determining whether or not to enhance the lodestar, California courts take into account multiple factors, many of which were specifically addressed above in §§ VI.B-C, *infra*. See, *Cates* at 822-823. Multiple factors warrant enhancement in this case, including the following:

- The time and labor required
- The skill requisite to perform the legal services properly
- The preclusion of other employment by the attorney due to the acceptance of the case
- The contingent nature of the fee
- The amount involved and results obtained
- The experience, reputation, and ability of the attorney
- Awards in similar cases

Ketchum at 1134.

Adjustment of the base lodestar figure to compute an award of attorneys' fees for a claim under the California Labor Code is appropriate. See *Id.*, at 1135-1136; *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 48-49. "The lodestar is calculated by multiplying the reasonable hours expended by a reasonable hourly rate. The court may then enhance the lodestar with a multiplier, if appropriate." *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 254. In the first stage of the lodestar adjustment method, the trial court determines the reasonable hourly rate of compensation for counsel, which it then multiplies by the number of hours the court finds were reasonably spent preparing the case, to obtain the lodestar figure. *Ketchum, supra*, 24 Cal.4th at 1131-1132. The lodestar figure is the "basic fee for comparable legal services in the community" based upon the "hourly amount to which attorneys of like skill in the area would typically be entitled." *Id.*, at 1132-1133 (quotation marks and citation omitted).

As discussed above, this was a highly contested matter which required an extensive amount of time and labor. Defendant raised defenses and denied liability, and the case involved gathering and analyzing documents and data not only from Defendant but also from the Class Members. The handling of this matter involved a great amount of effort, and required the exercise of high-level of skill, which Class Counsel has as a result of extensive experience in employment class actions and wage-and-hour litigation. Class Counsel has been actively involved in the prosecution of this matter, prior to its commencement and Class Counsel's work has continued all the way up to the present. Class Counsel's dedication to the representation of the Class Members has precluded other employment.

Most importantly, all services were performed by Class Counsel on a contingent basis. Both California and federal courts recognize that attorneys should be compensated for taking on such contingent risks and provided with financial incentives to enforce important rights and protections like those at issue in the matter at hand. See, e.g., *Vizcaino*, 290 F.3d at 1051; *Ketchum*, 24 Cal. 4th at 1132-33. Here, Class Counsel bore the risk that, despite all of its efforts and the skill employed, there may be no recovery. Therefore, at a minimum, Class Counsel is entitled to a risk multiplier. The results obtained by way of Class Counsel's efforts are significant here. Class Counsel was successful in achieving substantial results in the form of a settlement of

1 \$2,250,000.00. Also, Class Counsel’s efforts throughout the case demonstrate dedication to the
2 interests of the Class Members.

3 Class Counsel’s application for attorneys’ fees in light of the facts and circumstances
4 surrounding the matter is well within the range of reasonableness. While handling this matter,
5 Class Counsel devoted the hours in legal time summarized above and detailed in the Task and
6 Time Chart, which is attached as EXHIBIT A to the Declaration of Joanna Ghosh.⁹⁵ As indicated
7 in the chart and the Declaration of Joanna Ghosh, Class Counsel has worked 583.00 hours in the
8 pursuit of this matter. The Declaration of Joanna Ghosh sets forth the entire picture, and the work
9 performed by Class Counsel would place a base lodestar value of \$580,369.00 on Lawyers for
10 Justice, PC’s services.⁹⁶ Applying a modest multiplier of 1.30, the total enhanced lodestar fees are
11 \$754,479.70. Class Counsel seeks an attorneys’ fee award of \$750,000.00 (one-third of the Gross
12 Settlement Amount). Far greater multipliers have been awarded in similar cases, and the total
13 amount of fees sought by Class Counsel is also reasonable compared to fees awarded in similar
14 cases. Courts routinely enhance lodestar amounts based on multipliers that “range from **2 to 4 or**
15 **even higher.**” *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 255 (emphasis added); *see also, e.g., Chavez v.*
16 *Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 (approving **multiplier of 2.5**); *Vizcaino*, 290 F.3d at
17 1051 (approving **multiplier of 3.65**); *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.* (2d Cir. 2005) 396
18 F.3d 96, 123 (approving **multiplier of 3.5**); *Craft v. County of San Bernardino* (C.D. Cal. 2006)
19 624 F.Supp.2d 1113, 1125 (awarding **multiplier of 5.2** and referring to other cases with cross-
20 check **multipliers ranging from 4.5 to 19.6**).

21 The nature of the work performed, skill exercised, and the outcome in “this matter—which
22 involves an outstanding monetary recovery involving a **Gross Settlement Amount of**
23 **\$2,250,000.00** (with a Net Settlement Amount of **at least \$985,010.66 to be paid to Settlement**
24 **Class Members** with an average payment of approximately \$1,283.08 per Settlement Class
25 Member, a **payment of \$112,500.00 to PAGA Group Members** with an average payment of
26
27

28 ⁹⁵ Ghosh Decl., Exh. A.

⁹⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 12.

