Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
Allen Feghali (SBN 301080)
S. Phillip Song (SBN 326572)
Morgan W. Simpson (SBN 337325)
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125
E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: afeghali@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: psong@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: msimpson@moonlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Robinson A. Cerrada Rivera

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

ROBINSON A. CERRADA RIVERA, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SILVERLAKE RAMEN PORTLAND, INC., a California corporation; SILVERLAKE RAMEN, INC., a California corporation; SILVERLAKE RAMEN HOLDINGS, LLC, a limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CIVRS2500804

CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

DECLARATION OF KANE MOON IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

[*Filed with Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Plaintiff, the Declaration of Lisa Mullins, and [Proposed] Preliminary Approval Order*]

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING:
Date: June 24, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: R17
Judge: Hon. Gilbert Ochoa

Action filed: February 5, 2025
Trial date: Not set

DECLARATION OF KANE MOON

I, KANE MOON, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice as such before all Courts of the State of California and am one of the attorneys of record for Plaintiff Robinson A. Cerrada Rivera ("Plaintiff") and the putative Class. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the facts described herein.

CASE BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

2. This is a wage-and-hour class and representative action for alleged Labor Code violations and claims for civil penalties pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"). Plaintiff seeks to represent a class of all individuals who are or were employed by Defendants Silverlake Ramen Portland, Inc., Silverlake Ramen, Inc., and Silverlake Ramen Holdings, LLC ("Defendants") (together with Plaintiff, the "Parties") as non-exempt hourly employees in California during the Class Period, as set forth in the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement"). A true and correct copy of the Settlement is attached to the instant Declaration as **Exhibit 1**. The proposed Class Notice is attached to the Settlement as **Exhibit A**.

3. Defendants are California franchisees of a large, national ramen chain, Silverlake Ramen. Defendants employed Plaintiff and other non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the Class Period. Plaintiff contends he and his coworkers were subjected to the same unlawful labor practices, including failure to pay wages for all hours worked.

4. Plaintiff's claim for unpaid minimum and overtime wages stem from allegations that Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and others for off-the-clock work. Plaintiff's meal and rest period claims are based on allegations that due to the nature of their work, Class Members' breaks were often short, late, interrupted, and sometimes missed altogether, and that Defendants did not pay all premium wages for non-compliant breaks. Plaintiff further brings a claim for unreimbursed necessary business expenses based on allegations that Class Members were required to purchase slip resistant shoes and black work pants for work purposes without reimbursement from Defendants. Finally, Plaintiff also brings derivative claims

for waiting time penalties, wage statement violations, unfair business practices, and civil penalties under PAGA.

5. Because of the foregoing alleged violations of various provisions of the Labor Code, Plaintiff filed a class action on February 5, 2025, which alleges Defendants systematically: (1) failed to pay minimum wages, (2) failed to pay overtime compensation, (3) failed to provide meal periods, (4) failed to authorize and permit rest periods, (5) failed to indemnify necessary business expenses, (6) failed to timely pay final wages at termination, (7) failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and (8) engaged in unfair business practices.

6. Pursuant to PAGA, on January 19, 2025, Plaintiff gave written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "LWDA") of the alleged Labor Code violations, with certified mail service on Defendants, and paid the required filing fee. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's PAGA Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**. On April 2, 2025, Plaintiff timely filed a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint to add a ninth cause of action for civil penalties under PAGA (the "Operative Complaint"). In compliance with Labor Code section 2699(s)(1), Plaintiff subsequently submitted to the LWDA a file-stamped copy of the Operative Complaint containing the Court-assigned case number. To date, the LWDA has not indicated its intent to investigate the alleged violations or intervene in this Action.

7. Defendants ardently oppose the merits of this case and denies Plaintiff's factual allegations. Defendants assert they complied with all its compensation obligations, including compensating Class Members for any and all off-the-clock work, and therefore, Plaintiff and other Class Members were paid all wages owed. Defendants maintain compliance with all their meal and rest period obligations. Defendants assert they complied with all their reimbursement obligations, and that Plaintiff and other employees were compensated for any and all business expenses necessarily incurred. To the extent employees received wage statements that were allegedly inaccurate, Defendants assert employees suffered no actual damage or harm as a result. (*See, e.g.*, *Angeles v. U.S. Airways, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2013, No. C 12–05860 CRB) 2013 WL 622032, at *10 ["A plaintiff must adequately plead an injury arising from an employer's failure to provide full and accurate wage statements, and the omission of the required information alone is not

sufficient."].) With respect to Plaintiff's claim for waiting time penalties, Defendants allege their good-faith belief that they paid all wages precludes the imposition of waiting time penalties since Plaintiff cannot prove Defendants' alleged failure to pay all final wages at the time of separation was "willful." (*See, e.g.*, *Pedroza v. PetSmart, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. June 14, 2012, No. ED CV 11–298 GHK (DTBx)) 2012 WL 9506073, *5.) For these reasons, among others, Defendants deny all of Plaintiff's claims and allegations, and further claims they did not engage in any unfair business practices and denies liability under PAGA. Defendants also maintain the claims are improper for class treatment, in part, due to the individualized and testimony-intensive nature of the wage claims that could bar class certification or significantly reduce Defendants' overall liability.

<u>DISCOVERY AND INVESTIGATION</u>

8. The Parties agreed to mediate this action with Michael Ludwig, Esq., an experienced class and PAGA action mediator. In preparation for mediation, the Parties agreed to a protocol for an informal production of documents and information before mediation. Prior to mediation, Plaintiff obtained from Defendants, through informal discovery, documents and data that were necessary and helpful to evaluate the claims asserted in this Action. Defendants produced a 15% sample of time and pay records for the putative Class, time and pay records, and Defendants' written employment policies and handbook in effect during the Class Period. Defendants also provided information regarding the estimated number of current and formerly employed Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, and PAGA Pay Periods.

9. In preparation for mediation, Plaintiff's Counsel reviewed and analyzed all the information Defendants provided, including the sample records and documents regarding Defendants' wage-and-hour policies. Plaintiff's Counsel retained a statistics expert to analyze the sample records and prepare a damage analysis prior to the mediation. The sample time and pay records analyzed contained 3,717 actual shifts worked (representing roughly 8% of total shifts worked in the Class Period), which allowed Plaintiff's expert to prepare an analysis with a reasonable degree of certainty. In conjunction with their extensive factual investigation, Plaintiff's Counsel also investigated the applicable law regarding the claims and defenses asserted in the litigation. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counsel was able to evaluate the probability of class certification, success on the merits, and Defendants' maximum and realistic monetary exposure for all claims.

Thus, Plaintiff's and his Counsel's familiarity with the facts of the case and the legal issues raised by the pleadings allowed them to act intelligently in negotiating the Settlement.

SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS AND NOTICE TO THE LWDA

10. On August 25, 2025, the Parties participated in a full day of private mediation with Michael Ludwig, Esq. The negotiations were at arm's length and, although conducted in a professional manner, were adversarial. The Parties went into the mediation willing to explore the potential for a settlement of the dispute, but each side was also prepared to litigate their position through trial and appeal if a settlement had not been reached. After a full discussion regarding the strengths and weaknesses of Plaintiff's claims and Defendants' defenses and with the assistance of the mediator, the Parties reached a resolution, the material terms of which are set out in the Settlement.

11. In compliance with Labor Code section 2699(s)(2), notice of settlement and a copy of the proposed Settlement has been submitted to the LWDA along with a copy of Plaintiff's preliminary approval motion and the hearing date. A true and correct copy of the LWDA submission details is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. To date, the LWDA has not indicated any objection to the Settlement.

KEY TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

12. GSA and Funding: The Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") is $285,000.00, subject to potential increase under an Escalator Clause, and is non-reversionary. (Settlement, ¶ 3.1.) Defendants will separately pay their employer-side payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of Individual Class Payments. (*Id.*) Defendants shall fund the Gross Settlement Amount and their employer-share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator in two installments.[1] (*Id.* at ¶ 4.3.) Defendants shall fund one half of the GSA, i.e., $142,500, upon the Court's entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment ("First Payment"). (*Id.*) Defendants shall fund the remaining half of the GSA, i.e., $142,500, within nine (9) months following the First Payment ("Final Payment"). (*Id.*)

[1] The funding schedule of the Gross Settlement Amount was critical in settling the Action to ensure Defendants are able to fund the Gross Settlement Amount within its financial constraints. The Parties believe that the funding schedule is fair because it ensures Defendants can fund the Gross Settlement while remaining in business.

13. Escalator Clause: The Settlement provides an escalator clause under which should the number of Class Period Workweeks exceed the estimated count of 10,274 by more than 10% (i.e., 11,302 workweeks), then the portion of the GSA attributable to non-PAGA claims (i.e., the GSA less the PAGA penalties) shall be increased proportionately for each additional Workweek above the 10% buffer. (*Id.* at ¶ 8.) Alternatively, Defendants, in their sole discretion may elect to end the Class Period on the date in which the number of Workweeks is 11,302 such that the escalator clause is not triggered and no additional funds are due. (*Id.*)

14. Class Representative Service Payment: The Settlement includes a payment up to $7,500.00 payable from the GSA, subject to the Court's approval, to Plaintiff as the Class Representative, in addition to the amount he is eligible to receive as a Class Member. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1.13, 3.2.1.) This payment is for initiating the Action and providing services in support of the Action. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.13.) In the event the award finally approved is less, the difference will revert to Participating Class Members. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.1.)

15. Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payments: The Settlement permits a fee application of not more than $95,000.00 (representing 33.33% of the GSA) for reasonable attorneys' fees, plus reimbursement for actual litigation costs not to exceed $20,000.00, payable to Class Counsel from the GSA. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.2.) In the event the amounts finally approved are less, the difference will revert to Participating Class Members. (*Id.*) To date, my firm has incurred $18,111.88 in actual litigation costs, and a true and correct copy of such costs is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

16. Administration Expenses Payment: The Settlement provides an Administration Expenses Payment to the Administrator, payable from the GSA, in an amount not to exceed $5,850.00, except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.3.) In the event the amount of actual administration costs is less and/or the amount approved by the Court is less than requested, the difference will be allocated to the Net Settlement Amount. (*Id.*) Following a competitive bidding process, the Parties jointly selected ILYM Group, Inc. ("ILYM") as the neutral entity to administer this Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1.2, 7.1.) and the Parties selected ILYM based on its bid of $5,850.00, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

17. PAGA Penalties; Individual PAGA Payments: The Settlement allocates $15,000.00 from the GSA for settlement of the Released PAGA Claims, which will be distributed 65% ($9,750.00) to the LWDA and 35% ($5,250.00) to Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA law governing Plaintiff's claims. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1.33, 3.2.6.) Each Aggrieved Employee will be entitled to a pro rata share of the 35% share of the PAGA Penalties directly proportional to their number of PAGA Pay Periods. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.6.1.) This results in an average Individual PAGA Payment of roughly **$60.34** for each of the estimated 87 Aggrieved Employees ($5,250 / 87), and a PAGA Pay Period value of roughly **$1.11** for each of the 4,727 estimated Pay Periods in the PAGA Period ($5,250 / 4,727).

18. Net Settlement Amount: After deducting the Class Representative Service Payment, the Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payments, the PAGA Penalties allocation, and the Administration Expenses Payment from the GSA, in the amounts specifically approved by the Court, any difference in the amounts requested and the amounts awarded will be allocated to the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1.26, 3.2.) Accordingly, the Net Settlement Amount will be *no less than* **$141,650.00** for an estimated Class of **280 individuals**.[2]

19. Class Members/Period: The Settlement Class is defined as all individuals who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt hourly employees in California during the Class Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.4.) For purposes of Settlement, the "Class Period" is February 5, 2021, through October 25, 2025. (Settlement, ¶¶ 1.11.)

20. Individual Class Payments: Each Class Member who does not opt-out will be entitled to a pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount that is directly proportional to the number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.4.) The estimated **$141,650** Net Settlement Amount results in an average Individual Class Payment of roughly **$505.89** for each of the estimated 280 Class Members ($141,650 /

[2] The Net Settlement Amount was calculated by deducting the following from the $285,000.00 GSA: $7,500.00 for the Class Representative Service Payment, up to $5,850.00 for the Administration Expenses Payment, $15,000.00 for the PAGA Penalties to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees, $95,000.00 for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, and up to $20,000.00 for the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. (Settlement, ¶¶ 3.1–3.2.6.)

280),[3] and a Workweek value of roughly **$13.79** for each of the 10,274 estimated Workweeks in the Class Period ($141,650 / 10,274).

21. Tax Allocations: Individual Class Payments will be allocated as 20% as wages and 80% as penalties and interest for tax purposes. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.4.1.)

22. Disbursement and Uncashed Funds: Disbursement will occur within 10 days after Defendants fund the Final Payment of the GSA. (*Id.* at ¶ 4.4.) Class Members will not need to submit any claim form as a condition of receiving individual settlement payments. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.1.) Any funds remaining uncashed after 180 days from issuance be transmitted by the Administrator to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b). (*Id.* at ¶¶ 4.4.1, 4.4.3.)

23. Released Class Claims: The "Released Class Claims" is limited to all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint that arose during the Class Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.2.)

24. Released PAGA Claims: The "Released PAGA Claims" is limited to any and all claims for civil penalties under PAGA against Defendants and the Released Parties that arise out of or reasonably relate to the claims alleged in the Action, the Operative Complaint, and the operative PAGA Notice, or that could have been alleged based on the factual allegations in the Action, the Operative Complaint, and the operative PAGA Notice. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.3.)

25. Plaintiff's Section 1542 Release: Under the Settlement, Plaintiff has agreed to a general release of any and all claims against the Released Parties, including a release of rights pursuant to California Civil Code section 1542. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 5.1, 5.4.)

