BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
Keaton Mendoza (SBN 321172)
kmendoza@tomorrowlaw.com
Collier T. Litel (SBN 353136)
clitel@tomorrowlaw.com
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, SONIA YANET DE LA BARRA
and on behalf of all others similarly situated and aggrieved

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

SONIA YANET DE LA BARRA, an individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAY-LEE FOODS INC., a California Stock Corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 25STCV07247

[Assigned for all purposes to Honorable Elaine Lu in Dept. 9]

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT AND PROVISIONAL CLASS CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES ONLY; DECLARATIONS OF KEATON MENDOZA, DAVID D. BIBIYAN, SONIA YANET DE LA BARRA, AND SEAN HARTRANFT IN SUPPORT THEREOF

HEARING INFORMATION:

DATE: December 28, 2026
TIME: 8:30 a.m.
DEPT: 9

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on December 28, 2026, or as soon thereafter as she may be heard in Department 9 of the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Spring Street Courthouse, plaintiff Sonia Yanet De la Barra ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated and aggrieved, will and hereby does move for this Court for entry of an Order:

1. Preliminarily certifying the following settlement class ("Settlement Class," "Settlement Class Members" or "Class Members") for the purpose of settlement only: all current and former non-exempt employees of defendant Day-Lee Foods, Inc. ("Defendant") in the State of California during the period from September 16, 2021 through March 21, 2026 ("Class Period").

2. Preliminarily approving Plaintiff as Class Representative.

3. Preliminarily approving David D. Bibiyan and Sarah Cohen of Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., as Class Counsel.

4. Preliminarily approving the settlement claims under the terms set forth in the Class and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement").

5. Preliminarily approving payment of the Gross Settlement Amount of $1,200,000.00, which is subject to escalation pursuant to the Settlement Agreement.

6. Approving the form and content of the Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement and Date for Final Approval Hearing ("Class Notice") submitted herewith.

7. Appointing Apex Class Action Administration ("Apex") to administer the Settlement, including distribution of the Class Notice, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

8. Preliminarily approving the payment not to exceed $10,990.00 for settlement administration to Apex from the Gross Settlement Amount.

9. Preliminarily approving a service award of not more than $10,000.00 to Plaintiff, in consideration for Plaintiff's extensive efforts in prosecuting this case.

10. Preliminarily approving payment of reasonable attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the amount of not more than one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount which, unless escalated pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, amounts to $400,000.00.

11. Preliminarily approving reimbursement of Class Counsel's costs in an amount, according to proof, not to exceed $40,000.00.

12. Preliminarily approving PAGA penalties in the amount of $100,000.00, sixty-five percent (65%) or $65,000.00 of which will be paid to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") out of the Gross Settlement Amount, and thirty-five percent (35%) or $35,000.00 of which will be distributed to "Aggrieved Employees," defined as all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant in the State of California during the period from March 12, 2024 through March 21, 2026 ("PAGA Period").

13. Entering an Order preliminarily approving the Settlement consistent with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

Good cause exists for granting this Motion in that the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate.

This Motion will be based on this Notice of Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed herewith, the Declarations of Keaton Mendoza, David D. Bibiyan, Sonia Yanet De La Barra, and Sean Hartranft, and exhibits attached thereto, arguments of counsel and upon such other materials contained in the file and pleadings of this action.

Dated: November 20, 2026

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Keaton D. Mendoza

KEATON MENDOZA
COLLIER LITEL

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated and aggrieved

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Sonia Yanet De La Barra ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated and aggrieved, hereby applies for preliminary approval of the Class and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement," "Agreement" or "Settlement Agreement") upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, attached to the Declaration of Keaton Mendoza as Exhibit "1."

On February 6, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and served on defendant Day-Lee Foods, Inc. ("Defendant") a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 ("PAGA"), stating that she intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties on behalf of other non-exempt employees for various Labor Code violations ("PAGA Notice"). On March 12, 2025, Plaintiff filed an Amended PAGA Notice further specifying the facts and theories of the alleged violations ("Amended PAGA Notice"). True and correct copies of the PAGA Notice and Amended PAGA Notice are attached to the Declaration of Keaton Mendoza as Exhibit "2."

