

Arby Aiwarzian (SBN 269827)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
Helene Mayer (SBN 332975)
Ryan Slinger (SBN 351297)
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiff Alex Hernandez

Jeremy F. Bollinger (SBN 240132)
MOSS BOLLINGER, LLP
15300 Ventura Blvd., Suite 207
Sherman Oaks, California 91403
Tel. (310) 982-2984
Fax (818) 963-5954

Attorneys for Plaintiff Martin Sohal

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO**

ALEX HERNANDEZ, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general
public similarly situated and on behalf of
other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
California Private Attorneys General Act;
MARTIN SOHAL, individually, and on
behalf of other aggrieved employees
pursuant to the California Private Attorneys
General Act;

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CHEP SERVICES, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company; BRAMBLES USA, INC.,
an unknown business entity; and DOES 1
through 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB2123946

Honorable Jessica Morgan
Department S26

CLASS ACTION

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION AND
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA
SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
THEREOF**

[Declarations of Proposed Class Counsel (Helene Mayer and Jeremy F. Bollinger); Declaration of Proposed Class Representatives (Alex Hernandez and Martin Sohal); and [Proposed] Order filed concurrently herewith]

Date: August 13, 2024
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Department: S26

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

1 **TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR**
2 **COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

3 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on August 13, 2024 at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as
4 the matter may be heard before the Honorable Jessica Morgan in Department S26 of the Superior
5 Court of the State of California for the County of San Bernardino, located at 247 West Third
6 Street, San Bernardino, California 92415, Plaintiffs Alex Hernandez and Martin Sohal
7 (“Plaintiffs” or “Class Representatives”) will, and hereby do, move for an order:

- 8 • Granting preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement described herein
9 and as set forth in the parties’ Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement
10 (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”), attached as “**EXHIBIT 1**” to
11 the Declaration of Helene Mayer in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary
12 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, including the means of allocation and
13 distribution of the Total Settlement Amount, and the allocations for Attorneys’ Fees and
14 Costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Penalty Amount, and Settlement Administration
15 Costs;
- 16 • Certifying the proposed Class for settlement purposes only;
- 17 • Preliminarily appointing Plaintiffs Alex Hernandez and Martin Sohal as Class
18 Representatives;
- 19 • Preliminarily appointing Arby Aiwarzian, Joanna Ghosh, and Helene Mayer of Lawyers
20 *for Justice, PC* and Jeremy Bollinger of Moss Bollinger, LLP as Class Counsel;
- 21 • Approving the proposed Notice of Class and Representative Action Settlement (“Class
22 Notice”), attached as “**EXHIBIT A**” to the [Proposed] Order Granting Preliminary
23 Approval of Class Action Settlement;
- 24 • Appointing Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as the Settlement
25 Administrator to handle the notice and administration process for the Settlement and
26 preliminarily approving the Settlement Administration Costs;
- 27 • Directing the Settlement Administrator to mail the Class Notice to the proposed Class;
- 28 • Approving the proposed deadlines for the notice and administration process as reflected

herein and in the Settlement Agreement;

- Scheduling a hearing to consider final approval of the Settlement, at which time the Court will also consider whether to grant final approval of the requests for an award of the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payments, Settlement Administration Costs, and PAGA Penalty Amount;
- Granting Plaintiff leave to file the overlength brief included with this motion due to the complex nature of this motion.

This motion is based upon the following memorandum of points and authorities; the Settlement Agreement; the Declarations of Proposed Class Counsel (Helene Mayer and Jeremy F. Bollinger) and Proposed Class Representatives (Alex Hernandez and Martin Sohal) in support thereof; as well as the pleadings and other records on file with the Court in this matter, and such evidence and oral argument as may be presented at the hearing on this motion.

Dated: June 14, 2024

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC


By: 
Helene Mayer
Attorneys for Plaintiff Alex Hernandez

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	SUMMARY OF MOTION.....	1
II.	PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
III.	SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS	4
IV.	LEGAL STANDARD FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS	8
V.	THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT	9
A.	The Settlement Resulted from Arm’s-Length Negotiations Based Upon Extensive Investigation and Discovery.....	10
B.	The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.....	11
C.	The Settlement Is of Significant Value.	14
VI.	CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE	14
A.	The Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous.....	15
B.	The Class Members Share a Well-Defined Community of Interest.....	15
VII.	APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND ALLOCATION FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS.....	17
VIII.	THE PROPOSED NOTICE IS ADEQUATE	18
IX.	APPOINTMENT OF PHOENIX SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATORS AS THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR.....	20
X.	PROPOSED DEADLINES FOR THE NOTICE PROCESS	21
XI.	APPOINTMENT OF CLASS REPRESENTATIVES AND ALLOCATION FOR ENHANCEMENT AWARDS	22
XII.	CONCLUSION	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135	10
<i>Bartold v. Glendale Federal Bank</i> (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 816	15
<i>Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.</i> (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195	19
<i>Capitol People First v. Department of Developmental Services</i> (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 676 15, 16	
<i>Cartt v. Superior Court</i> (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 960.....	19, 20
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43.....	19
<i>City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corporation</i> (2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448.....	9
<i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle</i> (9th Cir. 1982) 955 F.2d 1268.....	8
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794	8, 9, 10
<i>Estrada v. Dr. Pepper/Seven-Up</i> , Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 262247 (May 2005).....	19
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> (9th Cir. 1998) 150 F.3d 1011.....	8, 9
<i>Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp.</i> (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 908.....	15
<i>In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc., Securities Litigation</i> (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 127 F.Supp.2d 418	13
<i>In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litigation</i> (D. D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp. 494.....	19
<i>Ketchum v. Moses</i> (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122	18
<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i> (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116	14
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.</i> (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480.....	18
<i>Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc.</i> (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19	18
<i>Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429.....	15
<i>Mendoza v. United States</i> (9th Cir. 1980) 623 F.2d 1338.....	19
<i>Moore v. IKEA</i> , Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC 263646 (Sept. 2006)	19