\$204.55 per PAGA Group Member, and ***payment of \$337,500.00 to the State of California***)—support the percentage fee sought and the application of a lodestar multiplier.⁹⁷

Therefore, application of a modest multiplier of 1.30 is warranted, and the lodestar as a cross-check to the percentage figure sought herein, strongly supports the reasonableness of the requested attorneys' fees award. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant final approval of, and award, attorneys' fees in the amount of \$750,000.00 to Class Counsel.

VII. COSTS TO BE REIMBURSED TO CLASS COUNSEL ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.

The Settlement provides for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses of up to \$40,000.00. As set forth in the Declaration of Joanna Ghosh, Class Counsel seeks reimbursement of \$24,994.34 in litigation costs and expenses incurred in this case.⁹⁸ This amount was reasonable and necessary in the prosecution of the case and to obtain the Settlement, and is less than the maximum amount allocated under the Settlement Agreement.⁹⁹ Accordingly, Plaintiffs requests that the Court award litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$24,994.34 to Class Counsel.

VIII. THE ADMINISTRATION FEES ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.

As set forth in the accompanying Simpluris Declaration, the total costs incurred and to be incurred by Simpluris for the notice and settlement administration process are \$9,995.00.¹⁰⁰ The costs incurred and to be incurred include, but are not limited to, (a) establishing and maintaining a related settlement fund account; (b) establishing and maintaining a calendar of administrative deadlines and responsibilities; (c) processing and mailing payments to the Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Group Members; (d) printing and mailing the Class Notice to Class Members in English and Spanish; (e) receiving and validating Requests for Exclusion, Notices of Objections, and disputes to Workweeks submitted by Class Members and PAGA Group Members; (f) calculating the Employer Taxes and providing appropriate forms and calculations to Defendants; (g) mailing Individual Settlement Payment checks to Settlement Class

⁹⁷ Simpluris Decl., ¶¶ 18 & 21. See n.8 & 39, *supra*.

⁹⁸ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 22.

⁹⁹ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 22.

¹⁰⁰ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 22.

Members and Individual PAGA Payment checks to PAGA Group Members, (h) providing counsel with weekly reports; and (i) other tasks as the Parties mutually agree or the Court orders Simpluris to perform.¹⁰¹

Accordingly, the Court should grant final approval of payment to Simpluris, a necessary third-party administrator, for its handling of the notice and settlement process, in the amount of \$9,995.00.

IX. THE REQUESTED INCENTIVE AWARDS ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.

The Settlement provides for an Incentive Awards in the amount of \$10,000.00 each to Plaintiffs Teresa Bond, Jesse Zamarripa, and Reyneiro Larios (for a combined total of \$30,000.00) to compensate Plaintiffs for the time and effort that they expended on behalf of the Class and the State of California. The requested Incentive Awards are both common and reasonable and should be awarded.

In determining whether to make service payments, courts consider the following factors: (1) the risk to the class representative in commencing suit, both financial and otherwise; (2) the notoriety and personal difficulties encountered by the class representatives; (3) the amount of time and efforts spent by the class representatives; (4) the duration of the litigation; and (5) the personal benefit (or lack thereof) enjoyed by the class representatives as a result of the litigation. *Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294, 299 (approving \$50,000 participation award to a single class representative).

The requested Incentive Awards are fair and appropriate because Plaintiffs spent a substantial amount of time and effort producing relevant documents and past employment records, as well as providing the facts and evidence to support the prosecution of the claims.¹⁰² Plaintiffs were available whenever Class Counsel needed them and actively tried to obtain, and gave, information to support the pursuit of the cases.¹⁰³ Plaintiffs spent numerous hours speaking with Class Counsel about their claims, describing their work experiences with Defendants, and

¹⁰¹ Simpluris Decl., ¶ 3.

¹⁰² Ghosh Decl., ¶ 23; Declaration of Teresa Bond (“Bond Decl.”), ¶¶ 3-5; Declaration of Jesse Zamarripa (“Zamarripa Decl.”); Declaration of Reyneiro Larios (“Larios Decl.”), ¶¶ 3-5.

¹⁰³ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 23; Bond Decl., ¶¶ 3-5; Zamarripa Decl., ¶¶ 3-5; Larios Decl., ¶¶ 3-5.

1 gathering and reviewing documents.¹⁰⁴

2 Accordingly, it is appropriate and just for Plaintiffs Teresa Bond, Jesse Zamarripa, and
3 Reyneiro Larios to each receive \$10,000.00 as reasonable Incentive Awards, for their services on
4 behalf of the Class, PAGA Group Members, and the State of California, in addition to their
5 individual settlement payments.

6 **X. CONCLUSION**

7 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant final approval
8 of the Settlement, and award Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Awards, Settlement
9 Administration Costs, and allocation for the PAGA Allocation, in their entirety, as sought herein;
10 and permit the filing of a memorandum that exceeds the page limit.

11 Dated: March 27, 2024

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

12
13 By: _____



14 Selena Matavosian
15 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹⁰⁴ Ghosh Decl., ¶ 23; Bond Decl., ¶¶ 3-5; Zamarripa Decl., ¶¶ 3-5; Larios Decl., ¶¶ 3-5.