On March 12, 2025, Plaintiff commenced this action by filing a complaint against Defendant for: failure to pay overtime wages; failure to pay minimum wages; failure to provide meal periods; failure to provide rest periods; waiting time penalties; wage statement violations; failure to timely pay wages; failure to indemnify; failure to pay vested vacation; and unfair competition ("Action").

On March 19, 2026, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint in the Action adding a cause of action for civil penalties under PAGA. The Amended Complaint is the operative complaint in the Action (the "Operative Complaint").

Thereafter, the Parties agreed to exchange informal discovery and attend mediation. Prior to mediation Plaintiff obtained, through informal discovery: (a) time and payroll records for all putative Class Members through mediation; (b) datapoints for the putative class and employees eligible for PAGA penalties; (c) relevant policy documents; and (d) all documents pertaining to Plaintiff available to Defendant.

On January 21, 2026, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Gig Kyriacou. The mediation was successful, and the Parties agreed to globally resolve all class and PAGA claims in the Action.

Class Counsel have conducted significant investigation of the law and facts relating to the claims asserted in the Action and the PAGA Notice, and have concluded that the Settlement set forth herein is fair, reasonable, adequate and in the best interests of the Settlement Class, taking into account the sharply contested issues involved, the expense and time necessary to litigate the Action through trial and any appeals, the risks and costs of further litigation of the Action, the risk of an adverse outcome, the uncertainties of complex litigation, the information learned through discovery regarding Plaintiff's allegations, and the substantial benefits to be received by Settlement Class Members.

II. THE SETTLEMENT

Subject to Court approval pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, rule 3.679, *et seq*., the Parties have agreed to settle the Action by agreement upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth in the Settlement Agreement, a copy of which is attached to the Declaration of Keaton Mendoza as Exhibit "1" thereto. A summary of the terms of the settlement is as follows:

Defendant will stipulate, for purpose of the Settlement only, as follows:

- Certification of a class ("Settlement Class," "Settlement Class Members" or "Class Members") defined as: all current and former non-exempt employees of defendant Day-Lee Foods, Inc. ("Defendant") in the State of California during the period from September 16, 2021 through March 21, 2026 ("Class Period").
- Defendant will pay $1,200,000.00 ("Gross Settlement Amount") to resolve the matter.
- Based on its records, Defendant estimates that, as of January 2026, (1) there are approximately 717 Class Members who worked approximately 58,082 Workweeks during the Class Period, and (2) there are approximately 498 Aggrieved Employees who worked approximately 14,943 Pay Periods during the PAGA Period. If the number of Workweeks during the Class Period is more than 10% greater than these figures,

Defendant agrees to either, at Defendant's option, end the Class Period on the date number of workweeks reaches 10% more than 58,082, or, increase the Gross Settlement Sum on a proportional basis that reflects the percentage over 10%. The Parties agree that after the agreed upon Class Period end date of March 21, 2026, Defendant will confirm the total workweek count through March 21, 2026 and inform Plaintiff of whether the Escalator Clause has been triggered, and if so, whether Defendant chooses to increase the Settlement Sum or roll back the Class Period end date. Defendant will make this decision no later than 30 days following the full execution of the Agreement.

- Defendant will pay the employer's share of taxes separate and apart from the Gross Settlement Amount.
- This is a non-reversionary settlement.
- Class Members will be paid their *pro rata* share of the class action settlement based on the total number of Workweeks[1] worked during the Class Period.
- The Settlement Administration costs, estimated not to exceed $10,990.00, will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.
- Class Counsel, comprised of David D. Bibiyan and Sarah Cohen of Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., may apply for, and Defendant will not oppose, attorneys' fees of not more than one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which, unless escalated pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, amounts to $400,000.00, and actual costs, not to exceed $40,000.00, all of which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.
- Class Counsel hereby apply for, and Defendant will not oppose, a service award of not more than $10,000.00 to Plaintiff, which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.
- "Aggrieved Employees" means all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant in the State of California during the period from March 12, 2024 through March 21, 2026.

