

Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943)
Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
Giovani Pimentel (SBN 345232)
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

CAMILLE CAMPBELL, individually, and on
behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant
to the California Private Attorneys General
Act;

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE OC MURPHY GROUP, a California
corporation; Philip M. Myers, individually;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 21TRCV00675

Honorable Elihu M. Berle
Department SSC 6

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION
AND MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT (CAL. LABOR CODE § 2698,
ET SEQ.) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
AND AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES
AND COSTS, GENERAL RELEASE
FEE, AND SETTLEMENT
ADMINISTRATION COSTS;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES**

[Declaration of Plaintiff's Counsel
(Edwin Aiwazian); Declaration of Plaintiff
(Camille Campbell); and [Proposed] Order
and Judgment filed concurrently herewith]

Date: September 26, 2023
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Department: SSC6

Complaint Filed: September 16, 2021
Trial Date: None Set

1 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on September 26, 2023 at 9:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter
2 as the matter may be heard before the Honorable Elihu M. Berle in Department SSC6 of the
3 Superior Court of the State of California, for the County of Los Angeles, located at the Spring
4 Street Courthouse at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, Plaintiff Camille
5 Campbell (“Plaintiff”) will and hereby does move for entry of the following orders:

- 6 1. Granting approval, pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2), of the
7 settlement between Plaintiff and Defendants The OC Murphy Group and Philip M.
8 Myers (“Defendants”) of the claims brought pursuant to the Private Attorneys
9 General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), as set forth in the Private Attorneys General Act
10 Settlement Agreement and Release (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement
11 Agreement”), attached as “**EXHIBIT 1**” to the Declaration of Edwin Aiwazian,
12 including and not limited to, the plan of allocation and distribution of the Total
13 Settlement Amount for payment of the LWDA Payment to the California Labor and
14 Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), Individual Settlement Shares to the
15 Aggrieved Employees, Attorneys’ Fees and Costs to Plaintiff’s Counsel, Settlement
16 Administration Costs to the PAGA Settlement Administrator, and General Release
17 Fee to Plaintiff;
- 18 2. Approving the Net Settlement Amount, estimated to be no less than \$111,948.97
19 which will be distributed to the LWDA and the Aggrieved Employees, pursuant to
20 California Labor Code section 2699(i), of which seventy-five percent (75%) will be
21 paid to the LWDA (“LWDA Payment”) and twenty-five percent (25%) will be paid
22 to the Aggrieved Employees (“Employees’ Portion”);
- 23 3. Appointing ILYM Group (“ILYM”) as the PAGA Settlement Administrator;
- 24 4. Directing Defendants to transmit the Total Settlement Amount of \$200,000.00 into a
25 qualified settlement account established by the PAGA Settlement Administrator for
26 administration of the Settlement, and directing the PAGA Settlement Administrator to
27 distribute the Total Settlement Amount in accordance with the Settlement Agreement;
- 28 5. Directing the mailing of Individual Settlement Share checks to the Aggrieved

1 Employees along with the proposed informational cover letter (“Cover Letter”),
2 which is substantially similar in content and form to that attached as “**EXHIBIT 1**” to
3 the [Proposed] Order and Judgment Granting Approval of Private Attorneys General
4 Act (Cal. Labor Code § 2698, *Et Seq.*) Settlement Agreement and Award of
5 Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, General Release Fee, and Settlement Administration Costs
6 (“[Proposed] Order and Judgement”) filed concurrently herewith;

7 6. Awarding \$5,000.00 to Plaintiff Camille Campbell as a General Release Fee;

8 7. Awarding up to \$5,000.00 to the PAGA Settlement Administrator as Settlement
9 Administration Costs; and

10 8. Awarding to Plaintiff’s Counsel, Lawyers for Justice, PC, \$66,666.67 as
11 compensation for reasonable attorneys’ fees and \$11,348.36 for reimbursement of
12 litigation costs and expenses (“Attorneys’ Fees and Costs”), pursuant to California
13 Labor Code section 2699(g)(1).

14 The Settlement Agreement and moving and supporting papers for this motion are being
15 concurrently submitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency in
16 conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2).

17 This motion is made pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2), which
18 provides for review and approval by the Court of the settlement of a civil action filed pursuant to
19 PAGA, and Rule 3.1113(e) of the California Rules of Court, which permits the Court to extend
20 the page limit for memoranda.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 This motion will be based upon the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities,
2 the Settlement Agreement, the Declarations of Plaintiff's Counsel (Edwin Aiwazian) and
3 Plaintiff (Camille Campbell) in support thereof, as well as the pleadings and other records on file
4 with the Court in this matter, and such evidence and oral argument as may be presented at the
5 hearing on this motion.

6 Dated: August 29, 2023

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

7
8 By: *Giovani Pimentel*
9 Giovanni Pimentel
Attorneys for Plaintiff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	SUMMARY OF MOTION.....	1
II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY	2
III.	SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS	4
A.	Aggrieved Employees.....	4
B.	Distribution of the Total Settlement Amount.....	4
C.	Distribution of the Net Settlement Amount	5
D.	Dismissal of the Class Action	6
E.	The Scope of the Release in the Settlement Agreement.....	6
F.	No Right to Object to, or Opt Out of, the Settlement	7
IV.	STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT	8
V.	THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	10
A.	The Factors Giving Rise to a Presumption of Fairness Exist	10
B.	The Relative Strength of the PAGA Claim and the Range of Possible Outcomes in the Litigation Strongly Favor Approval of the Settlement	12
C.	The Settlement Avoids Risky, Complex, and Lengthy Further Litigation.....	18
D.	The Settlement Is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable	19
E.	The Experience and Views of Plaintiff’s Counsel Favor Approval of the Settlement	21
VI.	THE PROPOSED ATTORNEYS’ FEES PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE, AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	21
A.	A Fee Award of a Percentage of the Entire Fund Is Appropriate.....	21
B.	The Fee Award Requested by Plaintiff’s Counsel Is Reasonable Based on the Factors Considered in Determination of Fee Awards.....	25
1.	Time & Labor.....	26
2.	The Skill Required to Perform Legal Services Properly	27
3.	The Value of the Settlement	28

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

4.	Whether the Fee Is Fixed or Contingent.....	28
5.	The Amount Involved and the Results Achieved	29
6.	The Reputation and Ability of the Attorneys	29
C.	The Lodestar Methodology Also Justifies Approval of the Requested Fees, Because Plaintiff’s Counsel Has Performed Work That Is of Significant Value Based on Reasonable Hours and Prevailing Hourly Rates of Compensation	30
1.	Plaintiff’s Counsel Performed Work for a Reasonable Number of Hours.....	30
2.	The Fees Requested Represent a Reasonable Hourly Rate of Compensation in Light of Plaintiff’s Counsel’s Efforts and Experience.....	31
VII.	COSTS TO BE REIMBURSED TO Plaintiff’S COUNSEL ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE, AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	34
VIII.	THE PROPOSED COVER LETTER TO THE AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	34
IX.	THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE, AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	35
X.	THE PROPOSED GENERAL RELEASE FEE IS FAIR, ADEQUATE, AND REASONABLE, AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	35
XI.	CONCLUSION	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Adolph v. Uber Technologies, Inc.</i> (2023) 14 Cal.5th 1104, 532 P.3d 682, 685.....	17
<i>Ali v. U.S.A. Cab Ltd.</i> (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 1333.....	13
<i>Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court.</i> (2009) 46th Cal.4th 993	8
<i>Arias v. Superior Court</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969	7, 8
<i>Bell v. Farmers Ins. Exch.</i> (2004) 115 Cal.App.4th 715	35
<i>Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.</i> (N.D. Cal. 1979) 485 F.Supp. 610	12
<i>Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004	13
<i>Casida v. Sears Holdings Corp.</i> (E.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2012) 2012 WL 253217	9
<i>City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders</i> (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 78.....	33
<i>Clark v. Am. Residential Servs., LLC</i> (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785	35
<i>Consumer Privacy Cases</i> (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 545.....	24
<i>Duran v. U.S. Bank Nat. Assn.</i> (2014) 59 Cal.4th 1.....	13
<i>edroza v. PetSmart, Inc.</i> (C.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2013) 2013 WL 1490667	9
<i>Estrada v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc.</i> (2022) 76 Cal.App.5th 685	14
<i>Fireside Bank v. Superior Court</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1069.....	8
<i>Horton v. Jones</i> (1972) 26 Cal.App.3d 952.....	15
<i>Ingram v. The Coca-Cola Co.</i> (N.D. Ga. 2001) 200 F.R.D. 685.....	35
<i>Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC</i> , (2014) 58 Cal.4th 348	8, 17
<i>Kirkorian v. Borelli</i> (N.D. Cal. 1988) 695 F.Supp. 446	12
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.</i> (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480	24, 30
<i>Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc.</i> (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19	23
<i>Ochoa-Hernandez v. CJADERS Foods, Inc.</i> (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2010) 2010 WL 1340777	10
<i>Resendez v. Bridgestone Retail Operations, LLC</i> , Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC596892 (June 2016)	9
<i>Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.</i> (1981) 29 Cal.3d 462,.....	8
<i>Safeway v. Superior Court</i> (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1138.....	13

1	<i>Satchell v. Fed. Express Corp.</i> (N.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2007) 2007 WL 1114010	12
2	<i>Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319.....	13
3	<i>Stafford v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.</i> (E.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2014) 2014 WL 6633396	15
4	<i>Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases</i> (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 495.....	33
5	<i>Thomas v. Aetna Health of Cal., Inc.</i> (E.D. Cal. June 2, 2011) 2011 WL 2173715	9
6	<i>Viking River Cruises, Inc. v. Moriana</i> (2022) 142 S. Ct. 1906, 2022 U.S. LEXIS 2940.....	16
7	<i>Vo v. Las Virgenes Municipal Water Dist.</i> (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 440	30
8	<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224.....	11
9	<i>Wesson v. Staples the Office Superstore, LLC</i> (2021) 68 Cal.App.5th 746.....	13
10	<i>Williams v. Superior Court</i> (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531	7, 8, 9, 21
11	Statutes	
12	Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(g)(1)(i)	21
13	Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(j).....	10
14	Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(l)(2)	1, 9
15	Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3	8
16	Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, <i>et seq.</i>	1

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION

Plaintiff Camille Campbell (“Plaintiff”) seeks approval of the Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement and Release (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”) entered into between Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the State of California and other aggrieved employees, and Defendants The OC Murphy Group and Philip M. Myers (“Defendants”), pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2).¹

Subject to approval by the Court, Plaintiff and Defendant (together, the “Parties”) have agreed to resolve the above-captioned action, brought pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), for a Total Settlement Amount of \$200,000.00.²

The Total Settlement Amount is inclusive of: (1) Attorneys’ Fees and Costs to be paid to Lawyers for Justice, PC (“Plaintiff’s Counsel”), (2) General Release Fee to Plaintiff, (3) Settlement Administration Costs to be paid to the PAGA Settlement Administrator, and (4) Net Settlement Amount to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and all current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees who have worked for Defendant in California during the PAGA Period (“Aggrieved Employees”).³

The Net Settlement Amount will be the Total Settlement Amount less the Court-approved Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Settlement Administration Costs, and General Release Fee, and is currently estimated to be no less than \$111,948.97.⁴ The Net Settlement Amount will be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the LWDA (“LWDA Payment”) and twenty-five percent (25%) to the Aggrieved Employees (“Employees’ Portion”).⁵ Each Aggrieved Employee will be entitled to payment of his or her *pro rata* share of the Employees’ Portion, based on the number of pay periods they each worked during the PAGA Period

¹ The Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement and Release (“Settlement Agreement”) is attached as “**EXHIBIT 1**” to the Declaration of Edwin Aiwanian.