26. Effective date of claims releases: The release of all claims will be effective only upon Defendants' funding of the GSA and employer-share of payroll taxes. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.)

---

[3] At this time, the actual amounts to Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees are unknown and will be calculated by the Administrator following preliminary approval and receipt and processing of the Class Data. (Settlement, ¶ 7.4.2.) The high and low range of payments will be provided to the Court in a motion for final approval.

27. Released Parties: Defendants and any of its former and present directors, officers, shareholders, owners, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors, assigns, parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.40.)

28. Class Notice; Disputes, Requests for Exclusion, Objections: The Class Notice will be via first-class U.S. mail to the current address of each Class Member. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.4.2.) The proposed Class Notice sets forth, in plain terms, a statement of case, the terms of the Settlement, the approximate amounts of attorneys' fees, costs, PAGA Penalties, and service award being sought, an explanation of how the individual payments are calculated, the Final Approval Hearing information, the procedure for disputing the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to each Class Members, and how Class Members may, should they choose, opt-out or otherwise object to the Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 7.4–7.7.3, Ex. A.)

29. No Related Actions: To the best of my knowledge, there is no other pending litigation involving similar claims against Defendants that may be impacted by approval of the Settlement at issue, nor have Defendants pointed to any.

THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE, AND ADEQUATE

30. Plaintiff's Counsel have conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of this case. As previously noted, the Settlement at issue was reached through arm's-length negotiations, private mediation, and the assistance of a statistics expert. Based on Defendants' informal class-wide discovery production, on Plaintiff's Counsel independent investigation and evaluation, and on their extensive experience in wage-and-hour litigation, Plaintiff's Counsel are of the opinion that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Furthermore, considering all known facts and circumstances, the risk of significant delay, trial risk, appellate risk, and the defenses Defendants may assert both to certification and on the merits, the Settlement is in the best interest of the Class and LWDA.

31. Based on Plaintiff's Counsel's review of the time, payroll, and additional data provided by Defendants, on Plaintiff's expert's analysis of the sample records provided by Defendants, and on information from Plaintiff, Plaintiff's Counsel evaluated the estimated maximum and risk-adjusted exposure that Defendants faced. Based on a review of Defendants' records, it is estimated that there are approximately 280 Class Members who collectively worked 10,274 Workweeks during the Class Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 4.1.)

There are also an estimated 87 Aggrieved Employees who collectively worked 4,727 PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period. Additionally, it was estimated that there were 103 former employees falling within the three-year statute of limitations ("SOL") period for waiting time penalties, that Class Members' average hourly rate was $17.54.

Accordingly, we calculated Defendants' potential exposure as follows:

Claim	**Relevant Time Period**	**Rate**	**Number of Violations**	**Realistic Recovery**
Unpaid Wages (Off the Clock)	10,274 Workweeks	$17.54 average hourly rate	7,502 net unpaid hours (assuming 10 minutes per shift) (9.5% overtime)	**$20,675.31****
Meal Period Violations	10,274 Workweeks	$17.54 average hourly rate	24,027 unique meal break violations	**$105,358.40***
Rest Period Violations	10,274 Workweeks	$17.54 average hourly rate	44,034 rest break violations (assuming 100% break violations for break-eligible shifts)	**$115,853.45****
Unreimbursed Business Expenses Violations	10,274 Workweeks	$25 / Pay Period	Based on Information from Plaintiff	**$19,263.75****
Labor Code § 203	Based on approx. 103 terminated employees within the 3-year SOL	$17.54 average hourly rate / 30-day max.	Assumes 6.1 hours / day	**$16,651.05*****
Labor Code § 226	Based on approx. 92 employees within the 1-year SOL	$50 per initial pay period / $100 per subsequent pay periods / $4,000 employee max.	Based on 4,727 pay periods within the 1-year SOL	**$18,400.00*****
PAGA	Based on 4,727 pay periods within the 1-year SOL	$100 per pay period	Based on 4,727 pay periods within the 1-year SOL	**$23,635.00*****
Total				**$319,836.95**

* These figures are discounted based on a 25% probability of prevailing at class certification and on the merits.
** These figures are discounted based on a 15% probability of prevailing at class certification and on the merits.
*** These figures are discounted based on a 5% probability of prevailing at class certification and on the merits.[4]

32. Plaintiff's unpaid wages claim is based on allegations that Defendants failed to pay all minimum and overtime wages due to off-the-clock work. Plaintiff alleges that he and other employees were required to wait in line before clocking into their shifts and complete work tasks after clocking out of their shifts. Therefore, Plaintiff's Counsel estimated Class Members spent an average 10 minutes off the clock per shift. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counsel and data expert estimated Defendants failed to pay Class Members for approximately 7,502 hours, 9.5% of which should have been paid at the overtime rate. From this, and in light of the average rates of the Class Members, Defendants' estimated maximum potential liability is $137,835.37. Defendants contend that all time worked was compensated, that the time required to wait in line or complete work tasks were *de minimis*, that Class Members were not permitted to work off-the-clock, and that this claim is highly individualized and not susceptible to class-wide treatment. I acknowledge that "off-the-clock" claims are difficult to be tried on a class wide basis because there is no apparatus that can be used to prove this claim—there are no records to be used as evidence. In light of these defenses, and for purposes of settlement, I discounted the maximum potential liability by 85%. **Plaintiff's realistic recovery estimate for the unpaid wages claim due to off-the-clock work is therefore $20,675.31.**

33. Plaintiff's meal period claim is based on allegations that Defendants did not provide or maintain sufficient meal period practices, such that Class Members were not always permitted or able to take meal periods and/or were sometimes subjected to late, short and/or interrupted meal periods without compensation in lieu thereof. The sample of time and corresponding payroll records for the putative Class indicated that Defendants either failed to provide a meal period or provided a short and/or untimely meal period 24,027

[4] It is reasonable to apply discounts to account for risks at certification and trial, in part, because the Judicial Council of California found that only 21.4% of all class actions were certified either as part of a settlement *or* as part of a contested certification motion. (*See* Findings of the Study of California Class Action Litigation, 2000-2006, available at http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/class-action-lit-study.pdf.) Further, the likelihood that Defendants could assert viable legal defenses would likely further reduce its overall exposure.

times throughout the Class Period, resulting in a 62% violation rate. Plaintiff's Counsel and its data expert then calculated that, in light of these violations and the average hourly rate of the putative Class, that Defendants had a potential liability of $421,433.58 (24,027 unique violations x $17.54 avg. hourly rate). Defendants nonetheless contends that many meal breaks were taken and, where a violation appears, it was a result of the Class Member voluntarily choosing to forego a meal period, to take it after the end of the fifth hour, or to stop his or her break early to return to work. Indeed, the majority of apparent violations are for unrecorded meals on shifts between 5-6 hours (83.7% violation rate). For shifts over 6 hours, 40% of the unique meal break violations also included a meal waiver. Moreover, certification and proof of this claim would require declarations from Class Members and obtaining such declarations potentially would reveal that each Class Member had a different experience with respect to meal periods. In light of these defenses, and for purposes of settlement, Plaintiff's Counsel believe it reasonable to apply a 75% discount to the potential liability. **Plaintiff's realistic recovery estimate for the meal period claim is therefore $105,358.40.**