[1] "Workweek" means any workweek from Sunday to Saturday in which a Class Member worked any amount of regular time as reflected in Defendant's pay and time records, during the Class Period.

- Defendant has agreed to pay $100,000.00, sixty-five percent (65%) or $65,000.00 of which will be paid to the LWDA out of the Gross Settlement Amount, and thirty-five percent (35%) or $35,000.00 of which will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees.
- Class Members' and Aggrieved Employees' checks shall remain valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the date of their issuance. Thereafter, checks for such payments shall be canceled and funds associated with such checks shall be transmitted to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member and Aggrieved Employee.

III. THE TWO-STEP APPROVAL PROCESS AND THE PRESUMPTION OF FAIRNESS

Any settlement of class litigation must be reviewed and approved by the Court. (*See* Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.769). This is done in two steps: (1) an early (preliminary) review by the trial court; and (2) a final review after notice has been distributed to the class members for their comment or objections. (*See id.*). Courts presume the absence of fraud or collusion in the negotiation of a settlement unless evidence to the contrary is offered. In short, there is a presumption that the negotiations were conducted in good faith. (Newberg on Class Actions, § 11.51; *In re Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation* (N.D. Cal. May 17, 2017) No. 16-cv-00295, 2017 WL 2214655, quoting *United States v. Oregon* (9th Cir. 1990) 913 F.2d 576, 580.) Here, the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and negotiations were conducted in good faith with the aid of a well-respected and neutral mediator.

IV. SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS

A notice of settlement of a class action "must contain an explanation of the proposed settlement and procedures for class members to follow in filing written objections to it and in arranging to appear at the settlement hearing and state any objections to the proposed settlement." (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.769, subd. (f).)

Attached to the Declaration of Keaton Mendoza as Exhibit "1" thereto is the Settlement Agreement between the Parties. Attached to the Settlement Agreement as internal Exhibit "A" is the

proposed Class Notice to be distributed to Class Members in English and Spanish. The proposed Class Notice satisfies these requirements.

The Parties respectfully request that this Court approve the above-referenced Class Notice and dissemination of the Class Notice to the Class Members, consistent with the manner and timing as set forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Parties have agreed to use Apex Class Action Administrators ("Apex"), an experienced Settlement Administrator, to administer the Settlement.

V. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE BASED UPON OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE

A. The Settlement was Negotiated at Arm's-Length and is not Collusive

The Settlement that has been reached, subject to this Court's approval, is a product of substantial efforts by the Parties and their counsel. The Settlement was reached after extensive factual and legal investigation and research; the exchange of informal discovery; substantial negotiation regarding the scope of informal discovery; exchange of documents and information that included review of time and pay records and analysis thereof with the aid of Plaintiff and expert consultants; analysis of shifts and Workweeks worked by Class Members in the Class Period, analysis of the number of pay periods and number of Aggrieved Employees in the PAGA Period for calculating PAGA penalties, number of Class Members eligible for wage statement penalties and waiting time penalties; an analysis of Plaintiff's employment records; extensive correspondence and communication between counsel; a review of pleadings, evidence and rulings in similar actions litigated elsewhere in the state; a review of similar cases in the same industry elsewhere in the country; and preparation for and attendance at a full-day mediation, followed by further discussions and coordination to finalize the terms and conditions of the general settlement parameters agreed to by the Parties.

While Class Counsel believes in the chance of success of certifying the claims, Class Counsel recognized the potential risk, expense and complexity posed by further litigation. Moreover, litigating Plaintiff's claims in this litigation—claims that involve approximately 726 Class Members during the Class Period—would require substantial preparation and discovery, and ultimately would involve the deposition and presentation of numerous more witnesses (including

Class Members and expert witnesses), as well as the consideration, preparation and analysis of expert reports. Therefore, should litigation have progressed any further, there would have been significant expense incurred by each side (above and beyond the expense already incurred).