1	<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission of City and County of San Francisco</i> (9th Cir.	
2	1982) 688 F.2d 615.....	9
3	<i>Rose v. City of Hayward</i> (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 926	15
4	<i>Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319	14, 15, 16
5	<i>Vasquez v. Superior Court</i> (1971) 4 Cal.3d 800	8
6	<i>Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i> (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294.....	24
7	<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224	8, 9, 10
8	Statutes	
9	Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781.....	19
10	Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781(f).....	8
11	Other Authorities	
12	Conte & Newberg, <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> § 11.25 (4th Ed.).....	9
13	Conte & Newberg, <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> § 11.26 (4th Ed.).....	22
14	Conte & Newberg, <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> § 11.47 (4th Ed.).....	13
15	Conte & Newberg, <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> § 14.03 (4th Ed.).....	19
16	Conte & Newberg, <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> § 8.21 (4th Ed.).....	20
17	Conte & Newberg, <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> § 8.39 (4th Ed.).....	20
18	<i>Manual for Complex Litigation</i> § 21.311 (4th ed. 2007).....	20
19	<i>Manual for Complex Litigation</i> § 21.312 (4th ed. 2007).....	20
20	Rules	
21	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2).....	20
22	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)	20

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION

Plaintiffs Alex Hernandez and Martin Sohal (together, “Plaintiffs” or “Class Representatives”) seek preliminary approval of the Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”) entered into by and between Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and other aggrieved employees, on the one hand, and Defendants CHEP Services, LLP and Brambles USA, Inc. (together, “Defendants”), on the other hand. Subject to approval by the Court, Plaintiffs and Defendants (collectively, the “Parties”) have agreed to settle the lawsuits for a Total Settlement Amount of Three Million Four Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$3,400,000.00).¹ The Total Settlement Amount includes the following: (1) Individual Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members which will be distributed from the Net Settlement Amount²; (2) the Enhancement Payments of Fifteen Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$15,000.00) each to Plaintiffs (\$30,000.00 total)³; (3) the Attorneys’ Fees and Costs to Class Counsel, consisting of attorneys’ fees in the amount of thirty-five percent (35%) of the Total Settlement Amount, or \$1,190,000.00 if the Total Settlement Amount remains \$3,400,000.00, and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses not to exceed Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$20,000.00)⁴; (4) the Settlement Administration Costs to the Settlement Administrator in the amount estimated to be up to Seventeen Thousand Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents (\$17,750.00);⁵ and (5) the amount of Three Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$350,000.00) allocated to penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), of which 75% (i.e., \$262,500.00) will be distributed to the Labor and Workforce Development

¹ Settlement Agreement, attached as “EXHIBIT 1” to Declaration of Helene Mayer (“Mayer Decl.”), ¶ 8.mm. Defendant represents that there were 48,350 Workweeks Worked during the period from August 16, 2017 to September 27, 2023. Should it be determined that the total number of Workweeks are more than ten percent (10%) higher than 48,350 during the Class Period, Defendant shall have the option in its sole discretion to either: (a) increase the Net Settlement Amount on a pro rata basis per Workweek exceeding the 10% increase (i.e. if the number increases by 11%, the Net Settlement Amount will be increased by 1%), or (b) Defendants may elect to have the Class Period and the PAGA Period end on the date when the 10% threshold is reached. *Id.*, ¶ 38.

² *Id.*, ¶ 8.r.

³ *Id.*, ¶ 13.

⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 12.

⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 14.

Agency (“LWDA”) and 25% (i.e., \$87,500.00) will be distributed to all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendant in California employed between February 20, 2020 through the date of preliminary approval (“PAGA Period”) (“PAGA Members”).⁶

Plaintiffs also seek to provisionally certify the following Class for settlement purposes, which Defendants do not oppose:

All current or former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendants in California employed at any time between August 16, 2017 through the date of Preliminary Approval (“Class” or “Class Members”).⁷

The Class is estimated to consist of approximately one thousand four hundred seventy-three (1,473) individuals.⁸

Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid request to be excluded from the Class Settlement (“Settlement Class Members”) will receive a *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount (“Individual Settlement Payment”) and PAGA Members will receive a *pro rata* share of the twenty-five percent (25%) portion of the PAGA Allocation (“Individual PAGA Payment”) on a *pro rata* basis based upon workweeks during the Class Period and/or PAGA Period when Class Members and/or PAGA Members were employed by Defendants as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee and recorded time worked (“Workweeks”).⁹

The Settlement, if granted preliminary and final approval by the Court, will operate to resolve the Released Class Claims of Plaintiff Alex Hernandez and Settlement Class Members, and the Released PAGA Claims of Plaintiffs, PAGA Members, and the State of California, against the Released Parties.¹⁰

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On August 16, 2021, Plaintiff Alex Hernandez filed a Class Action Complaint for Damages in the San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2123946 (“*Hernandez Class Action*”), thereby commencing the above-captioned lawsuit.

⁶ Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 8.x, 8.z, & 15.

⁷ *Id.*, ¶ 8.e.

⁸ Mayer Decl., ¶ 9.

⁹ Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 8.r, 8.q, 8.ll, 8.nn.

¹⁰ *Id.*, ¶ 32.

On August 25, 2021, Plaintiff Hernandez provided written notice by certified mail to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that were alleged to be violated (“Hernandez LWDA Letter”). On November 22, 2021, Plaintiff Sohal provided written notice by certified mail to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that were alleged to be violated (“Sohal LWDA Letter”).

On October 29, 2021, Plaintiff Hernandez filed a Complaint for Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code § 2698, Et Seq. in the San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2131140 (the “*Hernandez* PAGA Action”).

On January 27, 2022, Plaintiff Sohal filed a Complaint for Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code § 2698, Et Seq. in Stanislaus Superior Court, Case No, CV-22-000376 (the “*Sohal* PAGA Action”) (collectively with the *Hernandez* Class Action and *Hernandez* PAGA Action, the “Actions”).

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

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

///

On May 15, 2023, the Parties participated in a formal, full-day mediation conducted by Hon. Jeffrey Winikow (Ret.) (“Mediator”), a well-regarded mediator experienced in mediating complex labor and employment matters. With the aid of the Mediator’s evaluation, the Parties ultimately reached the Settlement described herein to resolve the Actions in their entirety.