34. The rest break claim is based on the allegation that Defendants did not provide or maintain sufficient rest break practices, such that Class Members were regularly required to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day, or a major fraction thereof, without authorization or permission to take a ten-minute, continuous and uninterrupted rest period or without compensation in lieu thereof. The precise number of rest break violations could not be calculated since Defendants neither documented, nor is required to document, when Class Members took their required rest breaks. Therefore, in preparation for mediation, Plaintiff's Counsel assumed a 100% violation rate for shifts greater than or equal to 3.5 hours in length and, based on the average hourly rate of the putative Class, calculated Defendants' potential liability to be $772,356.36 (44,034 unique rest break violations x $17.54 per hour). Defendants nonetheless contend rest periods do not have to be recorded, that Class Members voluntarily chose to forego some rest breaks and, significant for purposes of class certification, that this claim is individualized in nature and therefore would require declarations indicating the majority of Class Members experienced issues as to rest breaks. In light of these defenses, and for purposes of settlement, I discounted Defendants' potential liability by 85%. **Plaintiff's realistic recovery estimate for the rest break claim is therefore $115,853.45.**

35. The unreimbursed business expenses claim is based on the allegation that Defendants did not reimburse Class Members for all expenses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of duties. Based on information from Plaintiff, he and other employees purchased slip resistant shoes and black work pant for work purposes without reimbursement. The precise value of all necessary business expenses Class Members incurred could not be calculated. Therefore, in preparation for mediation, Plaintiff's Counsel estimated Defendants owed approximately $25.00 per pay period per Class Member in the statutory period and that Defendants' potential liability is $128,425.00. Defendants contend they complied with all their reimbursement obligations, and further, that the reimbursement claim would be difficult to certify, given the individualistic nature of this claim. In light of these defenses, and for purposes of settlement, I discounted Defendants' potential liability by 85%. **Plaintiff's realistic recovery estimate for the unreimbursed expenses claim is therefore $19,263.75.**

36. With respect to Plaintiff's derivative claims for statutory and civil penalties, Plaintiff estimates Defendants' maximum potential recovery, prior to risk-adjustment, is $1,173,721.00, which breaks down as follows: **$333,021.00** for waiting time penalties for approximately 103 terminated Class Members in the 3-year SOL; a **$368,000.00** penalty for inaccurate wage statements based on approximately 92 Class Members in the 1-year SOL; and **$472,700.00** for PAGA penalties based on 4,727 Pay Periods and the Court assessing a $100 penalty for each pay period containing a violation. However, I believe it would be unrealistic to expect the Court to award the full exposure amount given the discretionary nature of awarding penalties and given Defendants' defenses, including without limitation, that any failure to pay all final wages at the time of separation was not willful or intentional and that to the extent Plaintiff received wage statements that were allegedly inaccurate, Plaintiff suffered no actual resulting damage or harm. Moreover, I understand the individualized and testimony-intensive nature of the wage claims could bar class certification or otherwise significantly reduce Defendants' overall liability for statutory and civil penalties. Furthermore, considering the underlying wage claims are realistically estimated to be $261,150.90, awarding such a disproportional amount in penalties would also raise Due Process concerns. Weighing these factors, I applied a 95% discount to each penalty (resulting in **$16,651.05** for waiting time penalties, **$18,400.00** for inaccurate wage statement

penalties, and **$23,635.00**for PAGA penalties) and accordingly arrived at **a realistic recovery estimate of $58,686.05 for statutory and civil penalties**.

37. Using these estimated figures, Plaintiff predicted **the realistic (risk-adjusted) recovery for all claims, including penalties, is $319,836.95**. This means **the $285,000.00 gross settlement figure represents roughly 89% of the total realistic recovery**. This is an excellent result for the Class, particularly because, under the Settlement, Class Members will receive timely and guaranteed relief, avoiding the risk of not being able to recover anything.

38. With regards to the PAGA claims, the Settlement is a fair and reasonable resolution that satisfies PAGA's dual statutory purposes of deterrence and punishment, on the one hand, and providing Aggrieved Employees with genuine and meaningful relief, on the other. (Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*) As a result of this litigation, Defendants have had to hire legal counsel, engage in informal class-wide discovery, and participate in mediation. Defendants will also have to pay civil penalties to the LWDA under the Settlement, assuming final settlement approval is granted. (Settlement, ¶ 3.2.6.) Not including its own attorneys' fees and costs as well as the employer's share of payroll taxes, Defendants will pay no less than $285,000.00 to resolve this matter—of which $15,000.00 is allocated toward the PAGA claims and will be distributed, in compliance with Labor Code section 2699 as 65% ($9,750.00) to the LWDA and 35% ($5,250.00) to Aggrieved Employees—and the release obtained under the Settlement does not preclude Aggrieved Employees from pursuing any individual claims they may have against Defendants or the other Released Parties. Moreover, Plaintiff's Counsel are of the opinion that because the issues here are fairly contested, there is a possibility of the Court not awarding the PAGA penalties even if Plaintiff prevailed on the merits due to the largely discretionary nature of awarding PAGA penalties. In other words, were this matter to go to trial, any award granted would be at the discretion of the Court and subject to a substantial reduction.

39. Further, Plaintiff's Counsel took into account the risk of not being able to proceed on a representative basis due to the potential manageability issues and that even if Plaintiff prevailed at trial, penalties would likely be limited due to the largely discretionary nature of awarding PAGA penalties and in light of other defenses available to Defendants. Thus, it is entirely possible that even if Plaintiff would

be successful at trial, assuming he is first able to certify the claims and defeat the manageability issues presented at litigation, Plaintiff could be awarded substantially less than what was obtained through the Settlement. In sum, the $15,000 PAGA Penalties allocation under the Settlement constitutes "genuine and meaningful" that is "consistent with the underlying purpose of the statute to benefit the public." (*See O'Connor v. Uber Tech., Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2016) 201 F.Supp.3d 1110, 1133–35 [denying settlement approval where allocation for PAGA claims was 0.1% of the estimated full worth].)

40. Here, the Settlement represents a substantial recovery when considered against the risk and uncertainties involved in continued litigation, the burdens of proof necessary to certify the claims and establish liability, and the probability of appeal. While Plaintiff is confident in the merits of his claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each cause of action. Plaintiff also recognizes that proving the amount owed to each Class Member would be an expensive, time-consuming, and uncertain proposition.

41. The Settlement obviates the significant risk that this Court may deny certification of all or some of Plaintiff's claims. Plaintiff's Counsel took into account the risk of not prevailing at trial due to low or no participation by Class Members. Indeed, the individualized and testimony-intensive nature of the claims could bar manageability of the representative claims or otherwise significantly reduce any recovery whatsoever. For example, the rest period and unreimbursed expense claims are testimony-driven claims and assume a 100% violation rate, which would not likely be demonstrated at trial, as it assumes either the participation of a majority or all employees (which would be difficult given the reality that many, if not all, employees would be unwilling to participate due to fear of retaliation), or alternatively, the use of surveys or statistical data as a surrogate (which would still require the participation of a majority of employees to establish a sound representation of all non-exempts). Even assuming employees would be willing to participate, obtaining declarations would potentially reveal that each individual employee had a different experience.