B. The Settlement Amount is Well Within the Range of Reasonableness

The settlement amount reached in this case provides significant recovery to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, and easily falls within the range of reasonableness. Based on documents and information provided by Defendant, Class Counsel understand there are 726 Class Members and no more than 58,082 Workweeks during the Class Period.

1. Recovery of Damages for Failure to Pay Wages for All Time Worked

Class Counsel theorized, based on Plaintiff's narrative evidence and documents produced by Defendant, that Defendant failed to pay all wages due to Class Members because Defendant required Class Members to clock in early to complete tasks, meet production deadlines, cleaning work stations, and waiting in line to clock in, all without pay. One theory advanced by Class Counsel alleged, based on Plaintiff's narrative evidence, that Class Members worked off-the-clock for approximately five (5) minutes each shift throughout the Class Period, without pay. Class Counsel understand, based on time and payroll records produced by Defendant and analysis thereof by expert data consultants retained by Class Counsel, that there were approximately 290,035 shifts during the Class Period, 87.3% of which were over eight (8) hours in length, and Class Members' average hourly rate of pay of $20.56. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel resulted in Defendant's exposure for unpaid off-the-clock work in an approximate amount of **$773,837** ([290,035 shifts x 0.873 shifts over eight hours x 0.083 hour x $20.56 x 1.5 overtime rate] + [290,035 shifts x 0.127 shifts under eight hours x 0.083 hour x $20.56 x 2 in liquidated damages]).

Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendant makes the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendant contends that its policies specifically prohibit off-the-clock work. Defendant contends that it did not require Class Members to work off-the-clock, they were paid for all time suffered or permitted to work. Defendant contends that any allegations that Class Members were required to be under Defendant's control

off-the-clock would necessitate an individualized inquiry into when and why, making this claim not subject to class treatment and any trial in this litigation unmanageable. Thus, Defendant contends that no damages can be recovered here, and, even if, *arguendo*, they could, an estimate of five (5) minutes of unpaid work off-the-clock of Class Members for *every single shift* during the Class Period is a wild exaggeration of time spent working off-the-clock if *any* such time was spent.

2. Recovery of Damages for Non-Compliant Meal Periods

Class Counsel theorized that Defendant's meal period policies practices throughout the Class Period were non-compliant. Class Counsel theorized that Defendant's policies were non-compliant because the data indicated meal periods were late, many were missing, without any accompanying meal period waiver, and many meal periods were on duty. Class Counsel theorized that meal periods were on duty because Class Members were not allowed to leave the premises per Defendant's policies. Class Counsel also theorized that meal periods were interrupted by managers without allowing Class Members to clock in.

Class Counsel understand from Defendant's records, and analyzed by expert data consultants, that there are 36,220 unique facial meal period violations (*i.e.* meal periods that are missed, short, or late) in the Class Period through mediation. Class Counsel understand that Defendant paid a small amount of meal period premiums during the Class period. Thus, one theory advanced by Class Counsel, based solely on facial violations, resulted in Defendant's maximum exposure for non-compliant meal periods in an amount of **$743,552** [(36,220 meal period violations – 55 meal period premiums) x $20.56/hour].

Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendant makes the following defenses in connection with this claim. Defendant argued that it had compliant meal period policies and practices and that its policy requires their employees to take timely and full meal periods. Defendant argued that Class Members took timely and full meal periods or received the required meal period premium for each instance of meal period violations. Defendant further contends that any instance of a Class Member failing to take a compliant meal period was voluntary, in violation of its meal period policy, would necessitate an individualized inquiry and would not

lend itself to a manageable trial. Thus, Defendant contends that *no* monies are owed for this account but, even if any amounts were due, the amount calculated by Class Counsel is excessive.