III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS

Under the terms of the Settlement, Defendants will pay a Total Settlement Amount to resolve the Settled Class Claims of Plaintiff Alex Hernandez and Settlement Class Members and the Settled PAGA Claims of Plaintiffs, PAGA Members, and the State of California with respect to the Released Parties.¹¹ Subject to approval by the Court, the Net Settlement Amount will be calculated by deducting the following amounts from the Total Settlement Amount: (1) attorneys’ fees in an amount not to exceed One Million Ninety Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$1,190,000.00) (i.e., up to 35% of the Total Settlement Amount) and reimbursement of costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$20,000.00) to Class Counsel (collectively referred to as the “Attorneys’ Fees and Costs”); (2) settlement administration costs, which are currently estimated to be up to Seventeen Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents (\$17,750.00) to the Settlement Administrator (“Settlement Administration Costs”); (3) PAGA Penalty Amount of Three Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$350,000.00), of which seventy-five percent (75%) (i.e., \$262,500.00 out of \$350,000.00) will be paid to the LWDA (“LWDA Payment”) and twenty-five percent (25%) (i.e., \$87,500.00 out of \$350,000.00) will be distributed to PAGA Members on a *pro rata* basis (“Individual PAGA Payment”); and (4) payments in the amount of up to Fifteen Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$15,000.00) each to Plaintiffs Alex Hernandez and Martin Sohal (for a combined total of \$30,000.00) (“Enhancement Payments”).¹² The Parties have agreed to retain Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions (“Phoenix” or “Settlement Administrator”) to handle the notice and settlement administration process.¹³

///

¹¹ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 32.

¹² *Id.*, ¶¶ 12-15.

¹³ *Id.*, ¶ 8.jj.

The Parties have agreed that the Settlement Administrator will determine each Settlement Class Member's share of the available Net Settlement Amount (i.e., Individual Settlement Share), in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and as follows:

- a. The Settlement Administrator will divide the final Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Settlement Class Members during the Class Period to yield the "Class Workweek Value," and multiply each Settlement Class Member's individual Workweeks during the Class Period by the Class Workweek Value to yield his or her Individual Settlement Share. If any Class Member submits a timely and valid Request for Exclusion, his or her Individual Settlement Share will remain part of the Net Settlement Amount and will proportionally increase each Settlement Class Member's Individual Settlement Share.¹⁴

The Parties have agreed that the Settlement Administrator will determine each Individual PAGA Payment, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and as follows:

- a. The Settlement Administrator will divide the 25% portion of the PAGA Penalty Amount attributed to PAGA Members, i.e., \$87,500, by the total number of Workweeks worked by all PAGA Members during the PAGA Period ("Total PAGA Workweeks") resulting in the PAGA Workweek Value and then multiplying the PAGA Workweek Value by the number of Workweeks worked by each individual PAGA Member during the PAGA Period.¹⁵

Each Settlement Class Member's Individual Settlement Payment will be allocated as follows: twenty percent (20%) as wages (the "wage portion"), which will be reported on an IRS Form W-2; and the remaining eighty percent (80%) as interest, penalties, and other non-wage damages, which will be reported on an IRS Form 1099.¹⁶ Any payment for an Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as penalties, will not be subject to taxes or withholding, and will be reported on an IRS Form-1099, if necessary.¹⁷ Settlement Class Members will be issued payment of their Individual Settlement Payment subject to reduction for the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wage portion of each Individual Settlement Payment.¹⁸ Defendants will pay the employer's share of payroll taxes and contributions on the wages portion of Individual Settlement Payments in addition to the Total Settlement Amount.¹⁹

///

¹⁴ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 16.a.

¹⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 16.b.

¹⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 27.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Id.*, ¶ 8.mm.

1 The Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment checks shall be valid
2 and negotiable for one hundred eighty (180) calendar days after mailing by the Settlement
3 Administrator, and thereafter, shall be canceled.²⁰ The funds associated with such canceled
4 checks will be transmitted by the Settlement Administrator to the California Controller's
5 Unclaimed Property Fund.²¹

6 Class Members who wish to be excluded from the Class Settlement (i.e., opt out) must
7 send a written request to be excluded from the Class Settlement ("Request for Exclusion") to
8 the Settlement Administrator, by mail, postmarked no later than sixty (60) calendar days after
9 the Class Notice is mailed to Class Members ("Response Deadline").²² A Request for Exclusion
10 must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Class Action; (b) be signed by the Class
11 Member; (c) contain the full name, address, telephone number, and the last four digits of the
12 Social Security Number of the Class Member requesting exclusion; (d) clearly state that the
13 Class Member does not wish to be included in the Class Settlement; and (e) be returned by mail
14 to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response
15 Deadline.²³ Unless a Class Member submits a timely and valid Request for Exclusion with
16 respect to the Class Settlement described in the Agreement, he or she shall be bound by the
17 terms and conditions of the Agreement as it pertains to the Class Settlement, and shall also be
18 bound by the Final Approval Order and Judgment as it pertains to the Class Settlement.²⁴ PAGA
19 Members shall be bound to the PAGA Settlement irrespective of whether they exercise their
20 option to opt out of the Class Settlement.²⁵

21 Only Class Members who do not exclude themselves from the Class Settlement (i.e.,
22 Settlement Class Members) have standing to object to the Class Settlement ("Notice of
23 Objection").²⁶ Settlement Class Members who wish to object to the Class Settlement must
24 submit a Notice of Objection to the Settlement Administrator, by mail, on or before the Response

25 ²⁰ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 21.

26 ²¹ Ibid.

27 ²² *Id.*, ¶¶ 8.hh & 8.ii.

28 ²³ *Id.*, ¶ 8.hh.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 24.

Deadline.²⁷ Any such written Notice of Objection must: (a) include the case name and number of the Action; (b) include the objector's full name, signature, address, and telephone number, and the last four digits of his or her Social Security number; (c) include a written statement of all grounds for the objection accompanied by any legal support for such objection; (d) attach copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based; and (e) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline.²⁸ In addition to or as an alternative to a written Notice of Objection, Settlement Class Members may also appear at the Final Approval Hearing to orally present their objection to the Class Settlement.²⁹

Class Members and PAGA Members who wish to dispute the number of Workweeks credited to them in their Class Notice may do so by mailing a written letter to the Settlement Administrator on or before the Response Deadline.³⁰ The letter must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action, (b) be signed by the Class Member and/or PAGA Member, (c) contain the full name, address, telephone number, and the last four digits of the Social Security Number of the disputing Class Member and/or PAGA Member, (d) clearly state that the Class Member and/or PAGA Member disputes the number of Workweeks credited to him or her and what he or she contends is the correct number to be credited to him or her, (e) include information and/or attach documentation demonstrating that the number of Workweeks that he or she contends should be credited to him or her are correct, and (f) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline.³¹

IV. LEGAL STANDARD FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS

The settlement of a class action requires approval by the court. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1800; Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781(f). California courts look to federal authority for guidance with class action settlements. *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at

²⁷ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 24.

²⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 8.v.

²⁹ *Id.*, ¶ 24.

³⁰ *Id.*, ¶ 20.

³¹ *Ibid.*

1801, fn.7 (citing *Vasquez v. Superior Court* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 800, 821). The decision to approve or reject a proposed settlement is within the court’s discretion. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 234-35 (“In general, questions whether a settlement was fair and reasonable, whether certification of the class was proper, and whether the attorney fee award was proper are matters addressed to the trial court’s broad discretion.”). Accordingly, a court’s decision to approve a class action settlement may be reversed only upon a strong showing of “clear abuse of discretion.” *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.* (9th Cir. 1998) 150 F.3d 1011, 1026; *Class Plaintiff v. City of Seattle* (9th Cir. 1982) 955 F.2d 1268, 1276.

Courts review class action settlements in a two-step process: (1) an earlier conditional review by the court; and (2) a later detailed review after the period during which notice is distributed to class members for their comments or objections. Conte & Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* § 11.24 (4th Ed. 2002). This procedure, which is commonly utilized by both federal and state courts, assures class members of the protection of procedural due process safeguards and enables a court to fulfill its role as the guardian of the interest of the settlement class.

Preliminary approval of a settlement does not require a court to make a final determination that the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Rather, that decision is made only at the final approval stage, after notice of the settlement has been given to the class members and they have had an opportunity to voice their views of the settlement or to exclude themselves from the settlement. Cal. R. Ct. 3.769(g).

In considering a potential class settlement, a court need not reach any ultimate conclusions on the issues of fact and law which underlie the merits of the dispute and need not engage in a trial on the merits. See *City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corporation* (2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448, 456; *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission of City and County of San Francisco* (9th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 615, 625. Neither formal notice nor a hearing is required for the trial court to grant provisional class certification and preliminary approval; the court may grant such relief upon an informal application by the settling parties and may conduct any necessary hearing in court or in chambers, at the court’s discretion. *Newberg*, § 11.25.

1 **V. THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT**

2 The trial court has broad powers to determine whether a proposed settlement is fair under
3 the circumstances of the case. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794. To make
4 this fairness determination, courts must consider several relevant factors, including “the strength
5 of the plaintiff’s case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the
6 risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent
7 of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and view of counsel,
8 the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed
9 settlement.” *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801. “The list of factors is not exclusive and the
10 court is free to engage in a balancing and weighing of the factors depending on the circumstances
11 of each case.” *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 245. Furthermore, courts give “proper
12 deference to the private consensual decision of the parties.” *Hanlon, supra*, 150 F.3d at 1027
13 (citation omitted).

14 The proponent of the settlement has the burden to show that it is fair and reasonable.
15 *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 245. “A presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the
16 settlement is reached through arm’s-length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are
17 sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar
18 litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small.” *Id.*; *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at
19 1802; *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135,
20 1151.

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

23 The Parties actively litigated the Actions since the Class Action commenced on August
24 16, 2021. Both sides used the pre-mediation time period to investigate the veracity, strength,
25 and scope of the claims, and Class Counsel was actively preparing the matter for class
26 certification and trial.³²

27 Prior to engaging in mediation, Class Counsel conducted significant investigation and
28

³² Mayer Decl., ¶¶ 11-13.

1 formal and informal discovery regarding the facts of the cases, including and not limited to, the
2 exchange, review, and analysis of a large volume of documents and data produced by
3 Defendants.³³ The volume of data and documents that Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed
4 included and was not limited to: Plaintiffs' and other Class Members' employment records, a
5 detailed set of Class Members' time and pay data, excerpts of the Employee Handbook and
6 Handbook supplement, forms, procedures and policies (including, but not limited to, Fuel
7 Allowance policy, Production Employee Incentive Program, and Absenteeism and Tardiness
8 Policies, paycard program, and Meal and Rest Break Period Policy), among other information
9 and documents.³⁴ Class Counsel interviewed Plaintiffs and conducted investigations to gather
10 information regarding the facts and circumstances surrounding Plaintiffs' and putative class
11 members' employment and to identify potential witnesses.³⁵ Counsel for the Parties also met
12 and conferred on numerous occasions, e.g., to discuss issues relating to the pleadings, discovery,
13 and the production of documents and data prior to the mediation.³⁶ Class Counsel also drafted
14 Plaintiffs' mediation brief and prepared for and attended court proceedings, settlement
15 negotiations, and the mediation, among other tasks.³⁷

16 The Parties engaged in extensive settlement negotiations and participated in a formal,
17 full-day mediation conducted by Hon. Jeffrey Winikow (Ret.), a well-respected mediator
18 experienced in mediating complex labor and employment matters.³⁸ In the course of litigation
19 and in connection with mediation and settlement discussions, the Parties exchanged extensive
20 information and engaged in discussions regarding their evaluations of the cases and various
21 aspects of the cases, including but not limited to, the risks and delays of further litigation, the
22 risks to the Parties of proceeding with class certification and/or representative adjudication, the
23 law relating to off-the-clock theory, regular rate calculations, meal and rest periods, PAGA
24 representative actions, and wage-and-hour law and enforcement, as well as the evidence

25
26 ³³ Mayer Delc., ¶ 12.

27 ³⁴ Ibid

28 ³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 11.