42. Furthermore, even if Plaintiff was able to pursue his claims on a class-wide basis and obtain certification of all or some of the claims, continued litigation would be expensive, involving a trial and possible appeals, and would substantially delay and reduce any recovery by the Class. Although the Parties have engaged in a significant amount of investigation, informal discovery, and class-wide data analysis, they

have not conducted extensive formal discovery. Moreover, preparation for class certification and a trial would remain for the Parties as well as the prospect of appeals in the wake of a disputed class certification ruling for Plaintiff and/or any summary judgment ruling. As a result, the Parties would incur considerably more attorneys' fees and costs through trial. In sum, this Settlement avoids the risks, burdens, and the accompanying expense of further litigation.

43. The proposed $285,000.00 Settlement represents a substantial recovery when compared to the reasonably forecasted recovery for the Class. When considering the risks of litigation, the uncertainties involved in continued litigation, the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability, and the probability of appeal, it is clear the Settlement amount is within the "ballpark" of reasonableness, and that preliminary settlement approval is appropriate. (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc*. (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133; *see Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of L.A.* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408–09 [holding that *Kullar* does not require "an explicit statement of the maximum amount the plaintiff class could recover if it prevailed on all its claims," but instead, only an "understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the litigation"].)

THE SERVICE PAYMENT TO PLAINTIFF IS REASONABLE

44. Throughout this litigation, Plaintiff, who was a former employee of Defendants, has cooperated immensely with my office and has taken many actions to protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff provided valuable information regarding his hours worked, and what duties were performed during those hours. Plaintiff also provided information regarding meal periods taken and missed by Plaintiff and other Class Members. Plaintiff participated in decisions concerning this action, assisted in preparation for the mediation, and provided my office with the names and contact information of potential witnesses in this action. Before we filed this case, Plaintiff worked with my office to determine the viability of his claims. Plaintiff also provided information and documents relating to his employment by Defendants. The information and documentation provided by Plaintiff was instrumental in establishing the wage-and-hour violations alleged in this action, and the recovery provided for in the Settlement would have been impossible to obtain without his participation.

45. At the same time, Plaintiff faced many risks in adding himself as the named Plaintiff in this

matter. Plaintiff faced actual risks with his future employment, as putting himself on public record in an employment lawsuit could also very well affect his likelihood for future employment. For example, a search of Plaintiff's name will reveal this action, and as a result, many employers may likely forego hiring Plaintiff in learning he sued a former employer.

46. In turn, Class Members can now participate in a settlement, reimbursing them for wage violations they may have never known about or been willing to pursue on their own. If each Class Member would have tried to pursue legal remedies on their own, that would have resulted in each having to expend a significant amount of their own monetary resources and time, not to mention limited judicial resources, which were obviated by Plaintiff putting himself on the line on behalf of the Class.

47. This class action would not have been possible without the aid of Plaintiff, who put his own time and effort into this litigation and placed himself at risk for the sake of the Class. The requested enhancement award to Plaintiff for his service as the Class Representative is a relatively small amount of money considering the time and effort put into the litigation and compared to enhancements granted in other class actions. The requested enhancement award is therefore reasonable to compensate Plaintiff for his active participation in this lawsuit, in addition to his general release of claims, both known and unknown, and waiver of section 1542 rights.

MY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

48. I received a B.A. in History in 1998 from UCLA, and my J.D. from Loyola Marymount Law School in 2006. I became an Active Member of the State Bar of California in June 2007 and have been an Active Member in good standing continuously since then. I have been selected to Super Lawyers each year from 2019 to 2023.

49. I co-founded Moon & Yang, APC—now Moon Law Group, PC—in March 2010. My practice is focused exclusively on advocating for the rights of employees in wage-and-hour litigation, almost entirely in class and/or representative actions.

50. For the past decade, I have built my practice to have an emphasis on employment and related civil litigation cases and have both prosecuted and defended employment-related litigation cases. I have been

heavily, successfully, and continuously involved in active litigation and trial work, and have conducted bench and jury trials on behalf of both employees and employers in wage-and-hour cases.

51. My current billing rate is $950.00 per hour, which is my usual hourly rate in wage-and-hour litigations. A $950.00 per hour rate is reasonable considering my years of experience practicing in the highly specialized area of employment and labor law and my Laffey Matrix rate (The Laffey Matrix, http://www.laffeymatrix.com/see.html [last visited April 30, 2026].) The Laffey Matrix is a "well-established objective source for rates that vary by experience" used by the District of Columbia. (*In re HPL Tech., Inc. Sec. Litig.* (N.D. Cal. 2005) 366 F. Supp 2d 912, 921.) A true and correct copy of the Laffey Matrix is attached hereto as **Exhibit 6**. California Courts have adjusted the Laffey Matrix rate upwards based on "locality pay differentials" and the location of counsel's office in California to determine whether counsel's rates are reasonable. (*See, e.g.*, *id.* [applying a 9% upward adjustment to the Laffey Matrix rate based on an approximate difference of 9% between the locality pay differential of the District of Columbia and San Francisco, California, where counsel's office was located].) To determine the locality pay differential, the Court in *In re HPL Technologies, Inc.* utilized the locality pay differentials within the federal courts. (*Id.* at pp. 921–22.) Using the same method here and based on my firm's location in Los Angeles, California, the locality pay differential of the Los Angeles-Long Beach area is 36.47% and the locality pay differential of the Washington-Baltimore-Arlington area is 33.94%, which results in a difference of approximately 2.53%. (*Compare* Judiciary Salary Plan of Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA, Effective January 13, 2025, *with* Judiciary Salary Plan of Washington-Baltimore-Arlington, Effective January 13, 2025.) True and correct copies of the Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA and Washington-Baltimore-Arlington salary plans are attached hereto as **Exhibit 7** and **Exhibit 8**, respectively. Based on my 19+ years of experience out of law school, my Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.53% adjustment is $1,044.78 per hour ($1,019 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.53% x $1,019)). Accordingly, my current billing rate of $950.00 per hour is reasonable.