3. Recovery of Damages for Non-Compliant Rest Periods

Class Counsel theorized, based on documents and information produced by Defendant and Plaintiff's narrative evidence, that Defendant's rest period policies and practices throughout the Class Period were non-compliant. Class Counsel theorized, similar to non-compliant meal periods, Class Members were not allowed to leave the premises during rest periods and rest periods were interrupted. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel at mediation resulted in, assuming a 40% violation rate, Defendant's exposure for failure to provide compliant rest periods in a conservative amount of **$2,378,126** (289,169 shifts x 0.40 violation rate x $20.56/hour).

Class Counsel understand that Defendant makes the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendant argued that it had compliant rest break policies and practices and that its policy requires their employees to take timely and full rest periods. Defendant argued that Class Members took timely and full rest periods. Defendant further contends that any instance of a Class Member failing to take a compliant rest break was voluntary and therefore would necessitate an individualized inquiry and would not lend itself to a manageable trial. Defendant also argued that Class Members were provided a reasonable opportunity to take uninterrupted rest breaks and the employer is not required to "police" such rest breaks. Thus, Defendant contends that *no* monies are owed for this account but, even if any amounts were due, the amount calculated by Class Counsel is excessive.

4. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses and Pay Vested Vacation

Class Counsel initially theorized that Defendant failed to reimburse Class Members for necessary business expenses and fail to pay vested vacation. However, after diligent investigation and discovery, Class Counsel did not attribute significant value to this claim for purposes of this Settlement. Rather, the driving force behind the Settlement were the other claims analyzed and valued in this Motion.

///

///

5. Wage Statement Violations

Class Counsel theorized that Class Members are entitled to recover penalties for Defendant's alleged failure to issue compliant wage statements under Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), for the derivative impact of the failure to pay all wages owed on providing accurate information on wage statements. Specifically, Class Counsel theorized that penalties are owed under Labor Code section 226 due to, at minimum, Defendant's failure to pay premium wages. A non-exempt employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars ($50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars ($100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period. Class Counsel understand from the data provided by Defendant that there were 10,303 pay periods during the relevant statutory time period for Class Members. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel at mediation, based on the penalty of fifty dollars ($50) for each violation, resulted in Defendant's exposure for wage statement violations for Class Members in the approximate amount of **$515,150** (10,303 pay periods x $50/pay period).

Class Counsel understand that Defendant makes the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendant contends that the wage statements issued to the employees fully complied with Labor Code section 226. Defendant contends that because it believes no wages are unpaid that, thus, there can be no derivative penalties. However, Class Counsel also understand the risks inherent in this claim if the above claims were not certified. Class Counsel also had to factor in, and did factor in, the risk that the Court would find there was no injury to Class Members even if the wage statements were inaccurate or that Defendant's conduct was not intentional, both of which are requirements of Labor Code section 226 before penalties can issue. Class Counsel also note that the calculation used does not take into account the fact that all Class Members did not work all pay periods and, therefore, Class Counsels' calculation does not take into account the maximum penalty of $4,000 in Plaintiff's exposure model used at mediation.

///

///

6. Waiting Time Penalties

Pursuant to Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 203, each employee in the relevant statutory period (*i.e.*, three years before the filing of the initial Complaint) is entitled to 30 days' worth of wages as waiting time penalty for not being paid all wages due upon separation from employment. Class Counsel theorized at mediation, based on relevant documents provided by Defendant, that, under Labor Code section 203, Defendant is liable to pay each Class Member, who was terminated during the relevant statutory period, a full 30-day worth of wages as waiting time penalty for failure to pay compensation in lieu of compliant meal and rest periods, and failure to timely pay all wages due at the time of termination or resignation. Based on relevant documents provided by Defendant, there were approximately 277 Class Members who were terminated or resigned during the relevant statutory period. Thus, one calculation performed at mediation by Class Counsel resulted in **Defendant's exposure for waiting time penalties to be approximately $1,366,829** (277 separated Class Members x $20.56/hour x 8 hours x 30 days).

Class Counsel understand that Defendant contends that there is no credence to Plaintiff's off-the-clock theory and that, thus, no waiting time penalties are owed based on that theory. Finally, Defendant contends that its actions were not "willful" and that, thus, waiting time penalties cannot be awarded. Thus, Defendant argued that no waiting time penalties are owed.

