Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
Vartan Madoyan (SBN 279015)
Scarlet Tunney (SBN 359178)
LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
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-NORWALK

KISSY BARVARIN, 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;

Plaintiff,

vs.

RIVIERA NURSING & CONVALESCENT HOME, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 21NWCV00812

Honorable Lee W. Tsao
Department C

CLASS ACTION

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

Date:	January 5, 2026
Time:	9:30 a.m.
Department:	C
Reservation ID:	726209232920
Complaint Filed:	December 7, 2021
FAC Filed:	April 11, 2025
Trial Date:	None Set

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

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

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 5, 2026, or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard before the Honorable Lee W. Tsao in Department C of the Superior Court of the State of California, for the County of Los Angeles – Norwalk Courthouse, 12720 Norwalk Blvd. Norwalk CA 90650, Plaintiff Kissy Barvarin ("Plaintiff") will, and hereby does, move for an order:

- Granting preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement described herein and as set forth in the parties' Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement"), attached as "**EXHIBIT 2**" to the Declaration of Vartan Madoyan in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement;
- Certifying the proposed Class for settlement purposes;
- Appointing Kissy Barvarin as Class Representative;
- Appointing Arby Aiwazian, Joanna Ghosh, Vartan Madoyan, and Scarlet Tunney of Lawyers *for* Justice, PC as Class Counsel;
- Approving the proposed Notice of Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval ("Class Notice"), attached as "**EXHIBIT A**" to the [Proposed] Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, and directing the mailing thereof in accordance with the Settlement Agreement;
- Approving Simpluris, Inc., as the Settlement Administrator; and
- Scheduling a hearing to consider final approval of the Settlement.

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

This motion is based upon the following memorandum of points and authorities; the Settlement Agreement; the Declarations of Proposed Class Counsel (Vartan Madoyan) and Proposed Class Representative (Kissy Barvarin) in support thereof; as well as the pleadings and

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

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: September 25, 2025

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC

By: ______________________________
Vartan Madoyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION....... 1

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND....... 2

III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS....... 5

IV. LEGAL STANDARD FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS....... 7

V. THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT....... 8

A. The Settlement Resulted from Arm's-Length Negotiations Based Upon Extensive Investigation and Discovery....... 9

B. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate....... 10

C. The Settlement Is of Significant Value....... 11

VI. CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE....... 11

A. The Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous....... 12

B. The Class Members Share a Well-Defined Community of Interest....... 12

VII. APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND ALLOCATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES & COSTS....... 13

VIII. THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS ADEQUATE....... 16

IX. APPOINTMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR....... 17

X. CLASS REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT AWARD....... 17

XI. CONCLUSION....... 19

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp. (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135 7

Bartold v. Glendale Federal Bank (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 816 11

Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp. (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195 . 14

Capitol People First v. Department of Developmental Services (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 676 11

Cartt v. Superior Court (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 960 15

Chavez v. Netflix, Inc. (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43 14

City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corporation (2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448 7

Dunk v. Ford Motor Co. (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794 .... 6, 7

Estrada v. Dr. Pepper/Seven-Up, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 262247 (May 2005) 14

Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp. (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 908 11

In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc., Securities Litigation (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 127 F.Supp.2d 418 10

In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litigation (D. D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp. 494 14

Ketchum v. Moses (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122 13

Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc. (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116 10

Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc. (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480 .... 13, 14

Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc. (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19 .... 13, 14

Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co. (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429 11

Mendoza v. United States (9th Cir. 1980) 623 F.2d 1338 15

Moore v. IKEA, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC 263646 (Sept. 2006) 14

Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission of City and County of San Francisco (9th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 615 7

Rose v. City of Hayward (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 926 11

Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319 .... 10, 11

Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294 17

Statutes

Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781 15

Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781(f) 6

Other Authorities

Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 11.25 (4th Ed.) 7

Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 11.47 (4th Ed.) 10

Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 14.03 (4th Ed.) 14

Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 8.21 (4th Ed.) 15

Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 8.29 (4th Ed.) 15

Manual for Complex Litigation § 21.311 (4th ed. 2007) 15

Manual for Complex Litigation § 21.312 (4th ed. 2007) 15

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2) 15

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION

Plaintiff Kissy Barvarin ("Plaintiff" or "Class Representative") seeks preliminary approval of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement") entered into by and between Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and other aggrieved employees, on the one hand, and Defendant Riviera Nursing & Convalescent Home, Inc. ("Defendant"), on the other hand. Subject to approval by the Court, Plaintiff and Defendant (together, the "Parties") have agreed to settle the lawsuit for a Total Settlement Amount of $1,800,000.00.[1]