² Settlement Agreement, § 4(a).

³ *Id.*, §§ 4(a)(1)-(5). “PAGA Period” is defined as the period January 17, 2020 to June 3, 2023. See *id.* at § 4(a)(5).

⁴ *Id.*, § 4(a)(4).

⁵ *Id.*, § 4(a)(5).

(“Compensable Pay Periods”).⁶

The payments to Aggrieved Employees will be treated and reported for tax purposes as one hundred percent (100%) penalties and the PAGA Settlement Administrator will be responsible for issuing IRS Forms 1099 as required.⁷

Plaintiff submits that the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and meets the requirements for approval by the Court based upon the relevant fairness factors, the relative strengths of the PAGA claim, the risk, expense, and complexity of further litigation, the benefit conferred by the Settlement, the scope of the release of claims, the experience and views of counsel, and the reasonableness of the Net Settlement Amount (consisting of the LWDA Payment and Employees’ Portion), Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Settlement Administration Costs, and General Release Fee. Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court approve the Settlement, award the Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Settlement Administration Costs, and General Release Fee and approve the LWDA Payment, which are provided for by the Settlement and requested herein.

In order to efficiently present the Court with adequate information to determine whether to grant approval of the Settlement, Plaintiff also moves for an order permitting the filing of this memorandum, although it exceeds the page limit established by California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1113(d).

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants are located in Gardena, California and run a Chick-Fila-A Restaurant. Plaintiff Camille Campbell is a former employee of Defendant.

Prior to commencing this lawsuit, on July 13, 2021, as required by California Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff Camille Campbell provided the LWDA and Defendant with written notice of her intent to assert claims under PAGA and the basis for those claims, to which the LWDA did not respond (“PAGA Notice”).⁸ A true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s July 13, 2021

⁶ Settlement Agreement, § 8(b).

⁷ *Id.*, § 8(b)(1).

⁸ Declaration of Edwin Aiwasian (“Aiwasian Decl.”), ¶ 10.

PAGA Notice is attached to the Declaration of Edwin Aiwarzian as “**EXHIBIT 2.**”

On August 10, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Class Action Complaint for Damages entitled *Camille Campbell v. The OC Murphy Group*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV29390 (the “Class Action”).

On September 16, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code § 2698, Et Seq. (“Operative Complaint”) against Defendant in the Los Angeles County Superior Court (“Court”), Case No. 21TRCV00675 (the “PAGA Action”) (together with the Class Action, the “Actions”). Plaintiff’s core allegation is that Defendant has violated the California Labor Code by engaging in a uniform practice and procedure, with respect to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees, of, *inter alia*, failing to pay overtime and minimum wages, failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premiums, failing to pay timely wages during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements, failing to keep complete and accurate payroll records, and failing to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and costs.

On December 14, 2021, Defendant The OC Murphy Group filed an Answer to the Operative Complaint. Defendant The OC Murphy Group maintained, and continues to maintain, that it had, and continues to have, legally-compliant employment policies and practices throughout the time period at issue. Defendant The OC Murphy Group denies that it ever violated any provision of the California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, those sections for which Plaintiff seeks penalties under the PAGA.

On December February, 2022, Defendant Philip M. Myers filed an Answer to the Operative Complaint. Defendant Philip M. Myers maintained, and continues to maintain, that it had, and continues to have, legally-compliant employment policies and practices throughout the time period at issue. Defendant Philip M. Myers denies that it ever violated any provision of the California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, those sections for which Plaintiff seeks penalties under the PAGA.

On October 26, 2022, the Parties participated in a full-day mediation conducted by Jeffrey Krivis, Esq., a well-respected mediator experienced in mediating complex labor and

employment matters.⁹ The Parties did not reach a settlement at mediation.¹⁰ After further negotiations with assistance of the mediator, the Parties eventually reached the Settlement described hereon.¹¹

Plaintiff now moves for an order granting approval of the Settlement pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2). The Settlement Agreement and moving and supporting papers for this motion are being submitted to the LWDA in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2), concurrently with this filing.¹²

III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS

A. Aggrieved Employees

The Aggrieved Employees who are covered by the Settlement are:

All current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California during the PAGA Period.¹³

Based on information provided by Defendants as of July 11, 2023, there are approximately five hundred four (504) Aggrieved Employees.¹⁴

B. Distribution of the Total Settlement Amount

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will pay a Total Settlement Amount of \$200,000.00.¹⁵ The Net Settlement Amount will be the Total Settlement Amount less the following amounts: (1) Attorneys' Fees and Costs consisting of attorneys' fees of \$66,666.67 and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses of \$11,348.36 to Plaintiff's Counsel¹⁶; (2) General Release Fee of \$5,000.00 to Plaintiff; and (3) Settlement Administration Costs of up to \$5,000.00 to ILYM Group ("ILYM" or "PAGA Settlement Administrator").¹⁷ The Net Settlement Amount will be fully distributed to the Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA, as

⁹ Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 13.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² The Court is referred to the concurrently-filed Proof of Service, which confirms submission of the papers to the LWDA.

¹³ Settlement Agreement, § 4(a)(5); see n.3, *supra*.

¹⁴ Settlement Agreement, § 4(a)(5); Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 9.

¹⁵ Settlement Agreement, § 4(a); Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 11.

¹⁶ Although § 4(a)(1) of the Settlement Agreement provides for a request up to 35% of the Total Settlement Amount, Plaintiff's Counsel only seeks one-third of the Total Settlement Amount, i.e., \$66,666.67.

¹⁷ Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 11.

described in Part III.C, *infra*.

C. Distribution of the Net Settlement Amount

Within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the Court's order granting approval of the Settlement, Defendants will transmit the Total Settlement Amount to a qualified settlement account established by the PAGA Settlement Administrator for administration of the Settlement.¹⁸ No later than ten (10) calendar days after the Court's order granting approval of the Settlement, Defendant will provide the PAGA Settlement Administrator with a list of all Aggrieved Employees ("Aggrieved Employees List"), containing the following information for each Aggrieved Employee: (i) first and last name; (ii) last known address; (iii) last known telephone number; (iv) Social Security number, if available; (v) and Compensable Pay Periods.¹⁹

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the Net Settlement Amount (or approximately \$83,961.73) will be distributed to the LWDA (i.e., LWDA Payment) and twenty-five percent (25%) of the Net Settlement Amount (or approximately \$27,987.24) (i.e., Employees' Portion) will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees on a *pro rata* basis, based on their Compensable Pay Periods.²⁰ To calculate each Aggrieved Employee's share of the Employees' Portion ("Individual Settlement Share"), the PAGA Settlement Administrator will: (1) for each Aggrieved Employee, divide the number of Compensable Pay Periods he or she individually worked by the total aggregate number of Compensable Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees, and then (ii) multiply this amount by the Employees' Portion to arrive at each Aggrieved Employee's Individual Settlement Share.²¹ The payments to Aggrieved Employees for their Individual Settlement Shares are considered one hundred percent (100%) penalties to be reported on IRS Form 1099, if required.²²

No later than fourteen (14) calendar days after the PAGA Settlement Administrator

¹⁸ Settlement Agreement, § 8(a).

¹⁹ *Id.*, § 8(c)(1).

²⁰ *Id.*, § 4(a)(5).

²¹ *Id.*, § 8(b).

²² *Id.*, §§ 4(b) & 8(b)(1).

1 receives the Aggrieved Employees List and Total Settlement Amount, the PAGA Settlement
2 Administrator will mail the agreed-upon proposed informational cover letter (“Cover Letter”)
3 and Individual Settlement Share checks (together, the “PAGA Settlement Package”) to all
4 Aggrieved Employees by first-class United States mail.²³ For each PAGA Settlement Package
5 that is returned as undeliverable within thirty (30) calendar days of the initial mailing, the PAGA
6 Settlement Administrator will promptly attempt to locate an alternate, updated address for the
7 Aggrieved Employee at issue, by using a skip-trace search and shall attempt one (1) re-mailing
8 of the PAGA Settlement Package.²⁴

9 The Individual Settlement Share checks issued to Aggrieved Employees will remain valid
10 for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days, and thereafter, will be canceled.²⁵ Funds
11 associated with canceled checks will be transmitted to the State Controller’s Office Unclaimed
12 Property Division in the name of the Aggrieved Employee(s) at issue and in the amount of his or
13 her respective Individual Settlement Share(s).²⁶

14 **D. Dismissal of the Class Action**

15 Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Parties will seek to dismiss the Class
16 Action without prejudice.²⁷

17 **E. The Scope of the Release in the Settlement Agreement**

18 Upon the date the Court has entered an order approving the Settlement Agreement and
19 the full funding of the Total Settlement Amount, Plaintiff and the State of California with respect
20 to Aggrieved Employees will be deemed to have knowingly and voluntarily released and forever
21 discharged Released Parties from the Released Claims.

22 The “Released Claims” means Defendants, and each of their former, present, and future
23 owners, parents, and subsidiaries, and all of their current, former, and future officers, directors,
24 members, managers, employees, consultants, partners, shareholders, joint venturers, agents,
25

26 ²³ Settlement Agreement, § 8(c)(3).

27 ²⁴ Ibid.

28 ²⁵ *Id.*, § 8(c)(4).