7. PAGA Penalties

Class Counsel understand from the time and payroll data provided by Defendant that there are approximately 498 Aggrieved Employees who collectively worked 58,082 pay periods in the PAGA Period. Plaintiff's claims in the Action under PAGA are substantially similar to those described herein. PAGA penalties include penalties for initial violations and subsequent violations. Defendant contends that only initial violation rates may be used instead of the subsequent violation rates initially used by Class Counsel. With this in mind and because Class Counsel through investigation and discovery did not come to the conclusion that Defendant at any time was notified by any governmental entity that they violated any Labor Code sections presented in the PAGA Notice and PAGA claims, Class Counsel adjusted the exposure model for Defendant to include only initial violation rates.

While Class Counsel are informed and believe that reasonable minds differ with regard to calculation of PAGA penalties, Class Counsel believe it is reasonable to calculate Defendant's maximum exposure in PAGA penalties as follows:

a. Overtime Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations, and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $2,904,100 (58,082 pay periods x $50).

b. Minimum Wage Violations: Labor Code section 1197.1 prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $250 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $5,808,200 (58,082 pay periods x $100).

c. Meal Period Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $2,904,100 (58,082 pay periods x $50).

d. Rest Period Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $2,904,100 (58,082 pay periods x $50).

e. Wage Statement Violations: According to *Gunther v. Alaska Airlines, Inc.* (2021) 287 Cal.Rptr.3d 229, in this instance, Labor Code section 2699 would be the appropriate penalty for wage statement violations that are inaccurate, which prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $200 for each subsequent violation (*Id.* at 247-248). Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $5,808,200 (58,082 pay periods x $100).

f. Waiting Time Penalties: Labor Code section 2699 prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $200 for each subsequent violation. Because this violation is merited only at separation of employment, a 100% violation rate would likely include just one violation per employee. The data produced by Defendant indicate that there were 148 Aggrieved Employees whose employment was separated during the PAGA Period. This amounts to a maximum exposure of $14,800 (148 Aggrieved Employees x $100).

g. Conclusion: In sum, Class Counsel calculated Defendant's total maximum exposure for PAGA violations if the Court were to find a 100% violation rate for every Aggrieved Employee every pay period and not exercise its discretion to reduce any of those penalties to be $20,343,500. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendant argued the following in connection with this claim: Defendant contends that no PAGA penalties are likely to be awarded and, even if they were, the maximum exposure calculated by Class Counsel is vastly overstated. First, Defendant defends that PAGA penalties cannot and should not be stacked. Second, Defendant asserts that individualized issues predominate the PAGA claims, making the claims unmanageable for trial. Third, Defendant denies that a violation for each pay period can be established. Fourth, Defendant contends that a Court is unlikely to exercise its discretion to award civil penalties under PAGA where, as here, there is no conduct shown by Plaintiff that would show any Labor Code violation by Defendant is knowing and intentional. Defendant insists that this is especially true in this Action where class action damages are available to Class Members, rendering an award of PAGA penalties in addition to class action damages to be double recovery.

Class Counsel maintain that it is possible to recover the subsequent violation rate for penalties, that stacking is permissible, and that there is no manageability requirement under PAGA (citing *Estrada v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc.*). As such, Class Counsel believe a 90% discount of this claim to be reasonable, resulting in a valuation of **$2,034,350** as a reasonable estimate of the likelihood of what Plaintiff may recover at trial for PAGA penalties ($20,343,500 x .10). See also *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp*., 30 Cal.App.5th 504, 529 (2018) (upholding trial courts 90% reduction in maximum penalties, from $50 to $5 per initial violation).