Plaintiff also seeks to provisionally certify the following Class for settlement purposes, which Defendant does not oppose: All current or former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendant in California employed during the Class Release Period ("Class" or "Class Members").[2] Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion from the Class Settlement ("Settlement Class Member") will receive a *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount ("Individual Settlement Share"). The net payment of each Settlement Class Member's Individual Settlement Share ("Individual Settlement Payment") will be distributed to Settlement Class Members on a *pro rata* basis based upon the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the Class Release Period ("Workweeks").[3]

---

[1] Settlement Agreement, attached as Exhibit 2 to Declaration of Vartan Madoyan ("Madoyan Decl."), ¶ 15. Defendant represented that there were 43,605 Workweeks during the period from January 15, 2020 to July 11, 2024. Should the qualifying Workweeks during the Class Period increase by more than 5% of 43,605 (i.e., more than 45,785 Workweeks), Defendant shall have the option to: (1) increase the Total Settlement Amount on a *pro rata* basis equal to the percentage increase in the number of Workweeks worked by the Class Members above 5% (e.g., if the number of Workweeks increases by 6% to 46,221 Workweeks, the Total Settlement Amount will increase by 1%); or (2) end the Class Release Period and PAGA Release Period on the day that the total Workweeks reach 45,785 Workweeks, so long as Defendant informs Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator that it will so end the Class Release Period and PAGA Release Period, in writing at least three business days prior to the mailing of the Class Notice. *Id.*, ¶ 15.

[2] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 1.2.; "Class Release Period" is defined as the time period from January 15, 2020 through April 6, 2025, except as provided in the Settlement Agreement. *See id.*, ¶ 1.7.

[3] *Id.*, ¶¶ 1.18, 1.19, and 1.45.

The Settlement, upon final approval by the Court and funding of the Total Settlement Amount, will operate to resolve the Released Class Claims of Plaintiff and Settlement Class Members and the Released PAGA Claims of the State of California.[4]

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant is a long-term care and rehabilitation facility that provides a variety of healthcare services. Defendant's services include skilled nursing, rehabilitation, social services, pharmacy services, laboratory and radiology testing, nutrition consultations, audiology, dental, optometry, and podiatry care, psychology and psychiatry care, and hospice and respite care. Plaintiff is a former employee of Defendant.

On September 30, 2021, Plaintiff provided written notice via online submission to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendant of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that were alleged to be violated ("PAGA Notice").[5]

On December 7, 2021, Plaintiff filed the Complaint for Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code § 2698, et seq. in the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, thereby commencing the above-captioned lawsuit.[6]

On March 11, 2022, Defendant filed its Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint for Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act.[7]

On January 20, 2023, Plaintiff propounded discovery on Defendant, which Defendant responded to by providing objection-only responses. On May 1, 2023, Defendant propounded its own discovery on Plaintiff, to which Plaintiff provided responses on June 7, 2023 and June 9, 2023.[8]

The parties exchanged a series of detailed meet and confer letters. On May 1, 2023, Plaintiff's counsel sent a meet and confer letter to Defendant's counsel, requesting that Defendant withdraw its waived objections and provide full and complete supplemental responses

---

[4] Settlement Agreement, at ¶ 5.2, for the full scope of the "Released Class Claims;" *See id.*, at ¶ 5.3, for the full scope of the "Released PAGA Claims" and *id*. at ¶ 1.38 for the full scope of the "Released Parties."
[5] *Id.*, ¶ 2.1, Exh. 1.
[6] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 3.
[7] *Id.*, ¶ 4.
[8] *Id.*, ¶ 5.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

and documents. Defendant responded on May 8, 2023, alleging that Plaintiff lacked standing and stating that Defendant would be filing a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings. On May 15, 2023, Plaintiff's counsel responded with another meet and confer letter, providing supporting authority and exhibits in support of Plaintiff's standing. Finally, on May 16, 2023, the parties telephonically met and conferred but did not reach any resolution, leading to a series of Motions and Replies filed by both parties.[9]