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ *Id.*, § 2.

predecessors, successors, assigns, accountants, insurers, reinsurers, and/or legal representatives.²⁸

The “Released Parties” means any and all claims, arising during the PAGA Period, for civil penalties under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) as well as any interest, fees, and costs available under PAGA, based on the factual allegations in the PAGA Notice, including but not limited to, for failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime, failure to provide compliant meal periods and associated premiums, failure to provide compliant rest periods and associated premiums, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to timely pay wages upon termination, failure to provide compliant and accurate wage statements, failure to maintain complete and accurate payroll records, failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and costs, and for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802 and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, including inter alia, Wage Orders 4-2001 and 7-2001.²⁹

F. No Right to Object to, or Opt Out of, the Settlement

“[A] PAGA action is a statutory action for penalties brought as a proxy for the State,” as such, “there is no need to protect absent employees’ due process rights[.]” *Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 546. “Unnamed employees need not be given notice of the PAGA claim, nor do they have the ability to opt-out of the representative PAGA claim.” *Ochoa-Hernandez v. CJADERS Foods, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2010), 2010 WL 1340777, at *5. A representative PAGA action need not satisfy class action requirements, and no due process concern arises from the fact that there are “nonparty aggrieved employees who are not given notice of, and an opportunity to be heard in, a representative action that is not brought as a class action.” *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, 984. “PAGA does not make other potentially aggrieved employees parties” to the action and no “due process concerns arise under

²⁸ Settlement Agreement, § 9(a).

²⁹ *Ibid.*

1 PAGA because absent employees do not own a personal claim for PAGA civil penalties and
2 whatever personal claims the absent employees might have for relief are not at stake.” *Williams*,
3 *supra*, 546-547 (internal references omitted, citing *Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756*,
4 *AFL-CIO v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 993, 1003 and *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation*
5 *Los Angeles, LLC*, (2014) 58 Cal.4th 348, 381.)

6 “[A]bsent fellow employees will be bound by the outcome of any PAGA action[.]”
7 *Williams* at 548 (internal references omitted, citing *Arias, supra*, 980-981; *Fireside Bank v.*
8 *Superior Court* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1069, 1074 and *Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.* (1981) 29
9 Cal, 3d 462, 474.) A “judgment in such an action is binding not only on the named employee
10 plaintiff but also on government agencies and any aggrieved employee not a party to the
11 proceeding” because “the employee plaintiff represents the same legal right and interest as state
12 labor law enforcement agencies[.]” “collateral estoppel applies [...] against those for whom the
13 party acted as an agent or proxy[.]” and “[w]hen a government agency is authorized to bring an
14 action on behalf of an individual or in the public interest, and a private person lacks an
15 independent right to bring the action, a person who is not a party but who is represented by the
16 agency is bound by the judgment as though the person were a party.” *Arias, supra*, at 985-86
17 (citations omitted); see also *Robinson v. Southern Counties Oil Co.* (2020) 53 Cal.App.5th 476
18 (aggrieved employee cannot opt out of a PAGA settlement).

19 As such, the Settlement is consistent with the law, and there is no requirement that the
20 Aggrieved Employees be provided with a mechanism to opt out of or object to the Settlement.

21 **IV. STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT**

22 The PAGA allows an “aggrieved employee” to bring a civil action on behalf of himself
23 or herself and on behalf of other aggrieved employees and the State of California to recover civil
24 penalties which, outside of PAGA, only the LWDA can assess upon and collect from an
25 employer (Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a)). Before bringing a civil action under PAGA, an employee
26 must comply with California Labor Code section 2699.3. See Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a).
27 Plaintiff has complied.

28 ///

1 The settlement of a PAGA action requires court approval. See Cal. Lab. Code §
2 2699(l)(2) (“The superior court shall review and approve any settlement of any civil action filed
3 pursuant to this part.”). However, “[a] PAGA claim asserted on a non-class representative basis
4 . . . is not considered a class action but a law enforcement action” and therefore does not have to
5 meet the requirements of a class action. *Casida v. Sears Holdings Corp.* (E.D. Cal. Jan. 26,
6 2012) 2012 WL 253217, at *3; *Thomas v. Aetna Health of Cal., Inc.* (E.D. Cal. June 2, 2011)
7 2011 WL 2173715, at *11; *Arias, supra*, 46 Cal.4th at 980-88 (affirming lower court’s holding
8 that “plaintiff need not satisfy class action requirements” to assert a PAGA claim); *Pedroza v.*
9 *PetSmart, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2013) 2013 WL 1490667, at *15. As such, a court’s review of
10 a PAGA settlement involves analysis of several unique features that render the approval process
11 distinct from, and simpler than, the process for approval of a class action settlement. A court
12 reviewing a PAGA settlement need only “ensur[e] that a negotiated resolution is fair to those
13 affected.” *Williams, supra*, 549 (citing Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(l)(2)). Although California Labor
14 Code section 2699(l) does not set forth the criteria on which a PAGA settlement is to be judged,
15 courts have approved settlements of PAGA claims.³⁰ See, e.g., *Resendez v. Bridgestone Retail*
16 *Operations, LLC*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC596892 (June 2016), *DCH Auto*
17 *Wage and Hour Cases*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4833 (May 2017); *Garcia v.*
18 *Gordon Trucking* (E.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2012) 2012 WL 5364575, at *3; *Schiller v. David’s Bridal,*
19 *Inc.* (E.D. Cal. June 11, 2012) 2012 WL 2117001, at *14; *Chu v. Wells Fargo Invs., LLC* (N.D.
20 Cal. Feb. 16, 2011) 2011 WL 672645, at *1; *Franco v. Ruiz Food Prods.* (E.D. Cal Nov. 27,
21 2012) 2012 WL 5941801, at *14; *Nordstrom Commissions Case* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576,
22 589.

23 In a PAGA case, the court’s focus is not the monetary amount which aggrieved
24 employees or the State stand to receive, but instead, whether the total settlement amount achieves
25 the PAGA’s objectives. The purpose of the PAGA is “to incentivize private parties to recover
26 civil penalties for the government that otherwise may not have been assessed and collected by
27

28 ³⁰ Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 7.

overburdened state enforcement agencies.” See *Ochoa-Hernandez, supra*, 2010 WL 1340777, at *4 (citing *Arias, supra*, 46 Cal.4th at 986). Penalties recovered under the PAGA are, in part, to “be distributed to the [LWDA] for enforcement of labor laws . . . and for education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities under this code, to be continuously appropriated to supplement and not supplant the funding to the agency for those purposes.” See Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(j). The recovery of penalties on behalf of the State, by way of a PAGA claim, is essentially a law enforcement action. See *Amalgamated, supra*, 46 Cal.4th at 1003 (stating that the PAGA is a mechanism for “an aggrieved employee to recover civil penalties—for Labor Code violations—that otherwise would be sought by state labor law enforcement agencies”); see also *Iskanian, supra*, at 381.

A PAGA settlement is a settlement of claims for penalties and other remedies which the LWDA could assess and collect on behalf of employees without their involvement or approval. “[U]nnamed employees need not be given notice of the PAGA claim, nor do they have the ability to opt-out of the representative PAGA claim.” *Ochoa-Hernandez, supra*, 2010 WL 1340777, at *5. This renders the approval process of a PAGA settlement distinct from a class action settlement, and the Court need not employ the two-step approval process that applies to a class action settlement, under both state and federal law.

V. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

The Settlement resulted from hard-fought negotiations, fulfills the objectives of the PAGA statute, is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and meets all of the criteria for approval for the reasons discussed below.

A. The Factors Giving Rise to a Presumption of Fairness Exist

The Parties reached the Settlement through arm’s-length negotiations, after a mediation with an experienced and respected mediator, Jeffrey Krivis, Esq., and additional post-mediation settlement negotiations.³¹ A settlement that is “the product of extensive and hard-fought

³¹ Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 13.

adversarial negotiations between the parties” is entitled to a presumption of fairness. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245.

The Settlement is presumptively fair because: (1) it is the product of non-collusive, arm’s-length negotiations with the assistance of an independent mediator knowledgeable in complex labor and employment matters; (2) it was negotiated by counsel with significant experience in similar complex labor and employment matters; and (3) it occurred after counsel for the Parties engaged in significant investigation to evaluate the strength and potential value of the PAGA claim, and of litigating this claim through trial.³²

After engaging in significant investigations informal discovery, and the analysis of information, the Parties participated in settlement negotiations to try to resolve the lawsuit.³³ These efforts included participating in formal mediation conducted by Jeffrey Krivis, Esq., a well-respected mediator experienced in mediating complex labor and employment matters.³⁴ In the course of mediation and settlement negotiations, the Parties discussed all aspects of the case, including the risks and delays of further litigation and proceeding with trial, as well as the law relating to representative PAGA actions, manageability, off-the-clock theory, meal and rest periods (and meal waivers), and wage-and-hour enforcement, the evidence produced and analyzed, and the possibility of bifurcation of discovery and/or trial and appeals, among other things.³⁵ During all settlement discussions, the Parties conducted their negotiations at arm’s length in an adversarial position.³⁶

Based on all of the information available to the Parties and with the assistance of the experienced mediator, the Parties agree that this matter is well-suited for settlement given the strengths and weaknesses of the PAGA claim.³⁷ Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s Counsel believe that the settlement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of this matter.³⁸ Plaintiff’s Counsel has

³² Aiwazian Decl., ¶¶ 4-7, 11-13, & 16-20.

³³ *Id.*, ¶ 13.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Id.*, ¶ 27.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

1 extensive experience handling representative and class action wage-and-hour litigation and used
2 that experience to achieve a great result for Plaintiff, the State of California, and the Aggrieved
3 Employees.³⁹ Therefore, the Court should give considerable weight to the competency,
4 experience, and opinion of counsel and the involvement of a neutral mediator in assuring that the
5 settlement is a product of arm's length bargaining. See *Kirkorian v. Borelli* (N.D. Cal. 1988)
6 695 F.Supp. 446, 451 (opinion of experienced counsel is entitled to considerable weight); *Boyd*
7 *v. Bechtel Corp.* (N.D. Cal. 1979) 485 F.Supp. 610, 616-17, 622 (recommendations of plaintiffs'
8 counsel should be given a presumption of reasonableness); see also *Satchell v. Fed. Express*
9 *Corp.* (N.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2007) 2007 WL 1114010, at *4 (stating that the "assistance of an
10 experienced mediator in the settlement process confirms that the settlement is non-collusive").

11 **B. The Relative Strength of the PAGA Claim and the Range of Possible**
12 **Outcomes in the Litigation Strongly Favor Approval of the Settlement**

13 In order for Plaintiff to prevail on the PAGA claim, she would have to prove that
14 Defendants engaged in the alleged California Labor Code violations and demonstrate that
15 Defendants' conduct warrants the imposition of penalties. See, e.g., *Elliot v. Spherion Pac.*
16 *Work, LLC* (C.D. Cal. 2008) 572 F.Supp.2d 1169, 1181-82 ("Plaintiff's claim under [PAGA] is
17 wholly dependent upon her other claims. Because all of plaintiff's other claims fail as a matter
18 of law, so does her PAGA claim.").

19 Plaintiff's core allegation is that Defendants has systematically violated the California
20 Labor Code, with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, by, *inter alia*, failing to
21 properly pay minimum, regular, overtime wages, failing to provide compliant meal and rest
22 periods and associated premiums, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon
23 termination of employment, failing to provide complete and accurate wage statements, failing to
24 keep complete and accurate payroll records, and failing to reimburse necessary business-related
25 expenses and costs.