1 produced and analyzed, and the possibility of appeals, among other things.³⁹ During all
2 settlement discussions, the Parties conducted their negotiations at arm's length in an adversarial
3 position.⁴⁰ Arriving at a settlement that was acceptable to both Parties was not easy. Defendants
4 and their counsel felt strongly about their ability to prevail on the merits and at certification, and
5 Plaintiffs and Class Counsel believed that they would be able to obtain class certification and
6 prevail at trial.⁴¹ After conducting investigations, informal discovery, exchange of information,
7 extensive settlement negotiations, and with the aid of the mediator's evaluation, the Parties have
8 agreed that the matter is well-suited for settlement given the legal issues relating to Plaintiffs'
9 principal claims, as well as the costs and risks to both sides that would attend further litigation.⁴²

10 The Settlement takes into account the strengths and weaknesses of each side's position
11 and the uncertainty of how the cases might have concluded at certification and trial.⁴³ The Parties
12 have had the opportunity to interview and obtain information from their respective witnesses.⁴⁴
13 Counsel for the Parties have also reviewed documents and information relating to Plaintiffs' and
14 the Class Members' employment with Defendants and performed significant research into the
15 law concerning class certification, PAGA representative actions, off-the-clock theory, regular
16 rate calculations, meal and rest periods, wage-and-hour law and enforcement, Plaintiffs' claims,
17 and Defendants' defenses thereto, as well as facts discovered.⁴⁵ The Parties have reached the
18 Settlement based on this large volume of facts, evidence, and investigation. In addition, Class
19 Counsel has extensive experience in employment class actions, including significant experience
20 in California wage-and-hour litigation.⁴⁶

21 **B. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.**

22 The Settlement, which provides for a Total Settlement Amount of Three Million Four
23 Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$3,400,000.00), represents a fair, adequate, and
24

25 ³⁹ Mayer Decl., ¶ 11.

26 ⁴⁰ Ibid.

27 ⁴¹ *Id.*, ¶¶ 11 & 16-18.

28 ⁴² *Id.*, ¶ 11.

⁴³ *Id.*, ¶ 18.

⁴⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 11.

⁴⁵ *Id.*, ¶¶ 11-13 & 16-18.

⁴⁶ *Id.*, ¶¶ 6-7.

reasonable resolution of the matter.⁴⁷ The Settlement was calculated using the information and data uncovered during litigation, case investigation, as well as the informal exchange of information.⁴⁸ The Settlement takes into account the potential risks and rewards inherent in any case and, in particular, in the matter at issue.⁴⁹ Moreover, considering all of the facts and circumstances of the lawsuits, the Settlement represents a fair, reasonable, and adequate recovery for the Class.⁵⁰

Assuming that the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Penalty Amount, and Settlement Administration Costs are approved by the Court and paid in the full amounts provided for by the Settlement, the Settlement provides for a Net Settlement Amount that is currently estimated to be One Million Seven Hundred Ninety-Two Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents (\$1,792,250.00).⁵¹ As discussed in Part III, *supra*, the entire Net Settlement Amount will be fully paid out to the Settlement Class Members, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement. The amount of each Settlement Class Member's Individual Settlement Payment will be calculated based on his or her Workweeks during the Class Period, and the amount of each PAGA Member's Individual PAGA Payment will be calculated based on his or her Workweeks during the PAGA Period.⁵² There is no reason to doubt the fairness of the proposed plan of allocation of the settlement funds for purposes of preliminary approval. Even at the final approval stage, "[a]n allocation formula need only have a reasonable, rational basis [to warrant approval], particularly if recommended by experienced and competent class counsel." *In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc., Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 127 F.Supp.2d 418, 429-30.

In light of the foregoing considerations, Class Counsel believes that the Settlement as a whole is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interest of the Class Members.⁵³ Although the recommendations of Class Counsel are not conclusive, the Court can properly take

⁴⁷ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 6.mm & 50.

⁴⁸ Mayer Decl., ¶¶ 11-13.

⁴⁹ *Id.*, ¶¶ 16-18.

⁵⁰ *Id.*, ¶¶ 11, 13, & 22.

⁵¹ *Id.*, ¶ 14, 19 & 20.

⁵² Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 16.

⁵³ Mayer Decl., ¶¶ 11, 13, & 22.

the recommendations into account, particularly if Class Counsel appears to be competent, and has experience with this type of litigation, and investigation have been completed, as is the case here. *Newberg*, §11.47. Accordingly, the Court should grant preliminary approval of the Settlement.

C. The Settlement Is of Significant Value.

Pursuant to *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, the Parties conducted extensive formal and informal discovery and exchanged a large volume of documents, data, and information prior to mediation.⁵⁴ The discovery and information that Class Counsel obtained from Defendants and through other sources allowed Class Counsel to develop valuation models in order to evaluate the potential value and merit of the claims, and perform a complete evaluation of Defendants' defenses thereto.⁵⁵ As outlined in the Declaration of Helene Mayer, Class Counsel performed an extensive analysis of each and every claim pursuant to *Kullar* prior to entering into the Settlement.⁵⁶

VI. CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE

For settlement purposes, the requisites for establishing class certification are met, and the Parties have stipulated to conditional certification of the Class for settlement purposes only.⁵⁷ California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 "authorizes class actions when the question is one of a common or general interest, of many persons, or when the Parties are numerous, and it is impracticable to bring them all before the court." *Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319, 326. California courts certify class actions where the plaintiff identifies "both [1] an ascertainable class and [2] a well-defined community of interest among class members." *Id.*

The Class is ascertainable and numerous as to make it impracticable to join all Class Members, and there are common questions of law and fact that predominate over any questions affecting any individual Class Member. Further, Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of

⁵⁴ *Id.*, ¶¶ 11-13 & 18.

⁵⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 18.

⁵⁶ *Id.*, ¶¶ 11-13 & 16-18.

⁵⁷ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 9 & 10.

the Class Members, and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Finally, prosecution of separate actions by individual Class Members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications, and a class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of the cases. The Class is amenable to class certification for settlement purposes as discussed below.

A. The Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous.

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

This matter involves a class of approximately one thousand four hundred seventy-three (1,473) individuals.⁵⁸ This class is sufficiently numerous. *See Rose v. City of Hayward* (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 926, 934-35 (indicating that a class of 30 to 40 individuals satisfies the numerosity requirement as joinder is not practical at that point). Further, all Class Members can and will be identified by Defendants to the Settlement Administrator through a review of Defendants’ employment records regarding hourly-paid or non-exempt employees in California during the Class Period. As such, the Class is ascertainable and sufficiently numerous.