52. I am experienced in prosecuting and defending employment matters, particularly class actions and PAGA representative actions. My firm has focused a substantial percentage of its practice on wage, hour, and working conditions violations. In addition to the present case, I am also class counsel for other wage-

and-hour class action lawsuits pending in various California counties, including in state and federal courts. The following is a list of some of our recent class action settlements that have received preliminary and final approval: *Aparicio v. Lineage Logistics, LLC* (LASC No. BC722764) (class size approx. 155; lead counsel); *Black v. Mission Healthcare Servs., Inc*. (LASC No. 19STCV04602) (class size approx. 1,000; lead counsel); *Campa v. Bloomingdeals, Inc*. (LASC No. BC700366) (class size approx. 1,500; lead counsel); *Garcia v. Comfy U.S.A. Apparel, Inc.* (LASC No. BC709630) (class size approx. 210; lead counsel); *Gomez v. H Mart Cos., Inc.* (LASC No. BC671525) (class size approx. 2,500; co-counsel); *Jones v. Citiguard, Inc.* (LASC No. BC664890) (class size approx. 587; lead counsel); *Jones v. Fitness Alliance, LLC* (Riverside No. PSC1404079) (class size approx. 1,000; lead counsel); *Lagos v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Corp.* (LASC No. BC682972) ($750,000 for 79 class members; lead counsel); *Mark Brulee et al. v. DAL Global Servs., LLC* (C.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2018, No. CV 17-6433 JVS(JCGx)) 2018 WL 6616659, at *10 (class size approx. 2,650; lead counsel) (in approving my hourly rate in that case, the Court found: "Class Counsel's declarations show that the attorneys are experienced and successful litigators. Other courts have approved the attorneys' current rates for the Moon & Yang, APC attorneys"); *Martinez v. Bail Hotline Bail Bonds, Inc.* (LASC No. BC700131) (class size approx. 173; lead counsel); *Montoya v. Golden 1 Credit Union* (Sacramento No. 34-2018-00228252) (class size approx. 1,900; lead counsel); *Onofre v. Caitac Garment Processing, Inc*. (LASC No. BC702283) (class size approx. 750; lead counsel); *Rodriguez v. Rossmoyne, Inc.* (LASC No. BC699137) (class size approx. 220; lead counsel); *Sison v. Cha Hollywood Med. Ctr., L.P.* (LASC No. BC6441 29) (class size approx. 2,100; co-counsel); *Slaughter v. ACA Sec. Stems, LP* (LASC No. BC699137) (class size approx. 300; lead counsel); *Taylor v. Sherman's Delicatessen & Bakery, LLC* (LASC No. BC722765) (class size approx. 515; lead counsel); *Vargas v. AMS Paving, Inc*. (LASC No. BC722767) (case size approx. 260; lead counsel); *Vertti v. Bagcraft Papercon III, LLC* (LASC No. 19STCV12729) (class size approx. 260; lead counsel); and *Wallick v. Campbell Soup Supply Co., LLC* (San Joaquin No. STK-CV-UOE-2021-0000865) (class size 435; lead counsel).

ALLEN FEGHALI'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

53. Allen Feghali is a Senior Partner at Moon Law Group, PC. He received his B.A. in Global and International Studies in 2011 from UC Santa Barbara, and his J.D. from University of La Verne College of

Law in 2014. Mr. Feghali became an Active Member of the State Bar of California in December 2014 and has been an Active Member in good standing continuously since then. He was selected by Super Lawyers as a "Southern California Rising Star" in 2020–2023.

54. Mr. Feghali began working at Moon Law Group, PC in May 2015, and his practice focuses on advocating for the rights of employees at the trial-court and appellate level. Prior to approximately June 2018, with the exception of a handful of cases, his practice focused on individual FEHA and wrongful termination claims, as well as individual wage-and-hour claims. In June 2018, Mr. Feghali became heavily involved in the firm's class action practice.

55. Mr. Feghali's current billing rate is $900.00 per hour, which is his usual hourly rate in wage and hour litigations. Based on Mr. Feghali's 12 years of experience out of law school, his Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.53% adjustment is $1,044.78 per hour ($1,019 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.53% x $1,019)). (*See* Ex. 6.) As compared to the Laffey Matrix rate and when considering his experience, Mr. Feghali's billing rate of $900.00 per hour is reasonable.

56. During Mr. Feghali's tenure with Moon Law Group, PC, he has played a critical role in obtaining outstanding results for employees who have been wronged by their employers. Mr. Feghali's litigation experience includes, but is not limited to:

(a) In March 2021, Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in the matter of *Rivera, et al. v. Clearpath Federal Credit Union* (LASC No. 19STCV33504), which resulted in a certification order on all causes of action following contested briefing in a wage-and-hour class action.

(b) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Dawson, et al. v. GoHealth, LLC, et al.* (No. CGC-19-577790), which was argued and taken under submission by the Court on February 3, 2022.

(c) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Brown v. NTI-CA, Inc., et al.* (No. 21STCV04397).

(d) Mr. Feghali was part of a team that prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Thong, et al. v. Outlook Resources, Inc., et al.* (No. 19STCV44400), which was granted in part and denied in part in October 2022.

(e) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing which resulted in a remand order in the matter of *Andrade v. Rehrig Pacific Corp.* (C.D. Cal. April 22, 2020, No. CV 20-1448 FMP (RAOx)) 2020 WL 1934954, where defendant removed a wage-and-hour class alleging that Plaintiffs' claims were pre-empted by the Labor Management Relations Act.

(f) Mr. Feghali briefed, argued, and won the matter of *Lee, et al. v. The Christian Herald, U.S.A., Inc.* (Cal. Ct. App. Dec. 12, 2017, No. B266853) 2017 WL 6333905, at *1. There, the Court of Appeal reversed a dismissal of an individual defendant following the trial court's granting of a demurrer without leave to amend relating to alter ego allegations.

(g) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing which resulted in a remand order in the matter of *Sotelo v. Belfor USA Group, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. March 13, 2018, No. 2:17–cv–09056–RSWL–MRWx) 2018 WL 1352910. Defendants there sought to remove the case based on the inclusion of a "sham defendant," but the court agreed with Mr. Feghali's briefing which argued that the individual defendant, who was alleged to have harassed the Plaintiffs under FEHA, was a proper defendant.

(h) Mr. Feghali has been the lead counsel, or co-lead counsel, in individual cases that settled for $850,000.00, $375,000.00, and $250,000.00. In addition to the foregoing, Mr. Feghali has resolved or assisted in the resolution of approximately 100 cases which has resulted in millions of dollars of unpaid wages being returned to low-wage employees.

(i) Mr. Feghali was part of a team that prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of Hernandez v. CR Laurence, Inc., et al. (No. 20STCV32372), which was granted, in part, and denied, in part, in February 2024.