26 ///

27 _____
28 ³⁹ Aiwazian Decl., ¶¶ 4-7.

1 ///

2 Although wage-and-hour actions are amenable to resolution as to a group of employees,⁴⁰
3 some courts have also found that, for various reasons, the issues raised by Plaintiff raise
4 individualized issues and/or are unmanageable and thus not suitable for adjudication as to a
5 group of employees.⁴¹

6 Defendants contended that courts have required, and that due process requires, that the
7 adjudication of PAGA claims meets a “manageability” requirement. *See, e.g., Wesson v. Staples*
8 *the Office Superstore, LLC* (2021) 68 Cal.App.5th 746, 756 (“[C]ourts have inherent authority to
9 ensure that PAGA claims can be fairly and efficiently tried and, if necessary, may strike claims

10 ⁴⁰ See, e.g., *Martinez vs. Joe’s Crab Shack Holdings, et al.* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 362, 383-84, *modified on other*
11 *grounds by Martinez v. Joe’s Crab Shack Holdings, et al.* (Dec. 3, 2014, B242807) 2014 Cal.App. LEXIS 1102, *1-
12 2 (stating that difficult issues of proof do not vitiate the preference for efficient and effective means of resolving
13 wage-and-hour claims, including misclassification and overtime, recognizing that “statistical sampling may provide
14 assistance in identifying the realistic demands of the job and illuminating whether the typical employee was able to
15 meet those expectations” and that “[b]y refocusing its analysis on the policies and practices of the employer and the
16 effect those policies and practices have on the [employees] . . . the trial court may in fact find class analysis a more
17 efficient and effective means of resolving plaintiffs’ overtime claim”); *Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court*
18 (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319, 330-31 (Court successfully managed and adjudicated wage-and-hour claims made on behalf
19 of a group of employees, utilizing, among other things, statistics and surveying.); *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
20 *Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1033 (“Claims alleging that a uniform policy consistently applied to a group
21 of employees is in violation of the wage and hour laws are of the sort routinely, and properly, found suitable for
22 class treatment [...] The theory of liability – that [the employer] has a uniform policy, and that that policy, measured
23 against wage order requirements, allegedly violates the law - is by its nature a common question eminently suited for
24 class treatment.”); *Safeway v. Superior Court* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1138, 1159 (finding that real parties
25 demonstrated that the existence of the practice and the fact of damage were matters suitable for determination on
26 behalf of a group of employees and that, “[r]eal parties’ evidence supports the reasonable inference that [...] they
27 could establish that petitioners engaged in the alleged practice, that is, they never paid meal break premium wages,
28 even though a significant number of employees accrued them. Furthermore, in view of real parties’ theory of
29 restitution, those facts would also suffice to demonstrate the fact of damage. Under that theory, the fact of damage
30 does not require a showing that all -- or virtually all -- class members accrued unpaid meal break premium wages,
31 but only that on a system-wide basis, petitioners denied the class members the benefits of the compensation
32 guarantee and enhanced enforcement implemented by section 226.7.”); *Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Bouaphakeo* (2016) 136
33 S.Ct. 1036 (holding that statistical evidence is admissible to support class action certification because it is also
34 admissible to prove liability and damages across a group of employees, where the defendant employer had not kept
35 records of time spent by employees with respect to donning and doffing protective clothing).

36 ⁴¹ See, e.g., *Duran v. U.S. Bank Nat. Assn.* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 1, 25, 29, 31, and 34-35 (stating that even where it has
37 been alleged “that the employer consistently imposed a uniform policy or de facto practice” as to its employees, “the
38 party must still demonstrate that the illegal effects of this conduct can be proven efficiently and manageably” and in
39 litigating representative actions the procedures utilized by the court “may not be used to abridge a party’s
40 substantive rights,” including “abridge[ing the defendant’s] presentation of [a defense] simply because that defense
41 was cumbersome to litigate,” because of “principles of due process”); *Ali v. U.S.A. Cab Ltd.* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th
42 1333, 1341 (affirming denial of certification because employees’ declarations attesting to having taken meal and rest
43 breaks demonstrated that individualized inquiries were required to show harm); *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
44 *Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1018 (stating that employers must authorize, permit, or “relieve the
45 employee of all duty for [a] designated meal [or rest] period,” and “relinquish [full] control over [the employee’s]
46 activities” and “afford” employees an “opportunity to take an *uninterrupted* thirty-minute break,” but
47 are not obligated to affirmatively ensure that no work related tasks are performed during such periods).

that cannot be rendered manageable”)⁴²; but cf. *Estrada v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc.* (2022) 76 Cal.App.5th 685⁴³, 712, review granted (June 22, 2022) (“Imposing a manageability requirement would create an extra hurdle in PAGA cases that does not apply to LWDA enforcement

⁴² In *Wesson*, the appellate court determined that trial courts may dismiss PAGA actions if they are unmanageable. The employer moved to strike the PAGA claim, arguing that the misclassification allegations were “highly fact dependent” and would require individualized inquiries to evaluate the company’s affirmative defenses, and that the number of employees and the nature of the allegations made the PAGA action “unmanageable,” which would violate Staples’ due process rights. *Wesson*, 68 Cal.App.5th 746, 755-756 and 772-773. The trial court invited the plaintiff to submit a trial plan showing that his PAGA action would be manageable at trial, but the plaintiff insisted the trial court lacked authority to require that his claim was manageable. *Id.* at 755-756. Following this response, the trial court concluded that the PAGA claim could not be managed at trial and granted the employer’s motion to strike the PAGA claim. *Ibid.* The appellate court affirmed, holding that trial “courts have inherent authority to ensure that PAGA claims can be fairly and efficiently tried and, if necessary, may strike claims that cannot be rendered manageable;” “as a matter of due process, defendants are entitled to a fair opportunity to litigate available affirmative defenses, and a court’s manageability assessment should account for them;” and “given the state of the record and [plaintiff’s] lack of cooperation with the trial court’s manageability inquiry, the court did not abuse its discretion in striking his PAGA claim as unmanageable.” *Id.* at 755-756 and 764-766. The appellate court noted that because PAGA claims lack the basic requirements that control class actions, such as a well-defined community of interest and a showing that common questions predominate over individual ones, PAGA claims “may well present more significant manageability concerns than those involved in class actions.” *Id.* at 766. In other words, the appellate court noted, because PAGA actions may include “disparate groups of employees and involve different kinds of violations raising distinct questions,” there is a heightened need to consider manageability and that “a need for individualized proof pertaining to a very large number of employees will raise manageability concerns.” *Ibid.*

⁴³ In *Estrada*, the plaintiffs alleged representative claims under PAGA and class claims primarily based on purported meal and rest period violations. The trial court initially certified two classes and denied the employer’s pre-trial motion to decertify the class, due to the employer’s failure to show changed circumstances warranting decertification. *Estrada*, 76 Cal.App.5th 685, 700. However, following the presentation of evidence at trial, the trial court decertified one of the classes (and in relevant part, this also involved dismissing the PAGA meal period claims of this class, due to their being “unmanageable”), and entered judgment. *Id.* at 701-702. Both sides appealed. The Fourth District Court of Appeal determined, in relevant part, that the trial court erred in dismissing the PAGA claims as unmanageable, and in doing so, specifically acknowledged that it was reaching “the opposite conclusion” to that reached in *Wesson v. Staples the Office Superstore, LLC* (2021) 68 Cal.App.5th 746 (where it was concluded that courts have inherent authority to strike unmanageable PAGA claims). *Id.* at 697. The appellate court relied on *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969 and *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 73, to find that a court cannot strike a PAGA claim based on manageability, because:

“[t]hese cases have made clear that PAGA claims are unlike conventional civil suits and, in particular, are not class actions. Allowing dismissal of unmanageable PAGA claims would effectively graft a class action requirement onto PAGA claims, undermining a core principle of these authorities. It would also interfere with PAGA’s purpose as a law enforcement mechanism by placing an extra hurdle on PAGA plaintiffs that is not placed on the state. That said, courts are not powerless when facing unwieldy PAGA claims. Courts may still, where appropriate and within reason, limit the amount of evidence PAGA plaintiffs may introduce at trial to prove alleged violations to other unrepresented employees. If plaintiffs are unable to show widespread violations in an efficient and reasonable manner, that will just reduce the amount of penalties awarded rather than lead to dismissal.” *Id.* at 697.

For this and other reasons, the appellate court reversed the trial court’s order decertifying the class and dismissing the related PAGA claim as unmanageable. However, the appellate court also acknowledged that “[s]ome PAGA claims involve hundreds or thousands of alleged aggrieved employees, each with unique factual circumstances” and to address this, where appropriate and within reason, trial courts may “limit witness testimony and other forms of evidence when determining the number of violations that occurred and the amount of penalties to assess[.]” and plaintiffs’ counsel should “work with the trial courts during trial planning to define a workable group or groups of aggrieved employees for which violations can be more easily shown[.]” *Id.* at 712-713. Otherwise, the appellate court noted, a PAGA plaintiff seeking to try their claim “risk[s] being awarded a paltry sum of penalties, if any,” due to problems of proof. *Id.* at 713. The appellate court’s comments regarding the practical limitations of actually trying a PAGA lawsuit are being used by employers to argue that PAGA lawsuits are unmanageable or that the scope of such lawsuits should be narrowed for purposes of trial.

actions.”); *Litty v. Merrill Lynch & Co.* (C.D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2014) No. CV-14-0425-PA, WL 5904904 at **3-4 (Court dismissed the PAGA claim because a multitude of individualized assessments would be necessary, making the PAGA claim unmanageable).

Defendants also maintained several defenses to Plaintiff’s theory of liability, which, if successfully argued and proven, had the potential to eliminate or substantially reduce recovery. Throughout this litigation, Defendants maintained, and continues to maintain, that they had, and continue to have, legally-compliant employment policies and practices throughout the time period at issue.⁴⁴ Defendants deny that they ever violated any provision of the California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, those sections for which Plaintiff seeks penalties under the PAGA.⁴⁵ Defendants further denied, and continues to deny, that the lawsuit is appropriate for representative treatment for any purpose other than settlement.⁴⁶

Defendants also challenged Plaintiff’s standing as an aggrieved employee and denied that any of Defendants’ other employees whom Plaintiff seeks to represent are aggrieved.⁴⁷ Also, at the time that this case commenced, multiple courts had taken an approach requiring a plaintiff to establish standing and face the possibility of bifurcation of discovery and/or trial of the PAGA claim. *See Amalgamated Transit Union, supra*, 46 Cal.4th at 1001 (noting that PAGA “require[s] a plaintiff to have suffered an injury resulting from an unlawful action”); *Stafford v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.* (E.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2014) 2014 WL 6633396, at *4 (finding that judicial economy supported bifurcation because of the difficulties and inherent uncertainties of being able to establish liability with respect to a large number of potentially aggrieved employees and noted that “PAGA’s public purpose would be ill-served if the court finds [the plaintiff] has not been aggrieved by a Labor Code violation”); *Horton v. Jones* (1972) 26 Cal.App.3d 952, 955 (stating that bifurcation and sequencing of litigation is allowed to avoid wasting time and money on trial when litigation of issues could be rendered moot).