On May 23, 2023, Defendant filed a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings. On July 13, 2023, Plaintiff filed its Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings. On July 19, 2023, Defendant filed its Reply in Support of its Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings.[10]

Additionally, on June 8, 2023, Plaintiff filed several Motions to Compel, asking the Court to compel Defendant to provide further responses to Plaintiff's discovery requests. On July 17, 2023, Defendant filed its Oppositions to Plaintiff's Motions to Compel. On July 19, 2023, Plaintiff filed Replies in Support of their Motions to Compel.[11]

On July 26, 2023 the Court issued its final ruling to deny Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, and granted Plaintiff's Motions to Compel Defendant to Provide Defendant Further Responses to Plaintiff's Special Interrogatories (Set One) and Request for Production of Documents (Set One) ordering Defendant to provide further responses to Plaintiff's Request for the Production of Documents (Set One) Nos. 2, 3, 6, 8-11, 17 and 38-83, with Defendant to provide further responses to Special Interrogatories (Set One) Nos. 1-2 and Request for Production of Documents (Set One) Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 12-16, 18, 19, and 21-37 as stated in Defendant's Separate Statements.[12]

Thereafter, the parties met and conferred again, and on July 28, 2023, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation to Withdraw Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Plaintiff's Form Interrogatories (Set One) and Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Plaintiff's

[9] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 6.
[10] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 7.
[11] *Id.*, ¶ 8.
[12] *Id.*, ¶ 9.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Special Interrogatories (Set Two). On August 14, 2023, Defendant provided responses to Plaintiff's discovery sets Form Interrogatories (Set One), Request for Production of Documents (Set One), Special Interrogatories (Set One), and Special Interrogatories (Set Two).[13]

On October 20, 2023, Plaintiff propounded further discovery, Special Interrogatories (Set Three) on Defendant, and Defendant responded on November 20, 2023 with an objections-only response.[14]

On December 1, 2023, the Parties participated in arm's-length and informed negotiations with Mediator Brandon McKelvey, Esq. ("Mediator"), a respected mediator of complex wage and hour actions. However, the parties were unable to come to a resolution at the first mediation.[15]

After Defendant substituted in new counsel, the Parties once again met and conferred, and agreed to meet for a second mediation session with a different mediator, Chris Barnes, Esq. On July 11, 2024, the parties participated in arm's-length and informed negotiations with Mr. Barnes, Esq., which resulted in agreement of the Parties as to a resolution of the matter. The parties agreed that Plaintiff would file a First Amended Complaint, adding class action causes of action, and that a previous defendant party would be dismissed from the Action and thus removed from the caption page in the amended complaint, leaving Riviera Nursing & Convalescent Home, Inc. as the sole Defendant in the Action.[16]

Accordingly, on March 25, 2025, Plaintiff and Defendant jointly sought leave for Plaintiff to file a First Amended Class Action Complaint for Damages and Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698, *Et Seq*. ("Operative Complaint"), adding ten causes of action. The Court granted Plaintiff leave to file the proposed First Amended Complaint on April 7, 2025, and Plaintiff filed the First Amended Complaint on April 11, 2025. Defendant filed its Answer to the FAC on April 16, 2025. [17]

---

[13] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 10.
[14] *Id.*, ¶ 11.
[15] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 12.
[16] *Id.*, ¶ 13.
[17] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 14.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Plaintiff's core allegations are that Defendant has violated California wage and hour law, including but not limited to laws set forth in the California Labor Code, by engaging in a uniform practice and procedure, with respect to Plaintiff, Class Members, and PAGA Members of, *inter alia*, failing to pay all overtime and minimum wages, at all or at the correct rate of pay, 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. Plaintiff contends that they, and the Class Members, are entitled to, *inter alia*, unpaid wages, penalties (including and not limited to, penalties pursuant to PAGA), and attorneys' fees and costs.[18]

The Parties have actively litigated the Action since it was commenced on December 7, 2021. The parties have engaged in significant motion practice and briefing, have met and conferred numerous times, and participated in two arm's length mediation sessions and additional settlement negotiations. After intense litigation and settlement discussions, and with the aid of the Mediator Mr. Barnes, Esq., the Parties ultimately reached the Settlement described herein to resolve the Action in its entirety.[19]