57. Since June 2018, Mr. Feghali's practice has shifted to almost exclusively representing employees in wage-and-hour class and representative actions. His fee has been approved by Courts throughout the state. He has participated as lead, or co-lead counsel, in the litigation and resolution of over 100 wage-and-hour class actions, including obtaining preliminary and final approval of settlements. A selection of settled cases wherein Mr. Feghali served as lead or co-lead class counsel includes the following: *Barahona v. Methodist Hosp. of Cal*. (No. 20STCV09876) ($5,000,000); *Stanley Black & Decker Wage and*

Hour Cases (No. JCCP5218) ($3,500,000); *Vazquez v. St. Mar 2.0 Inc.* (No. 37-2021-00042702-CU-OE-CTL) ($2,250,000); *Duncan v. Infineon Technologies Americas Corp*. (No. 21STCV16872) ($2,500,000); *Aquino v. Coast King Packing, LLC* (No. 21CV002448) ($2,300,000); *Martinez, et al. v. Curative LLC* (No. 21STCV20778) ($1,500,000); *Calderon v. Installed Building Products* (No. 37-2021-00035844-CU-OE-CTL) ($1,500,000); *Majdoub v. Argent Hotel Mgmt.* (No. CGC-20-582921) ($1,800,000); *Fuentes v. Covid Clinic, Inc*. (No. CIVSB2106806) ($1,526,317.57); *Rahman, et al. v. Gate Gourmet, Inc*. (No. 3:20-cv-03047) ($3,850,000); *Pagoulatos v. Coast Hills Credit Union* (No. 20CV02801) ($1,100,000); *Hammers v. Redwood Oil Co., Inc*. (No. SCV-269625) ($1,180,000); *Cuadras v. R.C. Wendt Painting, Inc*. (No. BC705964) ($1,400,000); *Zaragoza v. The Roman Catholic Bishop of Fresno* (No. 22CV-00282) ($1,500,000); *Garcia v. San Jose Water Co.* (22CV396328) ($1,200,000); *Garcia v. Tri-Valley Plastering, Inc*. (No. 22CECG00591) ($1,250,000); *Garcia v. Tapia Enter., Inc*. ($2,137,651 for 507 class members); *Cha v. Center Point, Inc*. (No. CIV2102081) ($1,000,000); *Sison v. Cha Hollywood Med. Ctr., L.P*. (No. BC644129) (2,137 class members); *Lagos v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Corp.* (No. BC682972) ($750,000 for 79 class members); and *Montoya v. Golden 1 Credit Union* (No. 34-2018-00228252) ($1,250,000).

S. PHILLIP SONG'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

58. S. Phillip Song is a Senior Attorney at my office. He received his undergraduate degree in 2006 from the University of Houston, graduating cum laude with a Communications B.A. and minor in Accounting. Mr. Song earned his Juris Doctor degree in 2011 from the University of Houston Law Center. Mr. Song has been admitted to practice law since 2013 (Texas). Mr. Song is presently admitted to practice in all state courts of California (admitted in 2019), and before all federal district courts in California.

59. The focus of Mr. Song's practice is currently on class actions, wage-and-hour law, and employment law. Mr. Song has worked on numerous class action cases and representative actions that have been granted final approval, including *Paez et al. v. C&R Restaurant Group*, LP, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-103181-SDS; *Baker v. Central Coast Home Health, Inc*., San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV-0219; *Martinez v. Community Playgrounds, Inc*., Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS53879; *Duval v. Pacific States*

Petroleum, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2018-00231934; *Flores v. Wilmar Oils & Fats (Stockton)*, LLC, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2018-0012758; G*arcia v. Continental Intermodal Group LP dba CIG Logistics*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-19-102776; *Tourchette adv. Finelite, Inc*., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19022885; *Touch v. Presidio Components, Inc*., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-20-101005; *Johnston v. Environmental Logistics, Inc*., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-100865-DRL; *Lewis v. Environmental Waste Minimization, Inc*., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-19-102248-SDS; *Priess v. Fiore Management LLC dba Canndescent*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-20-100930; *Alcantar v. Bay Equity LLC, Marin County Superior Court*, Case No. CIV1903376; *Spier v. Gibbs International, Inc*., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-19-101774-DRL; *Borghi v. Goldco Direct LLC dba Goldco Precious Metals*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 56-2019-00533053-CU-OE-VTA; *Williams v. Aetna, Inc., et al*., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19004083; *Singh v. Ryzen*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19039158; *Hoshaw v. Sutherland Healthcare*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV33165; *Hart v. Zazzle, Inc*., San Mateo County Superior, Court Case No. 20-CIV-01321; *Stacy v. Branded Group, Inc*. Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-21- 100443-BCB; *Angeles v. iKrusher, Inc*., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. MSC20-01312, *Zuniga v. Central Valley Concrete, Inc*., Merced County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV-00490; *Gomez v. IHI Power Services Corp*., Merced County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV-02657; *Martinez v. N.A.F.T.A Distributors*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1938970; *Bandril v. Plastikon Industries*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19038227; *Williams v. National Construction Rentals, Inc*., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20075904; *Pho v. Kruger Foods, Inc*., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2020-0002099; *Collins v. Mobile Medical Examination Services, LLC dba MEDXM*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01130693-CU-OE-CXC; *McNeil v. Kik International, LLC, et al*., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1915438 (Consolidated with Case No. CIVDS2023661); *Weber* *v. Sunrise Medical (US) LLC*, Merced County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV-01461 (Consolidated with Case No. 20CV-01707); F*lores v. Rivermaid Trading Company*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2020-0008623; *Guzman v. Bentley Mills, Inc*., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20PSCV00789; and *Ferrara v. South Coast Winery, Inc*., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2101920 (Consolidated with Case Nos. CVRI2102449 and MCC2001498).

60. Mr. Song is currently handling multiple class action and PAGA matters. Mr. Song's current billing rate is $775.00 per hour, which is his usual hourly rate in wage and hour litigations. Based on Mr. Song's 14 years of experience, his Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.53% adjustment is $1,044.78 per hour ($1,019 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.53% x $1,019)). (*See* Ex. 6.) As compared to the Laffey Matrix rate and when considering his experience, Mr. Song's billing rate of $775.00 per hour is reasonable.

MORGAN W. SIMPSON'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

61. Morgan W. Simpson is an Associate Attorney at my office. He graduated from the University of South Carolina – Columbia in 2016 with a Bachelor of Arts in Journalism, *magna cum laude*. Mr. Simpson attended the University of Southern California Gould of School of Law and graduated in 2020. Mr. Simpson was admitted to the California State Bar as an attorney in June 2021. Mr. Simpson began practicing Plaintiff-side wage and hour class and representative actions in July 2024 when he joined Moon Law Group, PC. Mr. Simpson has served as a handling attorney on the following matters that successfully settled and are in the process of obtaining or have obtained preliminary or final approval: *Ocampo v. DNA Motor, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 23STCV31444; *Luna v. Realstone, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 24STCV16233; *Gutierrez v. Allegion Access Technologies, LLC*, San Bernardino County Case No. CIVSB2406590; *Gutierrez v. Patton Sales Corp.*, Los Angeles County Case No. 24STCV16019; *Cortez v. Newly Weds Foods, LLC, et al.*, Stanislaus County Superior Court No. CV-24-006949; *Velo v. Chicken Choice, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Case No. 24CV441906; *Stamm v. Pacific Clay Products, Inc.,* et al., Los Angeles County Case No. 24STCV04369; *Merino v. Gourmet Mushrooms, Inc.*, Sonoma County Case No. 24CV03847; *Calderon v. B-Per Electronic,*

Inc., Orange County Case No. 30-2024-01409795-CU-OE-CXC; *Luna v. 20-20 Mobile Corp.*, Riverside County Case No. CVRI2403706; *Nichols v. Southern California West Electric, Inc.*, Riverside County Case No. CVRI2403790; *Sandate v. Arcadia Chait Company, Inc.*, Orange County Case No. 30-2024-01421720-CU-OE-CXC. Mr. Simpson's current billing rate is $600.00 per hour, which is his usual hourly rate in wage and hour litigations. Based on Mr. Simpson's nearly 6 years of experience, his Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.53% adjustment is $640.81 per hour ($625 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.53% x $625)). (*See* Ex. 6.) As compared to the Laffey Matrix rate and when considering his experience, Mr. Simpson's billing rate of $600.00 per hour is reasonable.