Defendants also argued that an important feature of PAGA is that the Court retains

⁴⁴ Aiwazian Decl., ¶ 17.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Id.*, ¶ 19.

discretion to lower the penalties if, based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is “unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory.” See Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(e)(2); see also *Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Management, Inc.* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1136 (holding that a court may reduce the amount of PAGA penalties awarded to an employee based upon discretionary factors). Defendants maintained, and continue to maintain, that they had and continue to have, legally-compliant employment policies and practices throughout the time period at issue.⁴⁸ Defendants deny that they ever violated any provision of the California Labor Code.⁴⁹ Even if, *arguendo*, such violations occurred, which Defendants deny, Defendants contended that said violations would only be considered “initial violations” and thus heightened “subsequent violation” penalties were not warranted. See Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(f)(2); see also *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1208-09 (“Until the employer has been notified that it is violating a Labor Code provision [...], the employer cannot be presumed to be aware that its continuing underpayment of employees is a ‘violation’ subject to penalties.”).

Defendants also contended that, with respect to PAGA claims, the Court was unlikely to assess cumulative penalties for the maximum number of possible, separate California Labor Code violations, because it would be unjust, arbitrary, oppressive, and/or confiscatory, especially where certain conduct may be regulated by multiple provisions of the California Labor Code that are interrelated and work in tandem. As such, Defendants contended that cumulative penalties and heightened penalties would be unjust, arbitrary, oppressive, and confiscatory.

There is also uncertainty regarding PAGA claims due to the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Viking River Cruises, Inc. v. Moriana* (2022) 142 S. Ct. 1906, 2022 U.S. LEXIS 2940. As a result of that decision, it may be more likely that employer agreements containing arbitration terms will impact the viability of adjudication of PAGA claims in the judicial forum, which is relevant to this matter in light of agreements that Defendants obtained from their employees (which included, *inter alia*, release of claims, and/or binding individual

⁴⁸ Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 17.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

arbitration provisions). *Viking River Cruises, Inc. v. Moriana* (2022) 142 S. Ct. 1906, 2022 U.S. LEXIS 2940.⁵⁰ However, the California Supreme Court has confirmed that an aggrieved employee who has been compelled to arbitrate claims under PAGA that are premised on Labor Code violations actually sustained by the plaintiff maintains statutory standing to pursue PAGA claims arising out of events involving other employees that PAGA representative claims. *Adolph v. Uber Technologies, Inc.* (2023) 14 Cal.5th 1104, 532 P.3d 682, 685. Nevertheless, while the arbitrable and non-arbitrable components of an action are not severed from one another, it is still possible that trial courts will stay the representative/non-individual PAGA claims pending arbitration of a plaintiff's individual PAGA claims and if a plaintiff is determined to not be an "aggrieved employee" for PAGA purposes, issue preclusion would apply and, once reduced to a final judgment, trial courts are bound by the arbitrator's determination and the plaintiff loses standing to pursue non-individual PAGA claims. Agreement. *Id.* at 693. It should be noted that at the time that the Parties reached a settlement, there was uncertainty based on *Viking River Cruise*.

While Plaintiff disagrees with Defendants' contentions and maintains that her PAGA claim has merit, in reaching the settlement, Plaintiff and her counsel took into account the strengths and weaknesses of each side's position and the uncertainty of how the case might have concluded as litigation continued, at trial, and/or upon appeal.⁵¹

///

⁵⁰ Aiwazian Decl., ¶ 18. In *Viking River Cruises*, the U.S. Supreme Court determined that PAGA claims can be split into individual claims based on California Labor Code violations suffered by the plaintiff (that can then be subject to arbitration) and non-individual claims (that are representative in nature) and that the "indivisibility rule" recognized by the California Supreme Court in *Iskanian v. CLS Transp. Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348 is preempted by the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) to the extent it circumscribes the freedom of parties to agree to such contractual division or splitting of PAGA actions. *Viking River Cruises, Inc.*, 1923-1925. The U.S. Supreme Court also determined that, important structural differences between PAGA actions and class actions preclude any straightforward application of U.S. Supreme Court precedents invalidating prohibitions on class-action waivers, to *Iskanian*'s ban on wholesale PAGA representative action waivers, and thus this aspect of *Iskanian* is not preempted by the FAA. *Id.* at 1919, 1922-1925. The U.S. Supreme Court also expressed its understanding of California state law, and the impact of its ruling on, PAGA's standing requirement, regarding which California courts will have the last word, as noted by a concurring opinion. *Id.* at 1925-1926 (concurring opinion). Taken together, the substantive statutory right to pursue a PAGA claim has not been eviscerated and has been preserved, however, arbitration agreements may be used to select the forum and procedure to be used to resolve PAGA claims to some extent, and the California courts and legislature have yet to weigh in on and articulate where California law stands.

⁵¹ Aiwazian Decl., ¶ 20.

1 **C. The Settlement Avoids Risky, Complex, and Lengthy Further Litigation**

2 Courts favor the voluntary conciliation and settlement of complex litigation. *Class*
3 *Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle* (9th Cir. 1992) 955 F.2d 1268, 1276. Generally, “unless the
4 settlement is clearly inadequate, its acceptance and approval are preferable to lengthy and
5 expensive litigation with uncertain results.” *Nat’l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.*
6 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2004) 221 F.R.D. 523, 526 (citation omitted).

7 Prior to reaching the Settlement, the Parties investigate the veracity, strength, and scope
8 of the PAGA claim and allegations.⁵² In addition, the Parties exchanged a large volume of
9 information, documents, and data relevant to Plaintiff’s claim and Defendant’s defenses thereto,
10 including, and not limited to, the employment records of Plaintiff, a sampling of aggrieved
11 employees’ time and pay data, internal memorandum, various agreements and acknowledgments
12 (such as, Defendants’ arbitration agreement (with class action waiver language in the Spanish
13 version), meal period waiver agreements, and employee acknowledgements/attestations
14 addressing meal and rest breaks, recording of time worked, reimbursed employee expenses, and
15 other items of compensation), and Defendants’ operations and employment practices, policies,
16 and procedures documents, among other documents.⁵³ Counsel for the Parties undertook
17 significant investigation, and also invested time reviewing and analyzing relevant documents and
18 data to evaluate Plaintiff’s claim and allegations, including, and not limited to, calculating the
19 potential monetary recovery under PAGA.⁵⁴ Other work performed by Plaintiff’s Counsel
20 included, but was not limited to: meeting and conferring with Defendants’ counsel regarding the
21 pleadings, case management, the mediation, and settlement, among other issues; case strategy
22 and analysis; drafting, reviewing, and revising the pleadings, court filings, the mediation brief,
23 settlement agreement, and settlement approval motion papers; and preparing for and appearing
24 for court proceedings, the mediation, and settlement negotiations.⁵⁵

25 Had the case not settled, the Parties would have conducted extensive formal discovery,

26 ⁵² Aiwazian Decl., ¶ 14.

27 ⁵³ *Id.*, ¶¶ 14 & 20.

28 ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Aiwazian Decl., ¶ 14.

1 including propounding written discovery requests as well as multiple depositions of party and
2 percipient witnesses all over the State of California, to prepare the case for trial. From the
3 inception of this litigation, Defendants indicated that they would aggressively litigate this case.⁵⁶
4 Even if Defendants failed on their defenses, litigating a complex PAGA action is inherently
5 expensive, and the litigation could continue beyond entry of judgment if either party were to
6 appeal adverse rulings.⁵⁷ Additionally, there is a real possibility that Plaintiff would recover
7 nothing, either for herself or on behalf of the State of California or other Aggrieved Employees
8 after years of costly and labor-intensive litigation. Avoiding these risks and the likelihood of
9 future contentious litigation, which would involve significant costs, favors settlement.

10 **D. The Settlement Is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable**

11 “[T]he very essence of a settlement is compromise, ‘a yielding of absolutes and an
12 abandoning of highest hopes.’” *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Comm’n* (9th Cir. 1981) 688
13 F.2d 615, 624. “The proposed settlement is not to be judged against a hypothetical or
14 speculative measure of what might have been achieved by the negotiators.” *Id.* at 625.

15 The Settlement provides significant benefits to the State of California and the Aggrieved
16 Employees and falls well-within the range of acceptable settlements under the circumstances.
17 Under the Agreement, Defendants have agreed to pay a Total Settlement Amount of
18 \$200,000.00, which encompasses the Net Settlement Amount, Attorneys’ Fees and Costs,
19 Settlement Administration Costs, and General Release Fee.⁵⁸ Subject to approval by the Court,
20 the following amounts will be subtracted from the Total Settlement Amount to yield the Net
21 Settlement Amount: (1) Attorneys’ Fees and Costs consisting of attorneys’ fees in the amount of
22 \$66,666.67 and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$11,348.36 to
23 Plaintiff’s Counsel⁵⁹; (2) the Settlement Administration Costs of up to \$5,000.00; and (3)

24 ⁵⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 17.

25 ⁵⁷ *Id.*, ¶¶ 12, 13, 16 & 19.

26 ⁵⁸ Settlement Agreement, §§ 4(a) & 4(a)(1)-(5).

27 ⁵⁹ Settlement Agreement, § 4(a)(1). Although the Settlement Agreement provides that Plaintiff’s Counsel can seek
28 up to \$25,000.00 for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses, Plaintiff’s Counsel only seeks the amount of
\$11,348.36 for this payment, which is less than \$25,000.00. The difference between the amount sought and the
maximum allocated amount available under the settlement (i.e., the difference of \$13,651.64), will be a part of the
Net Settlement Amount.

1 General Release Fee of up to \$5,000.00 to Plaintiff.⁶⁰

2 The Net Settlement Amount is currently estimated to be \$111,948.97, of which an
3 estimated \$27,987.24 is to be distributed to Aggrieved Employees on a *pro rata* basis, based on
4 their Compensable Pay Periods and \$83,961.73 is to be distributed to the LWDA. There is no
5 reason to doubt the fairness of the proposed plan of allocation of the Net Settlement Amount as it
6 fully complies with California Labor Code section 2699(i).