B. The Class Members Share a Well-Defined Community of Interest.

The community of interest requirement “embodies three factors: (1) predominant common questions of law or fact; (2) class representative with claims or defenses typical of the class; and (3) class representative who can adequately represent the class.” *Sav-On, supra*, 34 Cal.4th at 326. “[T]he community of interest requirement for certification *does not mandate that class members have uniform or identical claims.*” *Capitol People First v. Dep’t of Developmental Services* (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 676, 692 (emphasis in original). Rather, courts

⁵⁸ Mayer Decl., ¶ 9.

1 focus on the Defendants’ internal policies and “pattern and practice . . . in order to assess whether
2 that common behavior toward similarly situated plaintiff renders class certification appropriate.”
3 *Id.* (citing *Sav-On, supra*, 34 Cal.4th at 333).

4 The “common issues” requirement “involves analysis of whether the proponent’s ‘theory
5 of recovery’ is likely to prove compatible with class treatment.” *Capitol People, supra*, 155
6 Cal.App.4th at 690 (emphasis added) (citing *Sav-On, supra*, 34 Cal.4th at 327). Furthermore,
7 the commonality inquiry centers on the “reasonableness” of the defendant’s labor policies as
8 applied to the potential class. *Ghazaryan, supra*, 169 Cal.App.4th at 1534.

9 Here, common issues of fact and law predominate as to each of the claims alleged and
10 asserted in the Actions. Based on the documents and information obtained through formal and
11 informal discovery and exchange of information in the cases, Plaintiffs contend that Class
12 Members were subject to the same or similar job duties and uniform operations and employment
13 practices, policies, and procedures during the time period at issue.⁵⁹ Plaintiffs’ claims arise from
14 Defendants’ alleged uniform policy and systematic scheme, with respect to Plaintiffs and the
15 Class Members, of, *inter alia*, failing to properly pay overtime and minimum wages for all hours
16 worked, failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium pay, failing
17 to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide
18 complaint wage statements, failing to keep requisite payroll records, and failing to reimburse
19 necessary business-related expenses.⁶⁰

20 Plaintiffs also contend that Defendants’ payroll and recordkeeping practices with respect
21 to Plaintiffs and the Class Members were substantially the same during the time period at issue.⁶¹
22 As a result, Plaintiffs claim that all of the Class Members were uniformly not paid all
23 compensation due to them from Defendants during the time period at issue.⁶²

24 Plaintiffs maintain that the outcome of this litigation would be determined by
25 Defendants’ alleged uniform operations and employment policies and procedures that applied
26

27 ⁵⁹ Mayer Decl., ¶ 16.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*

across its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked in California during the Class Period. Accordingly, the Court should certify the Class for settlement purposes only.

VII. APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND ALLOCATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS

Class Counsel has litigated the matter for over two (2) years, and was actively preparing the matter for class certification and trial.⁶³ The ongoing work has been extensive, demanding, and ultimately successful in achieving a substantial settlement resolution. Class Counsel conducted extensive investigations into the facts of the cases and formal and informal discovery, including, and not limited to, propounding multiple formal written discovery requests onto Defendants. Class Counsel reviewed a large volume of documents and data⁶⁴ and also interviewed and obtained information from Plaintiffs and other Class Members, researched applicable law, undertook damages/valuation calculations, and met and conferred with Defendants' counsel regarding the pleadings, discovery, and the production of documents and data prior to mediation.⁶⁵ Counsel for the Parties also undertook extensive settlement discussions, which included participating in a formal, full-day mediation.⁶⁶

Class Counsel is well-experienced in wage-and-hour class action litigation and used that experience to obtain a great result for the Class.⁶⁷

The Settlement establishes a Total Settlement Amount of Three Million Four Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$3,400,000.00), and provides for Class Counsel to apply to the Court for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, consisting of attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed thirty-five percent (35%) of the Total Settlement Amount and an amount not to exceed Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$20,000.00) for costs and expenses.⁶⁸ The attorneys' fees provided for by the Settlement is commensurate with: (1) the risk that Class Counsel took in bringing and litigating the cases, (2) the extensive time, effort and expense that Class Counsel

⁶³ Mayer Decl., ¶¶ 11-13.

⁶⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 12.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 11.

⁶⁷ *Id.*, ¶¶ 6-7; Bollinger Decl. ¶¶ 10-11.

⁶⁸ Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 12

dedicated to the cases, (3) the skill and determination that Class Counsel has shown, (4) the results that Class Counsel has achieved throughout the litigation, (5) the value of the Settlement that Class Counsel has achieved for the Class Members, and (6) the other cases that Class Counsel had to turn down in order to devote its time and efforts to this matter. The proposed Class Notice provides Class Members with information about the amount allocated toward the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and that an award of the Attorneys' Fees and Costs will be sought, as provided for by the Settlement.⁶⁹

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. 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. California law provides that attorney fee awards should be equivalent to fees paid in the legal marketplace to compensate for the result achieved and risk incurred. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503 (citing *Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 48-49). In *Lealao*, the court held that when an action leads to a recovery that can be "monetized" with a reasonable degree of certainty, the trial court should "ensure that the fee awarded is within the range of fees freely negotiated in the legal marketplace in comparable litigation." *Id.* at 50. In cases where class members present claims against a settlement fund and the settlement agreement provides that the defendant agrees to paying the attorneys a percentage of the same, use of that percentage method is appropriate. *Id.* at 32.

The propriety of calculating and awarding attorneys' fees as a percentage of a settlement that has, by litigation, been preserved or recovered for the benefit of others, has been confirmed by the California Supreme Court. *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal.5th 480 at 486 & 506. The California Supreme Court has taken the position that "[t]rial courts have discretion to conduct a lodestar cross-check on a percentage fee," "they 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 quotation marks omitted).

⁶⁹ Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.

Historically, courts have awarded fees as high as fifty percent (50%) of the settlement, depending on the circumstances of the case. *Newberg*, § 14.03; *see also In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.* (D.D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp. 494 (awarding attorneys’ fees in the amount of 45% of the \$7.3 million settlement); *Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.* (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195 (awarding approximately 53% of the settlement as attorneys’ fees). California courts routinely approve class action attorneys’ fee awards “averag[ing] around one-third of the recovery.” *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 n.11 (lower court found 20 to 40 percent range of contingency fee in marketplace was appropriate in class actions); *see also Estrada v. Dr. Pepper/Seven-Up*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC262247 (May 2005) (wage and hour); *Moore v. IKEA*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC263646 (Sept. 2006) (wage and hour).