8. Conclusion

When including derivative penalties, such as waiting time penalties, wage statement violations, and discretionary PAGA penalties, Class Counsel theorized Defendant's maximum exposure to be approximately **$7,811,844**. In all, Class Counsel obtained a Gross Settlement Amount of **$1,200,000.00**. Particularly in light of the risks involving obstacles to class certification, all issues and risks related to liability, the issues with manageability at trial, the discretionary nature of PAGA penalties, and considering the case law regarding fair, reasonable and adequate settlements, Class Counsel strongly believe that the settlement reached is fair, reasonable and adequate, and in the best interest of Class Members.

Moreover, $100,000.00 of the Gross Settlement Amount was attributed to PAGA penalties. This allocation was decided mutually by the Parties and the mutual decision was based on: (1) the fact that damages are available for the failure to pay wage claims while only penalties are available for the PAGA claims; (2) the risk that the Court may exercise its discretion to decline to stack PAGA penalties; (3) the risk that the Court may exercise its discretion to not award the full amount of PAGA penalties available; and (4) the risk that the Court may decline to award any PAGA penalties at all in light of the fact that damages are available for Class Members and it may find any further liability against Defendant unnecessarily punitive.

VII. THE PROPOSED ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS ARE REASONABLE

Class Counsel seeks an attorneys' fees award of not more than one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which, unless escalated pursuant to this Agreement, would amount to $400,000.00. Class Counsel also seeks reimbursement of costs not to exceed $40,000.00. The requested fees fall well within the historical range of attorney's fees awards under the common fund theory, which is generally from 25% to 50%. The requested fee is fair compensation for undertaking complex, risky, expensive and time-consuming litigation on a contingent fee basis. Thus, the Court should preliminarily approve the requested attorneys' fees and costs, which are justified by the results achieved, the complexity of the issues, the difficulty of the case and the great risks undertaken by Class Counsel. The requested attorneys' fees will not be opposed by Defendant and are well within established guidelines.

VIII. THE REQUESTED ENHANCEMENT AWARD TO THE NAMED PLAINTIFF AND CLASS REPRESENTATIVE IS REASONABLE

Plaintiff is entitled to enhanced award for her service as class representative, for answering extensive questions by Class Counsel, for being available and answering questions during mediation, for the risks in being the named plaintiff and for providing Defendant with a more expansive release of claims, including a waiver based upon California Civil Code section 1542, in exchange for the enhancement award. Defendant does not oppose the requested enhancement to Plaintiff. Plaintiff risked intrusive discovery and the payment of employer costs. In the experience of Class Counsel, the typical enhancement award in wage and hour class actions ranges from approximately $10,000.00 to $25,000.00, although some awards are higher. In contrast, Class Counsel seeks a limited enhancement of $10,000.00 to Plaintiff for her service.

IX. CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES

A. The Class should be Preliminarily Certified

In California, there are two certification prerequisites: (1) the existence of an "ascertainable class;" and (2) "a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented." (*Sotelo v. MediaNews Group, Inc.* (2012) 207 Cal.App.4th 639, 647.) To certify a class, the party advocating class treatment must demonstrate: (1) a numerous class; (2) predominant common questions of law or fact; (3) class representatives with claims or defenses typical of the class; and (4) class representatives who can adequately represent the class." (*Williams v. Sup. Ct.* (2013) 221 Cal.App.4th 1353, citing *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct.* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1021.) Each of the criteria for class certification is satisfied in this instance:

1. Ascertainability – "Ascertainability" is a due process requirement that ensures it is possible to decide who will be bound by the judgment (*res judica* effect). The determination is made by examining the class definition and the size of the class. Here, the Class Members definition (*i.e.*, all current and former non-exempt employees of defendant Day-Lee Foods, Inc. ("Defendant") in the State of California during the period from September 16, 2021 through March 21, 2026 ("Class Period")) is derived from the operative complaint, which complains of alleged violations of Labor Code sections that are chiefly and, in some instances, solely applicable

to non-exempt, hourly paid employees. There is no difficulty ascertaining who is a Class Member based on the above-described definition as it is readily apparent to all involved who is a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee who worked in California for Defendant during the Class Period based solely from Defendant's payroll records, which amounts to approximately 726 persons.