7 The Settlement is a compromise of highly disputed claims. Plaintiff and her counsel
8 recognize the expense and length of continued proceedings necessary to litigate the matter
9 through trial and any possible appeals.⁶¹ Plaintiff and her counsel have also taken into account
10 the uncertainty and risk of the outcome of further litigation, and the difficulties and delays
11 inherent in such litigation.⁶² Plaintiff and her counsel are also aware of the burdens of proof
12 necessary to establish liability, both generally and in response to Defendants' defenses thereto,
13 and the difficulties in establishing Defendants' liability for, and the right to recover, penalties on
14 behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and other Aggrieved Employees.⁶³ Plaintiff and her
15 counsel have also taken into account Defendants' agreement to enter into a settlement that
16 confers significant relief upon the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California.⁶⁴

17 Considering all of the facts in this case, Plaintiff and her counsel have determined that the
18 Settlement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the PAGA claim, and that it
19 is in the best interests of the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California.⁶⁵

20 ///

21 The result achieved in this case, and the monetary recovery provided by this settlement,
22 are well-within the range of an acceptable settlement under the circumstances, especially when
23 compared to the settlement of PAGA claims in other cases. *See, e.g., DCH Auto Wage and Hour*
24 *Cases*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4833 (May 2017) (approving the amount of

25 ⁶⁰ *Id.*, §§ 4(a)-4(a)(4).

26 ⁶¹ Aiwazian Decl., ¶¶ 12, 16 & 19.

27 ⁶² *Id.*, ¶¶ 12, 16 & 19.

28 ⁶³ *Id.*, ¶¶ 15 & 16.

⁶⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 13.

⁶⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 27.

\$15,000 out of \$4 million toward settlement of PAGA claims); *Garcia, supra*, 2012 WL 5364575, at *3 (approving the amount of \$10,000 out of \$3.7 million toward settlement of PAGA claims); *Schiller, supra*, 2012 WL 2117001, at *14 (approving the amount of \$10,000 out of \$518,245 toward settlement of PAGA claims); *Chu, supra*, 2011 WL 672645, at *1 (approving the amount of \$10,000 out of \$6.9 million toward settlement of PAGA claims); *Franco, supra*, 2012 WL 5941801, at *14 (approving the amount of \$10,000 out of \$2.5 million toward settlement of PAGA claims); *Nordstrom Commissions Case, supra*, at 589 (finding no abuse of discretion by the trial court in approving a settlement that allocates \$0 toward the settlement of PAGA claims that were at issue in the lawsuit). Here, the value obtained for settlement of the PAGA claim is significant, and it will be distributed in accordance with and in fulfillment of the objectives of the PAGA statute.

E. The Experience and Views of Plaintiff’s Counsel Favor Approval of the Settlement

Plaintiff’s Counsel is highly experienced in complex representative and class action wage-and-hour litigation.⁶⁶ In the view of Plaintiff’s Counsel, the benefits conferred by the settlement are eminently fair and reasonable, and in the best interests of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees in light of the risk, delay, and uncertainty of continued litigation and the substantial monetary benefits provided for by the Settlement.⁶⁷ Furthermore, courts have acknowledged that “the interests of plaintiff, counsel and other potentially aggrieved employees are largely aligned. All stand to gain from proving as convincingly as possible as many Labor Code violations as the evidence will sustain[.]” *Williams, supra*, 548 (citing Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(g)(1)(i)).

VI. THE PROPOSED ATTORNEYS’ FEES PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE, AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

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

⁶⁶ Aiwazian Decl., ¶¶ 4-7.

⁶⁷ *Id.*, ¶ 27.

1 The Settlement provides for a Total Settlement Amount of \$200,000.00.⁶⁸ The
2 Settlement provides for attorneys' fees in an amount of up to thirty-five percent (35%) of the
3 Total Settlement Amount, which is \$70,000.00⁶⁹, subject to approval and award by the Court;
4 Plaintiff's Counsel only seeks one-third of the Total Settlement Amount, i.e., \$66,666.67, which
5 is less than the maximum amount of attorneys' fees contemplated under the Settlement
6 Agreement. The requested attorneys' fees award is commensurate with: (1) the risk that
7 Plaintiff's Counsel took in bringing and litigating the case, (2) the time, effort, and expense
8 dedicated to the case, (3) the skill and determination that Plaintiff's Counsel has shown, (4) the
9 results that Plaintiff's Counsel has achieved throughout the litigation, (5) the value that
10 Plaintiff's Counsel has achieved in the case, and (6) the other cases that Plaintiff's Counsel has
11 turned down in order to devote its time and effort to this case.

12 Plaintiff's Counsel is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as a matter
13 of right under PAGA. See Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(g)(1) ("Any employee who prevails in any
14 [PAGA] action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs"). Plaintiff's
15 Counsel is also entitled to fees and costs under California Code of Civil Procedure section
16 1021.5, as the instant PAGA action is by definition "for the benefit" of others and secures
17 monetary recovery for a large number of Aggrieved Employees, as well as the State of
18 California. See *Estrada v. FedEx Ground Package Sys. Inc.* (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 1, 16-17
19 (recognizing that recovery obtained on behalf of 209 individuals satisfies the "significant
20 benefit," "public interest," and "large class of persons" requirements of Code of Civil Procedure
21 section 1021.5, regardless of plaintiff's personal motivation). The settlement will also benefit
22 the state labor agency in enforcing labor laws and educating "employers and employees about
23 their rights and responsibilities under [the California Labor Code]." Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(i).

24 ///

25 The propriety of calculating and awarding attorneys' fees as a percentage of a monetary
26 fund that has, by litigation, been preserved or recovered for the benefit of others, has been

27 ⁶⁸ Settlement Agreement, § 4(a).

28 ⁶⁹ *Id.*, § 4(a)(1); see also, n.16, *supra*.

confirmed by the California Supreme Court. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480 at 486 & 506. While trial courts have discretion to apply either a lodestar method or percentage-of-the-fund method, the California Supreme Court has taken the position that trial courts also “retain the discretion to forgo a lodestar cross-check and use other means to evaluate the reasonableness of a requested percentage fee” and “[t]he percentage of fund method survives in California.” *Id.* (internal quotes omitted); see also *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App. 4th at 253.

Courts award fees to serve as an economic incentive for lawyers to undertake litigation, and thereby enhance and facilitate access to the judicial system for adjudication of meritorious claims, and to deter wrongdoing. This is especially true in situations where multiple similar alleged wrongs would not be economically feasible to pursue individually, such as here. See A. Conte, *Attorney Fee Awards* (2d ed. 1993) 104, at 6.

Trial courts have “wide latitude” in assessing the value of attorneys’ fees and their decisions will “not be disturbed on appeal absent a manifest abuse of discretion.” *Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 41; see also *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal.5th 480 at 506 (holding that “trial court did not abuse its discretion in using [the percentage of fund method], in part to approve the fee request”). Indeed, it is long settled that the “experienced trial judge is the best judge of the value of professional services rendered in his court.” *Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132.

The percentage method is particularly appropriate where a monetary settlement has been recovered and “the benefit [recovered can be] easily quantified.” *In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.* (9th Cir. 2011) 654 F.3d 935, 942. Where the amount of a settlement is a “certain easily calculable sum of money,” California courts may calculate attorneys’ fees as a reasonable percentage of the settlement created. Weil and Brown, California Practice Guide, *Civil Procedure Before Trial*, Chapter 14, section 14:145; *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal. App. 4th at 1808.

The percentage fee method is preferred in representative actions because “it better approximates the workings of the marketplace than the lodestar approach.” *Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 49. California law provides that the award for attorneys’ fees should be equivalent to fees freely negotiated in the legal marketplace and paid in comparable litigation

1 based on the result achieved and risk incurred. *See Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 47-50;
2 *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal.5th 480 at 503. In cases where the settlement agreement provides that the
3 defendant will pay the plaintiff's attorneys a percentage of the fund created by the settlement, use
4 of that percentage method is appropriate. *Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 32. Fee awards that
5 are too small will "chill the private enforcement essential to the vindication of many legal rights
6 and obstruct the representative actions that often relieve the courts of the need to separately
7 adjudicate numerous claims." *Id.* at 53. Therefore, fees in representative actions should
8 approximate the probable terms of a contingent fee contract negotiated by a sophisticated
9 attorney and client in comparable litigation. *Id.* at 48. "The ultimate goal . . . is the award of a
10 'reasonable' fee to compensate counsel for their efforts, irrespective of the method of
11 calculation." *Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 557-58 (quoting *Apple*
12 *Computer, Inc. v. Superior Court, supra*, 126 Cal.App.4th at 1270).

13 Plaintiff's Counsel's application for attorneys' fees in light of the facts and circumstances
14 surrounding the case is well-within the range of reasonableness. Historically, courts have
15 awarded fees as high as fifty percent (50%) of the settlement in complex actions, depending on
16 the circumstances of the case. *See In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.* (D.D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp.
17 494 (awarding attorneys' fees in the amount of 45% of the \$7.3 million total settlement amount);
18 *Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.* (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195
19 (awarding approximately 53% of the settlement as attorneys' fees). California courts routinely
20 approve attorneys' fees awards "average[ing] around one-third of the recovery." *Chavez v.*
21 *Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 n.11 (lower court found the range of contingency
22 fees in marketplace to be 20 to 40 percent and determined such a percentage fee was
23 appropriate).

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

Plaintiff's Counsel has litigated this case since it was commenced, with the very real possibility of an unsuccessful outcome and no fee recovery of any kind.⁷⁰ Counsel for the Parties undertook significant investigation, and also invested time reviewing and analyzing relevant information, documents, and data to evaluate the claims, including, and not limited to, calculating the potential monetary recovery under PAGA.⁷¹ Other work performed by Plaintiff's Counsel included, but was not limited to: meeting and conferring with Defendants' counsel regarding the pleadings, motion practice, case management, the mediation, and settlement, among other issues; case strategy and analysis; drafting, reviewing, and revising the pleadings, court filings, the mediation brief, settlement agreement, and settlement approval motion papers; and preparing for and appearing for court proceedings, mediation, further negotiations after mediation, and settlement negotiations.⁷²

In the present case, Plaintiff's Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.⁷³ Plaintiff's Counsel is experienced in complex wage-and-hour litigation and used that experience to obtain a great result for Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California.⁷⁴ Considering the amount of fees requested, work performed, risks incurred, results obtained, and experience of Plaintiff's Counsel in handling similar matters, Plaintiff maintains that the requested attorneys' fees are reasonable and should be awarded.

B. The Fee Award Requested by Plaintiff's Counsel Is Reasonable Based on the Factors Considered in Determination of Fee Awards

The factors which courts consider in determining whether fee awards are reasonable, all of which support the fee award requested by Plaintiff's Counsel, are: (1) the time and labor required; (2) the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved; (3) the skill requisite to perform the legal services properly; (4) the preclusion of other employment by the attorney due

⁷⁰ Aiwazian Decl., ¶ 25.

⁷¹ *Id.*, § 14.

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ *Id.*, ¶ 25.

⁷⁴ *Id.*, ¶¶ 4-7.