III. <u>SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS</u>

Under the terms of the Settlement, Defendant will pay a Total Settlement Amount of $1,800,000.00 to resolve the Action.[20] Subject to approval by the Court, the Net Settlement Amount will be calculated by deducting the following amounts from the Total Settlement Amount: (1) PAGA Penalty Amount of $150,000.00 ("PAGA Penalty Amount"); (2) attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 35% of the Total Settlement Amount (i.e., $630,000.00, if the Total Settlement Amount remains $1,800,000.00) and litigation costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed $35,000.00 ("Attorneys' Fees and Costs") to Class Counsel; (3) payment in the amount of

[18] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 36.
[19] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 31.
[20] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 1.44.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

up to $7,500.00 to Plaintiff ("Enhancement Award"); and (4) Settlement Administration Costs, which are currently estimated not to exceed $9,000.00 to the Settlement Administrator ("Settlement Administration Costs").[21] The Parties have agreed to retain Simpluris, Inc., ("Simpluris" or "Settlement Administrator") to handle the notice and settlement administration process.[22]

The Parties have agreed that the Settlement Administrator will determine each Settlement Class Member's share of the available Net Settlement Amount ("Individual Settlement Share"), in accordance with the Settlement Agreement on a *pro rata* per Workweek basis, which will be adjusted after Final Approval to reflect the total Workweeks worked by the Settlement Class Members during the Class Release Period.[23] The Parties have also agreed that the Settlement Administrator will determine each PAGA Member's share of the 25% share of the PAGA Penalty Amount, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement on a *pro rata* per PAGA Pay Period basis ("Individual PAGA Payment").[24]

The Parties agree, for purposes of this Settlement, that Individual Settlement Shares will be allocated 20% to wages subject to withholdings and 80% to penalties, interest, and non-wage damages.[25] The Settlement Administrator will withhold the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Shares, and issue checks to Settlement Class Members for their Individual Settlement Payments. Individual PAGA Payments to PAGA Members will be allocated as 100% penalties and will not be subject to withholdings. Defendant will provide the funds for any employer-side taxes related to the Individual Settlement Shares.[26]

Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment checks shall remain valid and negotiable for 180 calendar days from the date of their issuance, and thereafter, shall be canceled.[27] Thereafter, funds from uncashed Individual Settlement Payment and/or Individual

---

[21] Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 1.22, 1.30, 3.2.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.3.
[22] *Id.*, ¶ 7.1.
[23] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.25.
[24] *Id.*, ¶ 3.2.6.
[25] *Id.*, ¶ 3.2.7.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 4.4.1.

PAGA Payment checks shall be transmitted to the California State Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of each Settlement Class Member and/or PAGA Member to whom the checks were issued.[28]

Any Class Member may request to be excluded from the Class Settlement by mailing a Request for Exclusion postmarked on or before the date that is 60 calendar days from the date of the initial mailing of the Class Notice by the Settlement Administrator ("Response Deadline").[29] PAGA Members shall be bound to the PAGA Settlement irrespective of whether they exercise their option to opt out of the Class Settlement.[30]

Only Class Members who have not submitted a Request for Exclusion (i.e., Settlement Class Members) may object to the Class Settlement by submitting an Objection in writing to the Settlement Administrator prior to the Response Deadline or by presenting their objection orally at the Final Approval Hearing, regardless of whether they submitted a written objection.[31]

In order to dispute the number of Workweeks attributable to an individual Class Member and/or PAGA Member, that Class Member and/or PAGA Member must submit a written letter to the Settlement Administrator and include copies of any supporting evidence they may have.[32]

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). 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). 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 at the final approval stage. Cal. R. Ct. 3.769(g).

---

[28] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 4.4.3.
[29] *Id.*, ¶¶ 7.5.1 & 1.40.
[30] *Id.*, ¶ 7.5.1.
[31] *Id.*, ¶ 7.7.2.
[32] Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 1.46 and 7.6.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

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.

V. THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT

The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether a proposed settlement is fair under the circumstances of the case. *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1800. To make this fairness determination, courts must consider several relevant factors, including "the strength of the Plaintiff's case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and view of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement." *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801. "The list of factors is not exclusive and the court is free to engage in a balancing and weighing of the factors depending on the circumstances of each case." *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc*. (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245. Furthermore, courts must give "proper deference to the private consensual decision of the parties." *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1027 (citation omitted).