Class Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.⁷⁰

Class Counsel will provide extensive evidence as to the time worked, litigation efforts, and further argument at the time of filing Plaintiffs’ motion for final approval of the Settlement and application for the Attorneys’ Fees and Costs and at the Final Approval Hearing. Considering the work performed and the risks incurred, the attorneys’ fees provided for by the Settlement and to be requested by Class Counsel are well within the range of reasonableness.

VIII. THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS ADEQUATE

California statutory and case law vests the Court with broad discretion in fashioning appropriate class notice. See Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781; *Cartt v. Superior Court* (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 960, 973-74. A class notice is adequate if it “present[s] a fair recital of the subject matter and proposed terms” of the Settlement. *Mendoza v. United States* (9th Cir. 1980) 623 F.2d 1338, 1351 (quoting *Marshall v. Holiday Magic* (9th Cir. 1977) 550 F.2d 1173, 1177).

The proposed Class Notice⁷¹ describes the Settlement, the deadlines and procedures to submit a Notice of Objection to the Class Settlement, mail a Request for Exclusion from the

⁷⁰ Mayer Decl., ¶ 19.

⁷¹ Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.

1 Class Settlement, and/or dispute regarding Workweeks, and the date and time set for the Final
2 Approval Hearing.⁷²

3 The proposed Class Notice fulfills the requirement of neutrality in notice procedure.
4 *Newberg*, at § 8.39. “Sufficient information about the case should be provided to enable class
5 members to make an informed decision about their participation.” *Manual for Complex*
6 *Litigation* § 21.311 at 413 (4th ed. 2004). The proposed Class Notice summarizes the
7 proceedings to date and the terms and conditions of the Settlement in an informative and
8 coherent manner.⁷³ The proposed Class Notice recognizes that the Court has not yet granted
9 final approval of the settlement.⁷⁴ The proposed Class Notice also apprises the Class Members
10 and PAGA Members of, *inter alia*, how their Individual Settlement Payment and, if applicable,
11 Individual PAGA Payment is calculated and the number of Workweeks Worked and PAGA
12 Workweeks Worked credited to them.⁷⁵

13 The proposed Class Notice satisfies all due process requirements and complies with the
14 standards of fairness, completeness, and neutrality. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2) and 23(e); *Newberg*,
15 §§ 8.21, 8.39; *Manual*, §§ 21.311, 21.312; see also *Cartt*, *supra*, 50 Cal.App.3d at 960 (“The
16 essentials of due process of law in class suits would appear to be afforded by fair representation
17 in the assertion of claims of class members against the opposing parties in any lawsuit, and
18 notice of the pending suit.”). Accordingly, the Court should approve the proposed Class Notice.

19 **IX. APPOINTMENT OF PHOENIX SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATORS AS THE**
20 **SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR**

21 The Parties have selected Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions to administer
22 the Settlement.

23 The Settlement Administrator will mail the Class Notice to each Class Member and
24 PAGA Member by First-Class U.S. mail in English.⁷⁶ The Settlement Administrator shall,
25 within five (5) business days, re-mail by First-Class US. mail the Class Notice returned by the

26 ⁷² Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.

27 ⁷³ *Ibid.*

28 ⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 19.

1 post office with a forwarding address within thirty (30) calendar days of initial mailing of the
2 Class Notice, and shall re-mail by First-Class US. mail the Class Notice to any Class Member
3 who personally provides an updated address to the Settlement Administrator and requests a re-
4 mailed Class Notice, within thirty (30) calendar days of initial mailing of the Class Notice.⁷⁷ In
5 the event that the first mailing of the Class Notice to any Class Member is returned within thirty
6 (30) calendar days without a forwarding address, the Settlement Administrator will immediately
7 perform skip trace(s) if necessary using social security numbers provided by Defendants, as
8 needed, to verify the accuracy of the addresses provided and will conduct a re-mailing of the
9 Class Notice by First-Class US. mail within five (5) business days.⁷⁸ If no new mailing address
10 information is ascertained by means of a skip trace, or if the Class Notice is returned to
11 Settlement Administrator after re-mailing, no additional re-mailing will be conducted.⁷⁹ The
12 Settlement Administrator will receive and process Notices of Objections, Requests for
13 Exclusions, and/or disputes regarding Workweeks.⁸⁰

14 The Settlement Administrator will calculate the amounts of the Individual Settlement
15 Payments and Individual PAGA Payments; deduct and transmit applicable state and/or federal
16 taxes in connection with the wage portion of Individual Settlement Payments; mail the
17 Individual Settlement Payment checks to Settlement Class Members and Individual PAGA
18 Payment checks to PAGA Members; issue W-2 and 1099 forms; calculate and disburse the
19 Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payments, and PAGA Penalty Amount; and perform
20 such other tasks necessary to effectuate the terms of the Settlement Agreement.⁸¹ The Settlement
21 Administration Costs are currently estimated to be Seventeen Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty
22 Dollars and Zero Cents (\$17,750.00) and will be paid out of the Total Settlement Amount,
23 subject to approval by the Court.⁸²

24
25
26 ⁷⁷ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 19.

27 ⁷⁸ Ibid.

28 ⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ *Id.*, ¶ 20 & 22.

⁸¹ Mayer Decl., ¶ 15.