1 to the acceptance of the case; (5) the customary fee; (6) whether the fee is fixed or contingent;
2 (7) the time limitation imposed by the client or the circumstances; (8) the amount involved and
3 results obtained; (9) the experience, reputation, and ability of the attorney; (10) the undesirability
4 of the case; (11) the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client; and (12)
5 awards in similar cases. *Camden I Condominium Association, Inc. v. Dunkel* (11th Cir. 1991)
6 946 F. 2d 768, 772. Some of the most relevant factors to this Court's fee determination will be
7 addressed below.

8 It should be highlighted that the percentage award sought is commensurate with the time,
9 effort, and expense dedicated to the case, the contingent nature of Plaintiff's Counsel's
10 representation and the risks taken in commencing the Actions, the skill and determination
11 required, the results that Plaintiff's Counsel has achieved, and the value of the settlement that
12 Plaintiff's Counsel has obtained on behalf of Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State
13 of California. For the reasons discussed herein, an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of
14 one-third (33.33%) of the Total Settlement Amount is reasonable.

15 **1. Time & Labor**

16 Plaintiff's Counsel has used its experience and skills in litigating complex wage-and-hour
17 actions to bring this matter to a successful conclusion. Prior to commencing this lawsuit,
18 Plaintiff's Counsel conducted a significant amount of investigation into the factual and legal
19 issues, Defendants' business, and its operations and employment policies, practices, and
20 procedures.⁷⁵ During the litigation of the Actions, Plaintiff's Counsel interviewed and obtained
21 information from Plaintiff, Defendant, and other sources, conducted legal research, reviewed and
22 analyzed a large amount of documents and data, prepared for and attended mediation, evaluated
23 the PAGA claim, and calculated the potential monetary recovery under PAGA.⁷⁶ Plaintiff's
24 Counsel also met and conferred with Defendants' counsel regarding the pleadings, case
25 management, the mediation, and settlement, among other issues.⁷⁷ Plaintiff's Counsel performed
26

27 ⁷⁵ Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 14.

28 ⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

1 other work including, *inter alia*, case strategy and analysis; and engaging in extensive settlement
2 negotiations.⁷⁸

3 Plaintiff's Counsel dedicated the full extent of staffing and monetary resources necessary
4 to prosecute the case with maximum efficiency, and has fully and actively participated in the
5 litigation process. The Attorney Task and Time Chart, which is attached as "**EXHIBIT 3**" to the
6 accompanying Declaration of Edwin Aiwarzian, sets forth in detail the hours that Plaintiff's
7 Counsel has spent performing tasks in this matter. Attorneys at Lawyers for Justice, PC has
8 spent **267.70 hours** to obtain a recovery on behalf of Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the
9 State of California. These hours were required to bring the case to its successful conclusion.

10 In light of the value of time expended and the carrying of costs involved in this litigation,
11 the requested attorneys' fees award is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

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

13 The skill required to properly litigate this case is evident not only in the results achieved,
14 but in the steps necessary to reach the same. Defendants retained highly-respected counsel to
15 represent its defenses. Defendants and their counsel felt very strongly about Defendants ability
16 to prevail on the merits and avoid representative adjudication of the PAGA claim. Plaintiff and
17 Plaintiff's Counsel believe that the PAGA claim has merit and that Plaintiff will prevail at trial.
18 Plaintiff's Counsel undertook extensive investigation, analysis, and research prior to filing the
19 lawsuit and during the litigation. Plaintiff's Counsel took steps to prepare the case for trial and
20 had every intention of taking the case to trial if Defendants did not offer an appropriate
21 settlement.

22 Plaintiff's Counsel's effort and skill were used to, among other things, investigate the
23 allegations and gather facts, research the legal issues, analyze data and information obtained
24 from Defendants, Plaintiff, and through other sources, evaluate the PAGA claim, and negotiate
25 the settlement. Despite all of the obstacles that had to be overcome, Plaintiff's Counsel used its
26 extensive experience and skill in the handling of complex wage-and-hour matters to advocate for

27
28 ⁷⁸ Ibid.

1 and obtain Aggrieved Employees and the State of California a recovery now, with maximum
2 efficiency, as opposed to the possibility of recovery in the future, after significant expense and
3 time.⁷⁹

4 ***3. The Value of the Settlement***

5 The Settlement represents an excellent resolution of this lawsuit, given the uncertainty
6 and risks of further litigation.⁸⁰ Had the case not settled, Defendants would have vigorously
7 challenged manageability and liability, and sought a reduction in the amount assessed as
8 penalties. Defendants, however, faced risks too, including and not limited to, the risk of having
9 the Court assess penalties. Additionally, preparing the case for trial would have been
10 extraordinarily expensive for the Parties.

11 At this stage, the settlement is preferred over continued litigation because such resolution
12 saves time and money that would otherwise go to litigation. The risks and expenses of further
13 litigation outweighed any benefit that might have been gained otherwise. The Settlement
14 provides an immediate recovery, as opposed to an uncertain result in the future after prolonged
15 litigation involving expert discovery, trial preparation, and appellate review of those
16 proceedings. The Settlement offers present and considerable monetary relief to Plaintiff, the
17 Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California while avoiding additional expense, risk, and
18 delay in obtaining possible further recovery.

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

20 The representation provided by Plaintiff's Counsel has been wholly contingent and
21 Plaintiff's Counsel took on this matter without knowing whether any recovery would be
22 obtained. Plaintiff's Counsel has invested **267.70 hours** of time to obtain relief on behalf of
23 Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California. Plaintiff's Counsel is also
24 requesting reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$11,348.36.⁸¹

25
26
27 ⁷⁹ Aiwazian Decl., ¶¶ 16-20.

⁸⁰ *Id.*, ¶¶ 15, 16, 19, & 27.

28 ⁸¹ *Id.*, ¶ 25 and Exh. 3.

1 In this case, Plaintiff's Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will
2 not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.⁸² If Plaintiff's Counsel had not been
3 successful, the time that they have devoted to litigating the case would have been for naught and
4 would not have produced any fee or any reimbursement of costs or expenses. Plaintiff's Counsel
5 is well-experienced in complex wage-and-hour litigation and used that experience to obtain a
6 great result for Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California.⁸³ The skill and
7 determination that Plaintiff's Counsel has shown throughout the Actions justify the requested
8 attorneys' fees and costs. Considering the amounts requested, work performed, and risks
9 incurred, the requested fees and costs are reasonable and should be awarded.

10 **5. The Amount Involved and the Results Achieved**

11 The results achieved, in light of the difficulties inherent in similar cases and the specific
12 difficulties faced in this case, are considerable. Here, the results achieved, and the recovery
13 obtained on behalf of Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California represent a
14 fair and reasonable resolution of this lawsuit. Plaintiff's Counsel's efforts have resulted in a
15 settlement that provides for a Total Settlement Amount of \$200,000.00, and it is currently
16 estimated that the Net Settlement Amount available for distribution to the Aggrieved Employees
17 and the State of California, as set forth in Part III.C *infra*, is approximately \$111,948.97.⁸⁴

18 **6. The Reputation and Ability of the Attorneys**

19 Plaintiff's Counsel is a recognized class action and complex litigation law firm, and its
20 attorneys employed their knowledge, skill, and experience to bring the case to a successful
21 conclusion. Plaintiff's Counsel has years of wage-and-hour class action and complex litigation
22 experience, has recovered millions of dollars on behalf of thousands of individuals in California,
23 and has successfully handled numerous significant wage-and-hour class action and representative
24 action cases.⁸⁵

26 ⁸² Aiwazian Decl., ¶ 25.

27 ⁸³ See *id.*, ¶¶ 4-7.

28 ⁸⁴ Settlement Agreement, § 4(a).

⁸⁵ Aiwazian Decl., ¶¶ 4-7.

C. **The Lodestar Methodology Also Justifies Approval of the Requested Fees, Because Plaintiff’s 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” and “does not impose an absolute maximum or minimum on the potential fee award.” *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal.5th at 505.

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. Plaintiff’s Counsel Performed Work for a Reasonable Number of Hours

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, this case was highly contested and required a significant amount of time and labor. Defendant made it clear very early on that it disputed all of Plaintiff’s allegations and disputed that representative adjudication was appropriate. Defendant also argued, *inter alia*, that it had facially-compliant employment policies and practices throughout the time period at issue.⁸⁶ Defendant raised affirmative defenses and denied liability, and the pursuit of this case

⁸⁶ Aiwazian Decl., ¶ 17.

involved gathering and analyzing data from Defendant as well as other sources.⁸⁷ The handling of this litigation involved a great amount of effort, and also required and involved the exercise of a high level of skill, which Plaintiff's Counsel has, as a result of its extensive experience in complex wage-and-hour litigation. Long and difficult battles would have followed as the case moved toward trial, including taking and defending declarant and expert depositions, depositions of person most knowledgeable designees, conducting additional formal discovery, and engaging in extensive motion practice. As Plaintiff's Counsel geared up for these battles, Plaintiff's Counsel undertook intense preparation in an attempt to resolve the entire matter through settlement negotiations.

Plaintiff's Counsel had to bring together a volume of data and documents that were obtained from Defendants, Plaintiff, Aggrieved Employees, and through other sources. Plaintiff's Counsel conducted extensive review and analysis of these documents and data to strategize and evaluate the case and engage in settlement discussions.

As set forth above in Part VI.B.1 *infra*, attached to the Declaration of Edwin Aiwazian is the Attorney Task and Time Chart that sets forth in detail the numerous tasks that Plaintiff's Counsel performed in this case, and the time required for completing those tasks.⁸⁸ The chart demonstrates that Lawyers for Justice, PC has spent a total of **267.70 hours** on this matter. In light of the facts and circumstances of this case, as well as the results Plaintiff's Counsel has achieved on behalf of Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, Plaintiff's Counsel has spent a reasonable number of hours on this matter.

***2. The Fees Requested Represent a Reasonable Hourly Rate of Compensation
in Light of Plaintiff's 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 matter. *See Ketchum, supra*, 24 Cal.4th at 1132-33. In

⁸⁷ Aiwazian Decl., ¶¶ 14 & 19.

⁸⁸ *Id.*, Exh. 2.

1 awarding attorneys' fees, the aim is to mirror "the established practice in the private legal market
2 of rewarding attorneys for taking the risk of nonpayment by paying them a premium over their
3 normal hourly rates for winning contingency cases." *See id.*

4 Plaintiff's Counsel has been actively involved in the prosecution of this case, prior to the
5 commencement of the Actions and all the way up to approval of the settlement, and their
6 dedication to the representation of Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of
7 California has precluded other employment. Here, Plaintiff's Counsel bore the risk that, despite
8 all of their efforts and skills employed, there may be no recovery. Ultimately, Plaintiff's Counsel
9 was successful in reaching a settlement of \$200,000.00.