CLASS COUNSEL'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

62. As demonstrated by the foregoing, my office is qualified to handle this litigation because we are experienced in litigating Labor Code and Wage Order violations in individual, class, and representative actions. The attorneys at my office have been appointed as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous wage-and-hour class and/or PAGA actions in state and federal courts by way of motion for settlement approval. Including myself, Moon Law Group, PC is comprised of approximately 35 attorneys, all of whom are actively and continuously practicing employment litigation, representing almost entirely employee-plaintiffs, in both individual and class and/or PAGA actions, in this Superior Court and other Superior Courts throughout the State, in the Courts of Appeal, and in various federal courts. The attorneys at my firm have a high level of skill and knowledge in wage-and-hour class actions, PAGA representative actions, and labor and employment law generally, the substantiative (state and federal) and procedural law of which is frequently evolving.

63. Moon Law Group, PC has been engaged in the practice of employment and labor law for over a decade, and presently focuses exclusively on plaintiffs' employment law. The firm and its lawyers have tried both bench and jury trials (representing both plaintiffs and defendants) relating to employment matters. As noted above, Moon Law Group, PC has been appointed lead or co-lead class counsel in federal and state courts in California. Also, the firm and its lawyers have successfully settled hundreds of cases during that time, including wage-and-hour class and/or PAGA actions.

64. The foregoing experience of myself and other attorneys of Moon Law Group, PC is helpful in assessing the reasonableness of settlements, such as the one at issue here, and from this experience we concluded that this litigation could not have been settled on better terms than provided under the Settlement.

65. I respectfully submit that the attorneys of Moon Law Group, PC, myself included, are well suited to act as Class Counsel in this action, and we have, and will continue to, vigorously represent the interests of the Class. To my knowledge, we do not have any conflicts of interest with Plaintiff, other Class Members, or the proposed Administrator, and we are not related to Plaintiff. We respectfully request to be appointed as Class Counsel, for settlement purposes.

THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS IS REASONABLE

66. The Settlement provides for attorneys' fees payable to Class Counsel in an amount not more than $95,000.00 (representing 33.33% of the GSA) and litigation costs up to $20,000.00. (Settlement, ¶ 3.2.2.) The proposed award of attorneys' fees can be justified under either the lodestar method or the percentage/common-fund recovery method. however, we base the proposed fees award on the percentage method, as many of the entries in the time records will have to be redacted to preserve attorney-client and attorney work product privileges.

67. I am informed and believe that the fees and costs provision in the Settlement is reasonable. The fee percentage requested is less than that charged by my office for most employment cases. Moreover, my office invested significant time and resources into the case, with payment deferred to the end of the case, and then, of course, contingent on the outcome.

68. It is further estimated that my office will need to expend at least another 50 to 100 hours to monitor the administration process leading up to the final approval, prepare for final approval, and oversee distribution to the Class following final approval. My office also bears the risk of taking whatever actions are necessary should Defendants fail to pay.

69. The risk to my office has been very significant, particularly if we would not be successful in pursuing this class action. In such instance, we would have been left with no compensation for all the time taken in litigating this case due to the contingency fee arrangement. Indeed, I have taken on a number of class action cases that have resulted in thousands of attorney hours being expended and ultimately having the

defendant company going bankrupt during litigation. The contingent risk in these types of cases is very real and occurs regularly. Furthermore, we were precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases which could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain.

70. Because most individuals cannot afford to pay for representation in litigation on an hourly basis, Moon Law Group, PC represents virtually all its employment law clients on a contingency fee basis, including Plaintiff in this matter. Pursuant to this arrangement, we are not compensated for our time unless we prevail at trial or successfully settle our clients' cases. Because Moon Law Group, PC is taking the risk that we will not be reimbursed for our time unless our client settles or wins his or her case, we cannot afford to represent an individual employee on a contingency basis if, at the end of our representation, all we are to receive is our regular hourly rate for services. It is essential that we recover more than our regular hourly rate when we win if we are to remain in practice so as to be able to continue representing other individuals in civil rights employment disputes.

71. As of the drafting of this motion, my office has incurred $18,111.88 in expenses litigating this action, and we anticipate accruing additional costs up to final approval. These expenses were reasonably necessary to the litigation and were actually incurred by my office. Moreover, because total litigation costs are below the maximum amount allowed under the Settlement, the difference will revert to Participating Class Members. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.2.) Therefore, our costs should be reimbursed in full.

72. My office invested significant time and resources into the case, with payment deferred to the end of the case, and then, of course, contingent on the outcome. My office's efforts have included, and will include following preliminary and final approval, without limitation, the following:

(a) Numerous interviews with Plaintiff and review of documents provided by him;

(b) Legal research and investigation regarding Defendants' business and employment practices at numerous points in the litigation;

(c) Preparation and submission of Plaintiff's PAGA notice;

(d) Preparation, finalization, and filing of multiple drafts of the original class action complaint and subsequent first amended complaint;

(e) Extensive "meet and confer" correspondence and discussions with Defense Counsel regarding mediation and to obtain relevant documents and information through informal discovery;

(f) Research and preparation of Plaintiff's mediation brief;

(g) Analysis of the discovery production and preparation of a damages model with the aid of a statistics expert;

(h) Attendance and active participation at a full day of mediation;

(i) Drafting, negotiating, and reviewing multiple drafts of the Settlement and Class Notice;

(j) Preparation of the motion for preliminary approval and the accompanying filings;

(k) Anticipated preparation for and attendance at the preliminary approval hearing;

(l) Anticipated conferring with Defense Counsel and the Administrator regarding the Class Notice mailing, Class responses, and preliminary and final calculations;

(m) Anticipated preparation, finalization, filing, and service of a motion for final approval and accompanying filings;

(n) Anticipated preparation for and anticipated attendance at the final approval hearing, and then monitoring of the distribution of funds following final approval; and

(o) Anticipated responding to Class Member inquiries and communicating with Plaintiff regarding the case.

73. Through the efforts of my office and Plaintiff in this case, a fair and reasonable joint resolution has been reached that includes a gross, non-reversionary payment by Defendants of *no less than* $285,000.00 to compensate Class Members for the alleged unlawful wage-and-hour practices. I am informed and believe that, without the efforts of my office or Plaintiff, the Labor Code and Wage Order violations alleged in the Operative Complaint would have gone completely unremedied.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 5, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

____

Kane Moon