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

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

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

The Parties have actively litigated the Action since it commenced on December 7, 2021. Both sides investigated the veracity, strength, and scope of the claims throughout the case, and Class Counsel was actively preparing the matter for class certification and trial.[33]

Class Counsel conducted significant investigation and both informal and formal discovery regarding the facts of the case, including and not limited to, the exchange, review, and analysis of a large volume of documents and data from Plaintiff, Defendant, and other sources.[34] The volume of data and documents that Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed included and was not limited to: a sampling of Class Members' time and payroll data, Plaintiff's personnel records, Defendant's Handbooks, company policy acknowledgements, Defendant's operations and employment practice, policies, and procedures, among other information and documents.[35] Class Counsel had the opportunity to interview Plaintiff and others to gather facts and to identify potential witnesses. In addition, Class Counsel has extensive experience in California wage-and-hour class actions.[36]

The Parties engaged in extensive settlement negotiations and participated in two full-day mediation sessions, one conducted by Brandon McKelvey, Esq., and a second mediation conducted by Chris Barnes, Esq., both well-respected mediators experienced in mediating complex labor and employment matters.[37] Prior to and during the mediation and settlement discussions, the Parties exchanged extensive information and engaged in discussions regarding their evaluations of the case and various aspects of the case, including but not limited to, the risks and delays of further litigation, including the risks of proceeding with class certification and/or representative adjudication; the law relating to off-the-clock theory, arbitration agreements, regular rate, meal and rest periods, PAGA representative claims, and wage-and-hour enforcement; the evidence produced and analyzed; and the possibility of appeals.[38] During all settlement discussions, the Parties conducted their negotiations at arm's length in an adversarial position.[39] Arriving at a

---

[33] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 31.
[34] Ibid.
[35] *Id.*, ¶ 32.
[36] *Id.*, ¶¶ 25-29.
[37] *Id.*, ¶ 31.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

settlement that was acceptable to both Parties was not easy. Both sides felt strongly about their ability to prevail at certification and at trial.[40] After conducting investigations, informal discovery, formal discovery, extensive settlement negotiations, and with the aid of the mediator, the Parties have agreed that the matter is well-suited for settlement given the legal issues relating to Plaintiff's principal claims, as well as the costs and risks to both sides that would attend further litigation.[41]

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

The Settlement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the matter.[42] The Settlement was calculated using the information and data uncovered during litigation, case investigation, and both the informal and formal exchanges of information.[43] The Settlement takes into account the potential risks and rewards inherent in any case and, in particular, in the matter at issue. Moreover, considering all of the facts and circumstances of the case, the Settlement represents a fair, reasonable, and adequate recovery for the Class.[44]

Assuming that the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Award, 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 $968,500.00.[45] Additionally, 25% of the PAGA Penalty Amount (i.e., Individual PAGA Payment), which is $37,500.00 out of $150,000.00, will be distributed to the PAGA Members, such that employees will be estimated to receive over $1,000,000 from the Total Settlement Amount. The entire Net Settlement Amount will be fully paid out to the Settlement Class Members, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement, without any reversion to Defendant.

The amount of each Settlement Class Member's Individual Settlement Payment and each PAGA Member's Individual PAGA Payment will be calculated based on his or her Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods during the Class Release Period and PAGA Release Period,

---

[40] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 31.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.
[43] *Id.*, ¶ 40.
[44] *Id.*, ¶ 33.
[45] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 16.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

respectively.[46] "An 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. Here, the allocation is reasonably related to the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods actually worked for Defendant during the relevant period and should be approved.

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, PAGA Members, and the State of California.[47] Although the recommendations of Class Counsel are not conclusive, the Court can properly take 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 informal and formal discovery and exchanged a large volume of documents, data, and information prior to each mediation.[48] The information that Class Counsel obtained from Plaintiff, Defendant, and 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 Defendant's defenses thereto.[49]

VI. CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE

The requisites for establishing class certification are met, and the Parties have stipulated to conditional certification of the Class for settlement purposes only.[50] 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.

[46] Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 3.2.5 & 3.2.6.
[47] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 31.
[48] *Id.*, ¶ 32.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 11.1.