10 As set forth in the Declaration of Edwin Aiwarzian, the professional backgrounds and
11 experience of Plaintiff's Counsel support a reasonable blended hourly rate of compensation of at
12 least \$650 per hour for services provided by Plaintiff's Counsel.⁸⁹ Lawyers for Justice, PC has
13 been awarded attorneys' fees, compensating the firm at the rate of at least \$650 for legal services
14 performed, by courts of this state.⁹⁰ While the circumstance of every case is unique, the fact
15 remains that the work performed and efforts undertaken by Plaintiff's Counsel in this matter
16 justify the requested attorneys' fees award.

17
18 ⁸⁹ Aiwarzian Decl., ¶ 24.

19 ⁹⁰ For example, final approval of the class and representative action settlement in *David Dugan v. TEC Equipment,*
20 *Inc., et al.* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV01591) was granted on July 8, 2021, and the award of
21 attorneys' fees involved an hourly rate of \$936.47; final approval of the class and representative action settlement in
22 *Larry Greenwood, et al. v. Scan Health Plan* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC715157) was granted on
23 April 20, 2021, and the award of attorneys' fees involved an hourly rate of \$919.57; final approval of the class
24 action settlement in *Thereasa Carrozzella v. Basalite Concrete Products, LLC* (Sacramento County Superior Court
25 Case No. 34-2017-00220214-CU-OE-GDS) was granted on February 21, 2020, and the award of attorneys' fees
26 involved an hourly rate of \$766.05; final approval of the class and representative action settlement in *Alice Rutledge,*
27 *et al. v. Healthport Technologies, LLC* (Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG16835813) was granted on
28 June 11, 2019, and the award of attorneys' fees involved an hourly rate of \$764.82; final approval of the class and
representative action settlement in *Seth Swan v. Pace Supply Corp.* (Sonoma County Superior Court Case No.
SCV258764) was granted on February 6, 2019, and the award of attorneys' fees involved an hourly rate of \$855.96;
final approval of the class and representative action settlement in *Stanley Bland, et al. v. Telecare Corporation*
(Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG16811450) was granted on November 21, 2018, and the award of
attorneys' fees involved an hourly rate of \$831.38; final approval of the class and representative action settlement in
Maryjo Ungerbuhler Anderson v. Boyett Petroleum (Stanislaus County Superior Court Case No. 2020582) was
granted on May 15, 2018, and the award of attorney's fees involved an hourly rate of \$780.77; and final approval of
the class and representative action settlement in *Demetrius Camarillo v. Blue Diamond Growers* (Sacramento
County Superior Court Case No. 34-2015-00175871) was granted on June 30, 2017, and the award of attorneys' fees
involved an hourly rate of \$845.64. Aiwarzian Decl., ¶ 24.

1 The lodestar method, as a cross-check to the percentage fee sought, strongly supports the
2 reasonableness of the requested attorneys' fees award. Applying the rate of \$650 per hour to
3 267.70 hours worked by Plaintiff's Counsel, would place a base lodestar value of \$174,005.00 on
4 the services provided by Plaintiff's Counsel. However, Plaintiff's Counsel only seeks an
5 attorneys' fee award of \$66,666.67 (equal to one- third of the Total Settlement Amount based on
6 the Settlement Agreement), which is less than the maximum amount of attorneys' fees
7 contemplated under the Settlement Agreement.

8 It also bears noting that a court may apply a multiplier in consideration for risk, efficiency,
9 and/or obtaining a substantial result, to enhance the lodestar for purpose of cross-check. See
10 *Ketchum*, 24 Cal.4th at 1133-34 (holding that a risk multiplier may be applied to compensate
11 contingency fee attorneys at a fair market rate). Such an enhancement "mirrors the established
12 practice in the private legal market of rewarding attorneys for taking the risk of nonpayment by
13 paying them a premium over their normal hourly rates for winning contingency cases." *Vizcaino*,
14 290 F.3d at 1051; accord *Ketchum*, *supra*, 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-34. A risk multiplier also serves
15 to bring the financial incentives for enforcing important rights "into line with incentives [attorneys]
16 have to undertake claims for which they are paid on a fee-for-services basis." *Ketchum*, 24 Cal.4th
17 at 1132. Courts have also approved fee awards with multipliers of 2 and even higher. See, e.g.,
18 *City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 78 (affirming a 2.34 multiplier without
19 remand); *Wershba*, *supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 255 ("Multipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even
20 higher."); *Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 495, 512 (applying a
21 2.52 multiplier on a lodestar cross-check); *Chavez*, *supra*, 162 Cal.App.4th at 66 (applying a 2.5
22 multiplier in a consumer class action).

23 The lodestar method as a cross-check to the percentage figure sought strongly supports the
24 reasonableness of the requested attorneys' fees. Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that
25 the Court approve and grant an attorneys' fees award in the amount of \$66,666.67 to Plaintiff's
26 Counsel, which is reasonable and justified on a percentage-basis, but also based on a lodestar
27 cross-check.

28 ///

1 ///

2 **VII. COSTS TO BE REIMBURSED TO PLAINTIFF’S COUNSEL ARE FAIR AND**
3 **REASONABLE, AND SHOULD BE APPROVED**

4 The Settlement provides for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses of up to
5 \$25,000.00. As set forth in the Declaration of Edwin Aiwarzian, Plaintiff’s Counsel seeks
6 reimbursement of \$11,348.36 in litigation costs and expenses.⁹¹ These expenses were reasonable
7 and necessary in the prosecution of this matter and to obtain the Settlement, and the amount
8 sought for reimbursement is less than the maximum amount allocated under the Settlement
9 Agreement for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses.⁹² It should be noted that
10 Plaintiff’s Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation to date and will not receive
11 any compensation until a recovery is obtained in this matter.⁹³ The cost savings of \$13,651.54
12 will be part of the Net Settlement Amount.⁹⁴ Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Counsel requests that the
13 Court award reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$11,348.36 to
14 Plaintiff’s Counsel.

15 **VIII. THE PROPOSED COVER LETTER TO THE AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES**
16 **SHOULD BE APPROVED**

17 Although PAGA does not require notice to unnamed aggrieved employees of a
18 settlement, the Parties prepared, and now present for the Court’s consideration and approval, the
19 Cover Letter for transmission to the Aggrieved Employees along with their Individual Settlement
20 Share check (together, PAGA Settlement Package), substantially in the form attached as
21 “EXHIBIT 1” to the [Proposed] Order and Judgment and as “EXHIBIT 1” to the Settlement
22 Agreement. The Cover Letter informs the Aggrieved Employees about the Actions and the
23 Settlement. Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court approve the Cover Letter
24 for transmission to the Aggrieved Employees at the time of disbursing their Individual
25 Settlement Shares.

26 ⁹¹ Aiwarzian Decl., ¶ 25.

27 ⁹² Ibid.

28 ⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

1 ///

2 **IX. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE FAIR AND**
3 **REASONABLE, AND SHOULD BE APPROVED**

4 As set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Parties have agreed to retain, subject to
5 approval by the Court, ILYM Group to handle the administration of the Settlement. The fees and
6 expenses of the PAGA Settlement Administrator are estimated not to exceed \$5,000.00. These
7 costs include, but are not limited to, expenses for preparing, translating, printing, and mailing the
8 Cover Letter and Individual Settlement Shares checks to the Aggrieved Employees (i.e., PAGA
9 Settlement Package); performing skip-trace searches; re-mailing the returned PAGA Settlement
10 Packages to any updated addresses located; and handling inquiries from Aggrieved Employees
11 regarding the Settlement, among other things. Accordingly, the Court should grant approval of
12 the Settlement Administration Costs in the amount of up to \$5,000.00 ILYM Group, a necessary
13 third-party for handling the settlement process.

14 **X. THE PROPOSED GENERAL RELEASE FEE IS FAIR, ADEQUATE, AND**
15 **REASONABLE, AND SHOULD BE APPROVED**

16 The Settlement provides for a General Release Fee to be paid to Plaintiff in the amount of
17 \$5,000.00 in recognition of her efforts and work in spearheading the litigation of this matter, as
18 well as for his broader individual waiver and release of claims with a California Civil Code
19 Section 1542 waiver (set forth in Section 9(b) of the Settlement Agreement).⁹⁵ The purpose of
20 such an award is to incentivize aggrieved employees to step into the shoes of the state labor
21 agency and undertake the responsibilities associated with initiating a lawsuit and serving in a
22 representative capacity. *See Bell v. Farmers Ins. Exch.* (2004) 115 Cal.App.4th 715, 726
23 (“service payments” compensate named plaintiff “for [her] efforts in bringing the action”); *Clark*
24 *v. Am. Residential Servs., LLC* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804 (“an incentive award is
25 appropriate ‘if it is necessary to induce an individual to participate in the suit’”); accord *Ingram*
26 *v. The Coca-Cola Co.* (N.D. Ga. 2001) 200 F.R.D. 685, 694 (internal quotation marks omitted)

27
28 ⁹⁵ Settlement Agreement, § 4(a)(2).

1 (“Courts routinely approve incentive awards to compensate named plaintiffs for the services they
2 provided and the risks they incurred during the course of the [...] litigation.”); *see also, e.g.,*
3 *Resendez, supra*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC59689 (approving \$10,000
4 enhancement award in a PAGA action).

5 Here, Plaintiff contributed considerable time and effort to the litigation of this case in
6 order to enforce the California Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and for the benefit
7 of other Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiff discussed her employment with her counsel, gathered
8 and produced relevant documents and information, and provided the facts and evidence
9 necessary to attempt to prove the allegations.⁹⁶ Plaintiff was available whenever her counsel
10 needed her and tried to obtain and provide documents and information that would aid in the
11 litigation of the PAGA claims and pursuit of recovery on behalf of the State of California and
12 Aggrieved Employees.⁹⁷

13 Accordingly, it is reasonable and just for Plaintiff to receive a General Release Fee in the
14 amount of \$5,000.00, in addition to the Individual Settlement Share she will receive as an
15 Aggrieved Employee for his share of the Net Settlement Amount.

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ⁹⁶ Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 26; Declaration of Camille Campbell (“Campbell Decl.”), ¶¶ 3 & 4.

28 ⁹⁷ Aiwasian Decl., ¶ 26; Campbell Decl., ¶¶ 3 & 4.

///

XI. CONCLUSION

The Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, as it represents a reasoned compromise of disputed claims that has been reached through arm's-length negotiations, in light of the risks, complexity, and expense of further litigation. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court approve the Settlement, including the plan of allocation and distribution of the Total Settlement Amount for the LWDA Payment to the LWDA, Individual Settlement Shares to the Aggrieved Employees, Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Plaintiff's Counsel, Settlement Administration Costs to the PAGA Settlement Administrator, and General Release Fee to Plaintiff, and permit the filing of a memorandum that exceeds the page limit.

Dated: August 29, 2023

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

Giovani Pimentel

By: _____

Giovani Pimentel
Attorneys for Plaintiff