2. Numerosity – According to the California Supreme Court, a putative class is sufficiently numerous to achieve the numerosity requirement if their joinder is impracticable and thus substantial benefits accrue both to litigants and the courts if the action proceeds as a class action. (*Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429, 435, 446.) Numerosity is presumed satisfied if there are forty (40) putative class members. (*Miri v. Dillon* (E.D. MI 2013) 292 F.R.D. 454, 461.) However, as few as 10 class members has been found sufficient. (*See, e.g., Bowles v. Sup. Ct.* (1955) 44 Cal.2d 574.) Class Counsel understand from documents provided by Defendant that there are at least 726 Class Members. That is sufficiently numerous to establish the numerosity requirement.

3. Commonality – California law also requires that "questions of law or fact common to the class [be] substantially similar and predominate over the questions affecting the individual members." (*In re Steroid Hormone Product Cases* (2010) 181 Cal.App.4th 145, 153.)

This litigation is brought to resolve common issues that include whether Defendant failed to pay for all hours worked; whether Defendant provided full, timely and un-interrupted meal and rest periods; whether Class Members are entitled to premium pay for incomplete, untimely or interrupted meal or rest periods, among other claims as set forth above.

4. Typicality – Typicality requires only that the named plaintiff's interests in the action be significantly similar to those of other class members. (*Williams v. Sup. Ct.* (2013) 221 Cal.App.4th 1353, citing *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct.* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1021.) Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of other Class Members as Plaintiff: (1) was a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee like other Class Members; (2) complains of not being paid for all time under Defendant's control or suffered and/or permitted to work for Defendant; (3) did not receive full premium pay for meal periods that were not compliant with the Labor Code; (4) did not receive premium pay for rest periods that were not provided, among others as set forth above.

5. Adequacy of Representation - To maintain a class action, the representative

plaintiff must adequately protect the interests of the class. (*Williams v. Sup. Ct.* (2013) 221 Cal.App.4th 1353, citing *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct.* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1021.) Adequacy of representation consists of two components. First, there must be no disabling conflicts of interest between the class representatives and the class. Second, the class representative must be represented by counsel who are competent and experienced in the kind of litigation to be undertaken. (*See McGhee v. Bank of Am.* (1976) 60 Cal.App.3d 442, 450; *accord In re Juniper Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation* (N.D. Cal. 2009) 264 F.R.D. 584, 590.) Both criteria are met in this instance:

(i) No Disabling Conflict of Interest Exists Between the Class Representative and the Class

No conflicts, disabling or otherwise, exists between Plaintiff and Class Members because Plaintiff alleges to have been damaged by the same alleged conduct of Defendant (*i.e.*, Plaintiff was classified as non-exempt, hourly-paid employee, not paid premium pay, etc.) and thus has the incentive to fairly represent all Class Members' claims to achieve the maximum possible recovery.

(ii) Class Counsel are Experienced Class Action Attorneys

As set forth in the Declarations of Class Counsel, Class Counsel in this matter consist of experienced class action attorneys, have been appointed as class counsel in other class actions and have a successful "track record" in litigating class actions.

6. Superiority of Class Action - Also relevant to the Court's certification decision is whether a class action is the superior method of adjudication. (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct.* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1021.)

It deals with common issues that are most efficiently adjudicated together, as indicated above. Moreover, with at least 726 Class Members, presentation of all of them before this Court may be problematic, impractical, and burdensome. On the contrary, a class action allows claims of many individuals to be resolved at the same time, eliminates the possibility of repetitious litigation and affords small claimants with a method of obtaining redress for claims which otherwise would be too insufficient to warrant individual litigation.

7. Conclusion – Thus, because this class action meets all criteria for certification and a lesser standard of scrutiny applies when evaluating these criteria for settlement purposes, it should be certified for purposes of effectuating this settlement.

X. CONCLUSION

Therefore, the Parties request the Court grant preliminary approval of the proposed settlement.

Dated: November 20, 2026

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Keaton D. Mendoza

KEATON MENDOZA

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated and aggrieved