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

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.*

A. <u>The Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous.</u>

"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; s*ee also 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). The Class here is estimated to be greater than 750 individuals, which is sufficiently numerous.[51] Further, all Class Members can and will be identified by Defendant to the Settlement Administrator through a review of Defendant's employment records regarding hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendant in California during the Class Release Period. As such, the Class is ascertainable.[52]

B. <u>The Class Members Share a Well-Defined Community of Interest.</u>

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 focus on the Defendant's internal policies and "pattern and practice . . . in order to assess whether that common behavior toward similarly situated Plaintiff renders class certification appropriate." *Id.* (citing *Sav-On*, 34 Cal.4th at 333).

---

[51] Madoyan Decl. ¶ 22.
[52] *Id.*, ¶ 21.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Here, common issues of law and fact predominate as to each of the claims alleged and asserted in the Action. Based on the documents and information obtained through informal discovery and exchange of information in the case, Plaintiff contends that Class Members performed similar job duties and were subject to uniform operations and employment policies, practices, and procedures during the Class Period, including payroll and recordkeeping practices.[53] As a result, Plaintiff claims that all of the Class Members were uniformly not paid all compensation due to them from Defendant during the time period at issue. Plaintiff maintains that the outcome of this litigation would be determined by Defendant's alleged uniform operations and employment policies and procedures that applied across its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked in California during the Class Release Period.

As a member of the Class who was subject to these same policies, practices, and procedures, Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class. Moreover, Plaintiff has no interests adverse to the Class. Plaintiff has taken steps to initiate and maintain this action and to ensure that it comes to a fair and reasonable resolution.[54] Importantly, Plaintiff has retained a law firm well-versed in wage and hour class actions, which has at all times represented the best interests of Plaintiff and the Class.[55]

Accordingly, the proposed Class shares a community of interest, and the Court should certify the Class for settlement purposes only.

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

Class Counsel has litigated the matter for over three years and was actively preparing the matter for class certification and trial.[56] The ongoing work has been extensive, demanding, and ultimately successful in achieving a substantial settlement resolution. Class Counsel reviewed a large volume of documents and data and also interviewed and obtained information from Plaintiff and other percipient witnesses, researched applicable law, undertook damages/valuation

---

[53] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 23.
[54] Declaration of Kissy Barvarin in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Barvarin Decl."), ¶¶ 2-3.
[55] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 30.
[56] *Id.*, ¶ 31.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

calculations, and met and conferred with Defendant's counsel regarding the pleadings and the production of documents and data prior to each mediation.[57] Counsel for the Parties also undertook extensive settlement discussions, which included participating in two mediation sessions.[58] Class Counsel is well-experienced in wage-and-hour class action litigation and used that experience to obtain a great result for the Class.[59]

The Settlement establishes a Total Settlement Amount of $1,800,000.00, and provides for Class Counsel to apply to the Court consisting of attorneys' fees in an amount up to 35% of the Total Settlement Amount (i.e., $630,000.00 if the Total Settlement Amount remains $1,800,000.00), and reimbursement of actual costs and expenses in an amount up to $35,000.00.[60] The attorneys' fees provided for by the Settlement are commensurate with: (1) the risk that Class Counsel took in bringing and litigating the case, (2) the extensive time, effort and expense that Class Counsel dedicated to the case, (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 that an award of the Attorneys' Fees and Costs will be sought and the amount allocated toward the Attorneys' Fees and Costs by the Settlement.[61]

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*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 48-49. In *Lealao*, the court held that, when an action leads to a recovery that can be "monetized"

---

[57] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 32.
[58] *Id.*, ¶ 31.
[59] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 30.
[60] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.2.
[61] *Id.*, Exh. A.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

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." *Lealao*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 50.

The California Supreme Court has confirmed 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. *Laffitte*, 1 Cal.5th 480 at 486 & 506. The Court has taken the position that while "[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).

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.[62] Class Counsel will provide extensive evidence as to the time worked, litigation efforts, and further argument at the time of filing Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement and application for the Attorneys' Fees and Costs at the Final Approval Hearing. Considering the work performed and the risks incurred, the attorneys' fees

[62] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 17.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

provided for by the Settlement are well within the range of reasonableness for preliminary approval.