⁸² Ibid.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court appoint Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as the Settlement Administrator and direct the mailing of the Class Notice to the Class Members and PAGA Members in the manner outlined and based on the proposed deadlines as described herein and set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

X. PROPOSED DEADLINES FOR THE NOTICE PROCESS

At this preliminary approval stage, plaintiffs seek approval of the proposed deadlines for the notice and settlement administration process. *Newberg*, at § 11.26. The notice process entails mailing of the Class Notice, in the form approved by the Court, to all known and reasonably ascertainable Class Members and PAGA Members based on Defendant's records.⁸³

Within twenty-one (21) calendar days after the Preliminary Approval Order is entered, Defendants shall provide to the Settlement Administrator a list of Class Members and PAGA Members formatted in a readable Microsoft Office Excel spreadsheet and will include each Class Member's (1) full name, (2) last known mailing address, (3) Social Security Number, (4) dates worked for Defendants during the Class Period and, if applicable, during the PAGA Period, and (5) such other information and data as necessary for the Settlement Administrator to independently calculate the Workweeks (collectively, "Class List").⁸⁴

Within fourteen (14) calendar days after receipt of the Class List from Defendants, the Settlement Administrator will perform a search based on the National Change of Address Database or any other similar services available, such as provided by Experian, for information to update and correct for any known or identifiable address changes, and shall send the Class Notice to each Class Member's last known address or updated address (if applicable) via First-Class U.S. mail.⁸⁵ With respect to Class Notices that are returned as undeliverable on or before the Response Deadline, the Settlement Administrator will search for an alternate address by way of skip trace(s) if necessary using social security numbers provided by Defendants, as needed, to verify the accuracy of the addresses provided and will conduct a re-mailing of the Class Notice by First-Class US. mail within five (5) business days.⁸⁶ Class Members will have until the

⁸³ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 58.

⁸⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 18.

⁸⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 19.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

1 applicable Response Deadline to submit a Request for Exclusion, Notice of Objection, and/or
2 dispute regarding Workweeks.⁸⁷

3 Within fifteen (15) calendar days after the Effective Date, the Settlement Administrator
4 will provide the Parties with an accounting of the amounts to be paid by Defendants pursuant to
5 the terms of the Settlement.⁸⁸ Defendants will make a one-time deposit of the Total Settlement
6 Amount, along with any employer-side tax obligation associated with the Total Settlement
7 Amount into an account established by the Settlement Administrator within thirty (30) calendar
8 days of the Effective Date.⁸⁹ Within seven (7) calendar days of the funding of the Total
9 Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator will issue payments due under the Settlement
10 and approved by the Court, as follows: (a) Individual Settlement Shares to Settlement Class
11 Members; (b) Individual PAGA Payments to PAGA Members; (c) LWDA Payment to the
12 LWDA; (d) Enhancement Payments to Plaintiff; (e) Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel;
13 and (f) Settlement Administration Costs to the Settlement Administrator.⁹⁰

14 Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment checks shall be valid and
15 negotiable for one hundred fifty (180) days after mailing by the Settlement Administrator, and
16 thereafter, shall be canceled.⁹¹ Subject to Court approval, funds (and any interest accrued
17 thereon) associated with such canceled checks shall be in accordance with California Code of
18 Civil Procedure section 384 to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name
19 of the Class Member.⁹²

20 **XI. APPOINTMENT OF CLASS REPRESENTATIVES AND ALLOCATION FOR**
21 **ENHANCEMENT PAYMENTS**

22 Plaintiffs Alex Hernandez and Martin Sohal respectfully request that the Court appoint
23 them as the Class Representatives and preliminarily approve the Enhancement Payments in an
24 amount up to Fifteen Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$15,000.00) each to Plaintiffs Alex

25
26 ⁸⁷ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 8.ii.

27 ⁸⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 11.

28 ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Id.*, ¶ 21.

⁹² *Ibid.*

Hernandez and Martin Sohal (for a combined total of \$30,000).⁹³ It is within the Court's discretion to award payment to a class representative for their efforts and work. *Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294, 299 (approving \$50,000 participation award to a single class representative). The factors that courts may consider in determining whether to make an enhancement payment include: (1) the risk to the class representative in commencing suit, both financial and otherwise; (2) the notoriety and personal difficulties encountered by the class representative; (3) the amount of time and effort spent by the class representative; (4) the duration of the litigation; and (5) the personal benefit (or lack thereof) enjoyed by the class representative as a result of the litigation. *Id.*

The Enhancement Payments are fair and appropriate. Plaintiffs spent a substantial amount of time and effort in producing relevant documents and past employment records and providing the facts and evidence necessary to attempt to prove the allegations.⁹⁴ Plaintiffs were available whenever Class Counsel needed them and actively tried to obtain and provide information that would facilitate the pursuit of class and PAGA claims.⁹⁵ The requested Enhancement Payments are reasonable in light of the general release of all claims Plaintiffs agreed to, which includes any unknown claims against Defendant – a release far greater than the release given by other class members.⁹⁶

Furthermore, Plaintiffs' status as the lead named Plaintiffs in a class and PAGA representative action against an employer puts them at risk in connection with possible future job searches. Prospective employers have access to the public records that will disclose their named Plaintiff status, and how much they cost their former employer through this Settlement. Moreover, in pursuing this action on behalf of the Class, Plaintiffs risked a judgment entered against them for attorneys' fees and costs in the event this matter had been lost.⁹⁷ In addition,

⁹³ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 13

⁹⁴ Mayer Decl., ¶ 20; Declaration of Alex Hernandez in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Hernandez Decl."), ¶ 4; Declaration of Martin Sohal in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Sohal Decl."), ¶ 11.

⁹⁵ Mayer Decl., ¶ 20; Hernandez Decl., ¶¶ 3-6; Sohal Decl., ¶¶ 11-12.

⁹⁶ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 33.

⁹⁷ Mayer Decl. ¶¶ 11 & 17.


the amount of the requested award will be disclosed in the Class Notice.⁹⁸ The Court may consider any objections by Class Members to the enhancement awards at that time.⁹⁹ Accordingly, it is appropriate and just for Plaintiffs to each receive an Enhancement Payment for their services on behalf of the Class, PAGA Members, and the State of California, in addition to their individual settlement payments.

XII. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant preliminary approval of the Settlement; conditionally certify the Class for settlement purposes; preliminary appoint and designate Lawyers for Justice, PC and Jeremy Bollinger of Moss Bollinger, LLP as Class Counsel; preliminary appoint and designate Plaintiffs Alex Hernandez and Martin Sohal as Class Representatives; appoint Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as Settlement Administrator; preliminarily approve the allocations for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Penalty Amount, and Settlement Administration Costs; approve the proposed Class Notice; direct the Settlement Administrator to undertake the notice and settlement administration process in conformity with the deadlines and procedures provided by the Settlement Agreement; schedule a Final Approval Hearing to take place in approximately five (5) months.

Dated: June 14, 2024

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

By: 
Helene Mayer
Attorneys for Plaintiff Alex Hernandez

⁹⁸ Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.

⁹⁹ Id., ¶ 24.