VIII. THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS ADEQUATE

California statutory authority 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). "Sufficient information about the case should be provided to enable class members to make an informed decision about their participation." *Manual for Complex Litigation* § 21.311 at 413 (4th ed. 2004).

The proposed Class Notice describes the Settlement, the deadlines and procedures to submit an Objection to the Class Settlement, submit a Request for Exclusion from the Class Settlement, and/or dispute regarding Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods, and the date and time set for the Final Approval Hearing.[63] The proposed Class Notice summarizes the proceedings to date and the terms and conditions of the Settlement in an informative and coherent manner.[64] The proposed Class Notice recognizes that the Court has not yet granted final approval of the settlement.[65] The proposed Class Notice also apprises the Class Members and PAGA Members of, *inter alia*, how their Individual Settlement Payment and, if applicable, Individual PAGA Payment is calculated and the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods credited to them.[66] The proposed Class Notice fulfills the requirement of neutrality in notice procedure. *Newberg*, at § 8.39.

Thus, the proposed Class Notice satisfies all due process requirements and complies with the standards of fairness, completeness, and neutrality. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2) and 23(e);

---

[63] Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Newberg, §§ 8.21, 8.39; *Manual*, §§ 21.311, 21.312; see also *Cartt*, *supra*, 50 Cal.App.3d at 960. Accordingly, the Court should approve the proposed Class Notice.

IX. APPOINTMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

The Parties have selected Simpluris, Inc. as the Settlement Administrator. Within 14 calendar days of receipt of the Class Data, the Settlement Administrator will perform an NCOA check and will mail the Class Notice to each Class Member and PAGA Member.[67] The Settlement Administrator will skip-trace returned Class Notices and re-mail the Class Notice to the new addresses within three calendar days.[68] In the case of a re-mailed Class Notice, the Response Deadline will be extended an additional 14 calendar days beyond the initial 60 calendar days provided.[69] The Administrator will receive and process Requests for Exclusion, Objections, or disputes regarding Workweeks.[70] In addition, the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for printing, distributing, and tracking Class Notices and other documents for the Settlement; calculating and distributing payments due under the Settlement; issuing of 1099 and W-2 IRS Forms and all required tax reporting, filings, withholdings, and remittances; providing necessary reports and declarations; and other duties and responsibilities to process the Settlement and as requested by the Parties.[71] The Settlement Administration Costs are currently estimated to be $9,000.00 and will be paid out of the Total Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court.[72] Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court appoint Simpluris, Inc., 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. CLASS REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT AWARD

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court appoint her as the Class Representative and preliminarily approve the Enhancement Award in an amount up to $7,500.00.[73] It is within the

---

[67] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 7.4.2.
[68] *Id.*, ¶ 7.4.3.
[69] *Id.*, ¶ 7.4.4.
[70] *Id.*, ¶¶ 7.8.2, 7.8.3, and 7.8.4; Madoyan Decl., ¶ 19.
[71] *Id.*, ¶ 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 4.4.1, and 7.4.
[72] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.3.
[73] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.1.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Court's discretion to award payment to a Class Representative for her efforts and work. *Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294, 299. The factors that courts may consider in determining whether to make an Enhancement Award 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 Award is fair and appropriate. Plaintiff 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.[74] Plaintiff was available whenever Class Counsel needed her and actively tried to obtain and provide information that would facilitate the pursuit of class and PAGA claims.[75] Accordingly, it is appropriate and just for Plaintiff to receive an Enhancement Award for her services on behalf of the Class, PAGA Members, and the State of California, in addition to her individual settlement payment.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

[74] Madoyan Decl., ¶ 18; Declaration of Kissy Barvarin in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Barvarin Decl."), ¶ 5.

[75] Madoyan Decl., ¶¶ 18, 24; Barvarin Decl., ¶¶ 3-7.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

XI. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant Preliminary Approval of the Settlement; conditionally certify the Class for settlement purposes; appoint Lawyers *for* Justice, PC as Class Counsel; appoint Plaintiff Kissy Barvarin as Class Representative; appoint Simpluris, Inc., as Settlement Administrator; preliminarily approve the allocations for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Award, 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; and to schedule a Final Approval Hearing to take place in approximately 6 months.

Dated: September 25, 2025

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC

By: Vartan S. Madoyan

Vartan Madoyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff