

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
Allen Feghali (SBN 301080)
Enzo Nabiev (SBN 332118)
Jason Kwak (SBN 360940)
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: enabiev@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: jkwak@moonlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Patrick Ejinaka

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF STANISLAUS**

PATRICK EJINAKA, individually, and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ELITE FAMILY SYSTEMS, a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CV-25-004886

CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION
AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

*[Filed with the Declaration of Kane Moon, the
Declaration of Plaintiff, the Declaration of
John Sarhadi, the Declaration of Sean
Hartranft, and [Proposed] Preliminary
Approval Order]*

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING:

Date: September 30, 2026

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Dept.: 21

Judge: Hon. John R. Mayne

Action Filed: May 20, 2025

Trial Date: Not set

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

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on September 30, 2026 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 21 of this
3 Court located at 6th Floor City Towers Courthouse, 801 10th Street, Modesto, California 95354
4 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, rule 3.769 *et seq.*,
5 Plaintiff Patrick Ejinaka (“Plaintiff”) will, and hereby does, move the Court for an order granting
6 preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement between Plaintiff and Defendant Elite
7 Family Systems. Specifically, Plaintiff moves the Court for an order:

- 8 1. Granting preliminary approval of the Joint Stipulation of Class and Representative Action
9 Settlement Agreement;
- 10 2. Certifying a Class, for settlement purposes only;
- 11 3. Approving the Class Notice and plan for its distribution;
- 12 4. Appointing Plaintiff as the Class Representative, for settlement purposes only;
- 13 5. Appointing Moon Law Group, PC as Class Counsel, for settlement purposes only;
- 14 6. Appointing APEX Class Action Administration as the Administrator; and
- 15 7. Scheduling a Final Approval Hearing no earlier than 120 days from the date of preliminary
16 approval.

17 The motion will be based upon this notice, the attached memorandum of points and authorities,
18 the supporting declarations and attachments thereto, the record and files in this action, and any other
19 evidence or argument that the Court may properly receive at or before the hearing.

20 As this Motion is unopposed, the Parties respectfully request relief from the page limit
21 requirement set by California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1113(d).

22 Respectfully submitted,

23 Dated: August 27, 2026

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

24 By: _____
25 Kane Moon
26 Allen Feghali
27 Enzo Nabiev
28 Jason Kwak
Attorneys for Plaintiff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2	TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
3	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
4	I. INTRODUCTION	1
5	II. SUMMARY OF THE LITIGATION AND SETTLEMENT.....	1
6	A. Plaintiff’s Claims and Procedural History	1
7	B. Discovery and Investigation	3
8	C. Settlement Negotiations and Notice of Settlement to the LWDA	4
9	D. Key Terms of the Proposed Settlement	4
10	III. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL	6
11	A. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, Adequate, and the Product of Investigation,	
12	Litigation, and Negotiation.....	7
13	1. The Settlement Is the Product of Discovery, Investigation, Informed and Non-	
14	Collusive Arm’s-Length Negotiations, and Realistic Claims Analysis	7
15	2. The Class Settlement Is Fair Considering the Parties’ Respective Positions and	
16	Significant Risks to Certification and Proof on the Merits	9
17	3. The PAGA Settlement Is Fair Considering the Parties’ Respective Positions	
18	and Significant Risks	10
19	4. Plaintiff’s Counsel Have Extensive Experience in Class and PAGA Action	
20	Litigation, Which Was Integral to Negotiating the Settlement	11
21	B. The Proposed Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Are Reasonable.....	12
22	1. Counsel Request a Fees Award Based On the “Common Fund” Method.....	12
23	2. The Requested Fee Award Is in Line with Typical Cases.....	13
24	3. This Matter Involves a “Fee-Shifting” Provision of the Labor Code	14
25	4. Counsel’s Experience, Reputation, and Ability Support the Fees Request.....	14
26	C. The Service Payment to Plaintiff Is Reasonable.....	14
27	IV. CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES IS WARRANTED.....	16
28	A. Legal Standard	16

1	B. The Criteria for Class Certification Are Satisfied	16
2	1. The Class Is Ascertainable and Numerous	16
3	2. There Are Many Common Issues of Law and Fact Which Predominate	17
4	3. Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical of the Claims of the Class	18
5	4. Plaintiff and His Counsel Meet the Adequacy Requirement.....	18
6	5. A Class Action Is Superior to a Multiplicity of Litigation	19
7	V. THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS CONSTITUTIONALLY SOUND AND	
8	SATISFIES RULES OF COURT	19
9	VI. CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

<i>Angeles v. United States Airways, Inc.</i> (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2013, No. C 12-05860 CRB) 2013 WL 622032	3
<i>Frank v. Eastman Kodak Co.</i> (W.D.N.Y. 2005) 228 F.R.D. 174	15
<i>Leyva v. Medline Industries Inc.</i> (9th Cir. 2013) 716 F.3d 510	19
<i>Pedroza v. PetSmart, Inc.</i> (C.D. Cal. June 14, 2012, No. ED CV 11–298 GHK (DTBx)) 2012 WL 9506073	3
<i>Priddy v. Edelman</i> (6th Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 438	7
<i>Rodriguez v. West Publishing Corp.</i> (9th Cir. 2009) 563 F.3d 948	15
<i>Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i> (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294	13
<i>Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.</i> (9th Cir. 1977) 557 F.2d 759	12

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Eisenberg & Miller, <i>Incentive Awards to Class Action Plaintiffs: An Empirical Study</i> (2006) 53 UCLA L. Rev. 1303	15
---	----

COURT RULES

California Rules of Court, rule 3.766(e), (f)	19
California Rules of Court, rule 3.769(f)	20

TREATISES

Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions (3rd ed. 1992) § 8.39	20
Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions (3rd ed. 1992) § 11.51	7
Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions (3rd ed. 1992) § 14.03	13

STATE CASES

<i>Cartt v. Superior Court</i> (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 960	20
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43	13
<i>City and County of San Francisco v. Sweet</i> (1995) 12 Cal.4th 105	12
<i>Classen v. Weller</i> (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 27	18
<i>Clothesrigger, Inc. v. GTE Corp.</i> (1987) 191 Cal.App.3d 605	17

1	<i>Collins v. Rocha</i> (1972) 7 Cal.3d 232.....	17
2	<i>Daar v. Yellow Cab Co.</i> (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 695.....	16
3	<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794	6, 17
4	<i>Gentry v. Superior Court</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4th 443	15, 19
5	<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i> (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116.....	7, 10
6	<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half International Inc.</i> (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480.....	13
7	<i>Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429	16
8	<i>Mallick v. Superior Court</i> (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 434	6
9	<i>McGhee v. Bank of America</i> (1976) 60 Cal.App.3d 442	18
10	<i>Miller v. Woods</i> (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 862.....	17, 19
11	<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i> (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399	7, 10, 13
12	<i>Neary v. Regents of University of California</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 272	6
13	<i>Quinn v. State of California</i> (1975) 15 Cal.3d 162.....	12
14	<i>Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.</i> (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 462.....	16
15	<i>Rose v. City of Hayward</i> (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 926	17
16	<i>Serrano v. Priest</i> (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25	12
17	<i>Stamburgh v. Superior Court</i> (1976) 62 Cal.App.3d 231.....	7, 19
18	<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224.....	9
19	<i>Wilner v. Sunset Life Insurance Co.</i> (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 952	17
20	STATE STATUTES	
21	California Code of Civil Procedure § 382	16
22	California Labor Code § 90.5	15
23	California Labor Code § 218.5	14
24	California Labor Code § 226	14
25	California Labor Code § 1194	14
26	California Labor Code §§ 2698, <i>et seq.</i>	10
27	California Labor Code § 2699(e)(2)	11
28	California Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).....	14

1	California Labor Code § 2802(d).....	14
---	--------------------------------------	----

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Patrick Ejinaka (“Plaintiff”) seeks preliminary approval of a proposed \$240,000.00 non-reversionary, wage-and-hour class action settlement (the “Settlement”) with Defendant Elite Family Systems (“Defendant”) (together with Plaintiff, the “Parties”). The Settlement will provide substantial monetary payments to an estimated 188 Class Members who worked an estimated aggregate of 9,842 Workweeks, of which roughly 89 are Aggrieved Employees who worked an estimated aggregate of 1,695 PAGA Pay Periods. (The Declaration of John Sarhadi [“Sarhadi Decl.”] ¶ 3.) As set forth more fully below, the proposed Settlement satisfies all the criteria for settlement approval under California law. The Settlement was reached after extensive investigation, informal discovery, and negotiations between the Parties. The negotiations were at arm’s-length and were facilitated through private mediation by an experienced and neutral class action mediator, Jason Marsili, Esq. Accordingly, Plaintiff requests the Court preliminarily approve the Settlement, certify the proposed Class, approve the proposed Class Notice to Class Members, and set a final approval hearing no earlier than 120 days from the date of preliminary approval.

II. SUMMARY OF THE LITIGATION AND SETTLEMENT

A. Plaintiff’s Claims and Procedural History

This is a wage-and-hour class action 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”). (Declaration of Kane Moon in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class and Representative Action Settlement [“Moon Decl.”], ¶ 2.) Plaintiff seeks to represent a class of all current and former non-exempt, hourly employees of Defendant in California employed by Defendant during the period from May 20, 2021, through May 31, 2026 (the “Class Period”), as set forth in the Joint Stipulation of Class and Representative Action Settlement Agreement (the “Settlement”). (*Id.*)

Defendant is a social services organization that provides individual and family services to individuals in California. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.) Defendant employed Plaintiff and other non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the Class Period. (*Id.*) Plaintiff worked for Defendant in a non-exempt, hourly-paid

1 position from approximately February 2025 to March 2025 as a youth counselor. (Declaration of
2 Plaintiff Patrick Ejnaka in Support of Class and Representative Action Settlement [“Plaintiff Decl.”],
3 ¶ 2.) Plaintiff contends he and his coworkers were subjected to the same unlawful labor practices,
4 including failure to pay wages for all hours worked. (*Id.* at ¶ 7; Moon Decl., ¶ 3.)

5 Plaintiff’s claims for unpaid minimum and overtime wages stem from allegations that
6 Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and others for off-the-clock work and failed to incorporate all
7 remuneration into employees’ regular rate of pay for purposes of paying overtime, meal break
8 premiums, and sick pay. (Moon Decl., ¶ 4.) Plaintiff’s meal and rest period claims are based on
9 allegations that due to the nature of their work and Defendant’s poor employment practices, Class
10 Members’ breaks were often short, late, interrupted, and sometimes missed altogether, and that
11 Defendant did not pay all premium wages for non-compliant breaks. (*Id.*) Plaintiff further brings a
12 claim for unreimbursed necessary business expenses based on allegations that Class Members were
13 required to use their personal cellphone and computers and home internet for work purposes without
14 reimbursement from Defendant. (*Id.*) Finally, Plaintiff also brings derivative claims for waiting time
15 penalties, wage statement violations, unfair business practices, and civil penalties under PAGA. (*Id.*)

16 Because of the foregoing alleged violations of various provisions of the Labor Code, Plaintiff
17 filed a class action on May 20, 2025, which alleges Defendant systematically: (1) failed to pay
18 minimum wages, (2) failed to pay overtime compensation, (3) failed to provide meal periods, (4) failed
19 to authorize and permit rest periods, (5) failed to indemnify necessary business expenses, (6) failed to
20 timely pay final wages at termination, (7) failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and (8)
21 engaged in unfair business practices. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.)

22 Pursuant to PAGA, on May 18, 2025, Plaintiff gave written notice to the California Labor and
23 Workforce Development Agency (the “LWDA”) of the alleged Labor Code violations, with certified
24 mail service on Defendant, and paid the required filing fee. (*Id.* at ¶ 6, Ex. 2.) On August 20, 2025,
25 Plaintiff timely filed a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint to add a ninth cause
26 of action for civil penalties under PAGA (the “Operative Complaint”). (*Id.* at ¶ 6.) In compliance with
27 Labor Code section 2699(s)(1), Plaintiff subsequently submitted to the LWDA a file-stamped copy of
28 the Operative Complaint containing the Court-assigned case number. (*Id.*) To date, the LWDA has not

1 indicated its intent to investigate the alleged violations or intervene in this Action. (*Id.*)

2 Defendant ardently opposes the merits of this case and denies Plaintiff’s factual allegations. (*Id.*
3 at ¶ 7.) Defendant asserts it complied with all its compensation obligations, including compensating
4 Class Members for any and all off-the-clock work and overtime work, and therefore, Plaintiff and other
5 Class Members were paid all wages owed. (*Id.*) Defendant argues it did not fail to incorporate any non-
6 discretionary bonuses into the regular rate of pay. (*Id.*) Defendant maintains compliance with all its
7 meal and rest period obligations. (*Id.*) Defendant asserts it complied with all its reimbursement
8 obligations, and that Plaintiff and other employees were compensated for any and all business expenses
9 necessarily incurred. (*Id.*) To the extent employees received wage statements that were allegedly
10 inaccurate, Defendant asserts employees suffered no actual damage or harm as a result. (*Id.*; *see, e.g.,*
11 *Angeles v. U.S. Airways, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2013, No. C 12–05860 CRB) 2013 WL 622032, at
12 *10 [“A plaintiff must adequately plead an injury arising from an employer’s failure to provide full and
13 accurate wage statements, and the omission of the required information alone is not sufficient.”].) With
14 respect to Plaintiff’s claim for waiting time penalties, Defendant alleges its good-faith belief that it paid
15 all wages precludes the imposition of waiting time penalties since Plaintiff cannot prove Defendant’s
16 alleged failure to pay all final wages at the time of separation was “willful.” (Moon Decl., ¶ 7; *see, e.g.,*
17 *Pedroza v. PetSmart, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. June 14, 2012, No. ED CV 11–298 GHK (DTBx)) 2012 WL
18 9506073, *5.) For these reasons, among others, Defendant denies all of Plaintiff’s claims and
19 allegations, and further claims it did not engage in any unfair business practices and denies liability
20 under PAGA. (Moon Decl., ¶ 7.) Defendant also maintains the claims are improper for class treatment,
21 in part, due to the individualized and testimony-intensive nature of the wage claims that could bar class
22 certification or significantly reduce Defendant’s overall liability. (*Id.*)

23 **B. Discovery and Investigation**

24 The Parties agreed to mediate this action with Jason Marsili, Esq., an experienced class and
25 PAGA action mediator. (*Id.* at ¶ 8.) In preparation for mediation, the Parties agreed to a protocol for an
26 informal production of documents and information before mediation. (*Id.*) Prior to mediation, Plaintiff
27 obtained from Defendant, through informal discovery, information sufficient to meaningfully evaluate
28 the claims at issue in the Action. (*Id.*) Defendant produced documents relating to its policies, practices,

1 and procedures regarding payment of wages, meal and rest periods, expense reimbursement, and wage
2 statements, along with payroll and timekeeping records, and information relating to the size and scope
3 of the Class, as well as data permitting Plaintiff to understand the number of Workweeks and PAGA
4 Pay Periods. (*Id.*)

5 In preparation for mediation, Plaintiff's Counsel reviewed and analyzed all the information
6 Defendant provided, including the sample records and documents regarding Defendant's wage-and-
7 hour policies. (*Id.* at ¶ 9.) The documents and information produced by Defendant are sufficient to
8 analyze and evaluate Defendant's potential exposure and merits of Plaintiff's claims. (*Id.*) In
9 conjunction with their extensive factual investigation, Plaintiff's Counsel also investigated the
10 applicable law regarding the claims and defenses asserted in the litigation. (*Id.*) Accordingly, Plaintiff's
11 Counsel was able to evaluate the probability of class certification, success on the merits, and
12 Defendant's maximum and realistic monetary exposure for all claims. (*Id.*) Thus, Plaintiff's and his
13 Counsel's familiarity with the facts of the case and the legal issues raised by the pleadings allowed
14 them to act intelligently in negotiating the Settlement. (*Id.*)

15 **C. Settlement Negotiations and Notice of Settlement to the LWDA**

16 On May 12, 2026, the Parties participated in a full day of private mediation with Jason Marsili,
17 Esq. (*Id.* at ¶ 10.) The negotiations were at arm's length and, although conducted in a professional
18 manner, were adversarial. (*Id.*) The Parties went into the mediation willing to explore the potential for
19 a settlement of the dispute, but each side was also prepared to litigate their position through trial and
20 appeal if a settlement had not been reached. (*Id.*) After a full discussion regarding the strengths and
21 weaknesses of Plaintiff's claims and Defendant's defenses and with the assistance of the mediator, the
22 Parties reached a resolution, the material terms of which are set out in the Settlement. (*Id.*, Ex. 1.)

23 In compliance with Labor Code section 2699(s)(2), notice of settlement and a copy of the
24 proposed Settlement has been submitted to the LWDA along with a copy of Plaintiff's preliminary
25 approval motion and the hearing date. (*Id.* at ¶ 11, Ex. 3.) To date, the LWDA has not indicated any
26 objection to the Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶ 11.)

27 **D. Key Terms of the Proposed Settlement**

28 Under the Settlement, Defendant will pay a non-reversionary amount of *no less than*

1 **\$240,000.00** (“GSA”) to resolve this action. (Settlement, ¶ 3.1.) Defendant will separately pay its
2 employer-side payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of Individual Class Payments. (*Id.*) Other key
3 terms of the Settlement are outlined in the counsel declaration submitted concurrently herewith. (Moon
4 Decl., ¶¶ 12–30.) The proposed Settlement Administrator — APEX Class Action Administration—was
5 jointly selected by the Parties based on its bid of \$6,750.00. (*Id.* at ¶ 16, Ex. 5; Settlement, ¶¶ 1.1, 7.1.)

6 The Class is defined as all current and former non-exempt, hourly employees of Defendant in
7 California employed by Defendant during the period from May 20, 2021, through May 31, 2026.¹ (*Id.*
8 at ¶¶ 1.4, 1.12.) “Aggrieved Employees” is defined as all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt
9 employees of Defendant who worked for Defendant in California at any time during the period from
10 May 18, 2024, through May 31, 2026. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1.3, 1.33.) The Settlement allocates \$20,000.00 from
11 the GSA for settlement of the Released PAGA Claims, which will be distributed 65% (\$13,000.00) to
12 the LWDA and 35% (\$7,000.00) to Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA law governing Plaintiff’s
13 claims. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1.34, 3.2.5.) Each Aggrieved Employee will be entitled to a pro rata share of the 35%
14 share of the PAGA Penalties directly proportional to their number of PAGA Pay Periods. (*Id.* at ¶
15 3.2.5.a.) This results in an average Individual PAGA Payment of roughly **\$78.65** for each of the
16 estimated 89 Aggrieved Employees (\$7,000.00 / 89), and a PAGA Pay Period value of roughly **\$4.13**
17 for each of the 1,695 estimated Pay Periods in the PAGA Period (\$7,000.00 / 1,695). (Moon Decl., ¶
18 18.)

19 The Net Settlement Amount is the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in
20 the amounts approved by the Court: the Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the
21 Class Representative Service Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation
22 Costs Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment. (Settlement, ¶ 1.27.) The remainder is to
23 be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments. (*Id.*) Accordingly, the Net
24
25
26

27 ¹ The Escalator Clause is not triggered, and the Class Period end date will remain May 31, 2026.
28 (Moon Decl., ¶ 13.)

1 Settlement Amount will be *no less than \$99,250.00* for an estimated Class of **188 individuals**.² (Moon
2 Decl., ¶ 19.) Each Class Member who does not opt-out will be entitled to a pro rata share of the Net
3 Settlement Amount that is directly proportional to the number of Workweeks worked during the Class
4 Period. (Settlement, ¶ 3.2.4.) The estimated **\$99,250.00** Net Settlement Amount results in an average
5 Individual Class Payment of roughly **\$527.93** for each of the estimated 188 Class Members (\$99,250.00
6 / 188),³ and a Workweek value of roughly **\$10.08** for each of the 9,842 estimated Workweeks in the
7 Class Period (\$99,250.00 / 9,842). (Moon Decl., ¶ 21.)

8 The Parties, Class Counsel, and Defense Counsel represent that they are not aware of any other
9 pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement.
10 (Settlement, ¶ 2.8.)

11 **III. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL**

12 The law favors the settlement of lawsuits, particularly in class actions and other complex cases.
13 (*See, e.g., Neary v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* (1992) 3 Cal.4th 272, 277–81.) To prevent fraud, collusion,
14 or unfairness to the class, the settlement of a class action requires court approval. (*Dunk v. Ford Motor*
15 *Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1800–01 [citing authority omitted].) To approve a settlement, the
16 Court must find “the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable.” (*Id.*) This Court has wide discretion
17 in making this determination. (*Mallick v. Super. Ct.* (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 434, 438.) Fairness,
18 adequacy, and reasonableness are presumed, as here, when: “(1) the settlement is reached through
19 arm’s-length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court
20 to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors
21 is small.” (*Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at p. 1802 [citing Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions (3rd ed. 1992)
22 § 11.41].)

23
24 ² The Net Settlement Amount was calculated by deducting the following from the \$240,000.00
25 GSA: \$10,000.00 for the Class Representative Service Payment, up to \$6,750.00 for the
26 Administration Expenses Payment, \$20,000.00 for the PAGA Penalties to the LWDA and Aggrieved
Employees, \$84,000.00 for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, and up to \$20,000.00 for the Class
Counsel Litigation Costs Payment. (Settlement, ¶¶ 3.2.1–3.2.5.)

27 ³ At this time, the actual amounts to Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees are unknown
28 and will be calculated by the Administrator following preliminary approval and receipt and
processing of the Class Data. (Settlement, ¶ 7.2.) The high and low range of payments will be
provided to the Court in a motion for final approval. (Moon Decl., ¶ 21, n.2.)

1 In evaluating a settlement, the trial court considers the following factors: (1) the strength of
2 plaintiff's case; (2) the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation; (3) the risk
3 of maintaining class action status through trial; (4) the settlement amount offered; (5) the extent of
4 discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings; (6) counsel's experience and views; (7) the
5 presence of a governmental participant; and (8) the class members' reaction to the proposed settlement.
6 (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 128.) To approve a class action
7 settlement, "the court must satisfy itself that the class settlement is within the 'ballpark' of
8 reasonableness." (*Id.* at p. 133.) The record need not contain an explicit statement of the maximum
9 theoretical recovery. (*Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of L.A.* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408–
10 09 [holding that *Kullar* does not require "an explicit statement of the maximum amount the plaintiff
11 class could recover if it prevailed on all its claims," but instead, only an "understanding of the amount
12 that is in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the litigation"].)

13 As discussed below, Plaintiff's Counsel have provided materials and information exceeding the
14 threshold required for this Court to conclude the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

15 **A. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, Adequate, and the Product of Investigation,**
16 **Litigation, and Negotiation**

17 **1. The Settlement Is the Product of Discovery, Investigation, Informed and Non-**
18 **Collusive Arm's-Length Negotiations, and Realistic Claims Analysis**

19 Courts presume the absence of fraud or collusion in the negotiation of a settlement, unless
20 evidence to the contrary is offered. (Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions (3rd ed. 1992) § 11.51.)
21 Settlement is favored, and settlement agreements are realistically assessed. (*Stamburgh v. Super. Ct.*
22 (1976) 62 Cal.App.3d 231, 236; *Priddy v. Edelman* (6th Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 438, 447 ["The fact that
23 the plaintiff might have received more if the case had been fully litigated is no reason not to approve
24 the settlement."].) Thus, there is a presumption here that negotiations were conducted in good faith.

25 Here, Plaintiff's Counsel have conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of this case.
26 (Moon Decl., ¶ 31.) The Settlement at issue was reached through arm's-length negotiations and private
27 mediation. (*Id.*) Based on Defendant's informal class-wide discovery production, on Plaintiff's
28 Counsel's independent investigation and evaluation, and on their extensive experience in wage-and-

1 hour litigation, Plaintiff's Counsel are of the opinion that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable,
2 and adequate. (*Id.*)

3 Based on Plaintiff's Counsel's review of the time, payroll, and additional data provided by
4 Defendant, and on information from Plaintiff, Plaintiff's Counsel evaluated the estimated maximum
5 and risk-adjusted exposure that Defendant faced. (*Id.* at ¶ 32.) Specifically, based on the information
6 provided for mediation, the total estimated **realistic recovery** (adjusted for risks at certification and
7 proof on the merits) for the alleged claims, including penalties, is estimated to be **\$307,637.25**.⁴ (Moon
8 Decl., ¶¶ 32, 38.) This amount was calculated as follows: **\$70,576.23** (90% discount) for the off-the-
9 clock work claim; negligible, if any value, for the regular rate claim; **\$94,525.65** (75% discount) for
10 the meal period claim; **\$75,617.39** (90% discount) for the rest period claim; **\$6,026.25** (90% discount)
11 for the unreimbursed business expenses claim; **\$45,549.24** (95% discount) for the waiting time
12 penalties claim; **\$7,567.50** (95% discount) for the wage statement claim; and **\$7,775.00** (95% discount)
13 for the PAGA penalties claim. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 32–37.) The foregoing discounts were based on the evidence
14 presented for mediation and arguments made during arm's-length settlement negotiations. (*Id.*)

15 **The \$240,000.00 gross settlement figure represents approximately 78% of the total**
16 **realistic recovery.** (*Id.* at ¶ 38.) This is an excellent result for the Class, particularly because, under the
17 Settlement, Class Members will receive timely and guaranteed relief, avoiding the risk of not being
18 able to recover anything. (*Id.*)

19
20
21 ⁴ Plaintiff's realistic recovery was estimated based on the demographic figures provided at
22 mediation. (Moon Decl., ¶ 32.) At the time of mediation, it was estimated that there were
23 approximately 183 Class Members who collectively worked 9,642 Workweeks during the Class
Period, and 83 Aggrieved Employees who collectively worked 1,555 PAGA Pay Periods during the
PAGA Period.⁴ (Settlement, ¶ 4.1.)

24 Based on Defendant's review of its records as of June 24, 2026, it is estimated that there
25 are 188 Class Members who collectively worked 9,842 Workweeks during the Class Period, and
there are an estimated 89 Aggrieved Employees who worked 1,695 Pay Periods during the PAGA
Period. (Sarhadi Decl., ¶ 3.)

26 The estimates at mediation and Defendant's estimates as of June 24, 2026 are not
27 significantly different (there are an estimated 5 more Class Members, 200 more Workweeks, 6
28 more Aggrieved Employees, and 140 more PAGA Pay Periods from the June 24, 2026 estimates
and the mediation estimates). (Moon Decl., ¶ 32, n.4.) Plaintiff's Counsel continue to believe the
Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. (*Id.*)

1 **2. The Class Settlement Is Fair Considering the Parties’ Respective Positions and**
2 **Significant Risks to Certification and Proof on the Merits**

3 A settlement is not judged against what a plaintiff might recover had he prevailed at trial, nor
4 does the settlement have to provide 100% of the damages sought to be fair and reasonable. (*Wershba*
5 *v. Apple Comp., Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 246, 250 [“Compromise is inherent and necessary in
6 the settlement process . . . even if ‘the relief afforded by the proposed settlement is substantially
7 narrower than it would be if the suits were to be successfully litigated,’ this is no bar to a class settlement
8 because ‘the public interest may indeed be served by a voluntary settlement in which each side gives
9 ground in the interest of avoiding litigation.’”] [quoting *Air Line Stewards v. Am. Airlines, Inc.* (7th
10 Cir. 1972) 455 F.2d 101, 109].)

11 Here, considering all known facts and circumstances, the risk of significant delay, trial risk,
12 appellate risk, and the defenses Defendant may assert both to certification and on the merits, the
13 Settlement is in the best interest of the Class and LWDA. (Moon Decl., ¶ 31.) While Plaintiff is
14 confident in the merits of his claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each cause of action. (*Id.* at
15 ¶ 41.) Plaintiff also recognizes that proving the amount owed to each Class Member would be an
16 expensive, time-consuming, and uncertain proposition. (*Id.*)

17 The Settlement obviates the significant risk that this Court may deny certification of all or some
18 of Plaintiff’s claims. (*Id.* at ¶ 42.) Plaintiff’s Counsel took into account the risk of not prevailing at trial
19 due to low or no participation by Class Members. (*Id.*) Indeed, the individualized and testimony-
20 intensive nature of the claims could bar manageability of the representative claims or otherwise
21 significantly reduce any recovery whatsoever. (*Id.*) For example, the rest period and unreimbursed
22 expense claims are testimony-driven claims and assume a 50% and a 100% violation rate, respectively,
23 which would not likely be demonstrated at trial, as it assumes either the participation of a majority or
24 all employees (which would be difficult given the reality that many, if not all, employees would be
25 unwilling to participate due to fear of retaliation), or alternatively, the use of surveys or statistical data
26 as a surrogate (which would still require the participation of a majority of employees to establish a
27 sound representation of all non-exempt employees). (*Id.*) Even assuming employees would be willing
28

1 to participate, obtaining declarations would potentially reveal that each individual employee had a
2 different experience. (*Id.*)

3 Furthermore, even if Plaintiff was able to pursue his claims on a class-wide basis and obtain
4 certification of all or some of the claims, continued litigation would be expensive, involving a trial and
5 possible appeals, and would substantially delay and reduce any recovery by the Class. (*Id.* at ¶ 43.)
6 Although the Parties have engaged in a significant amount of investigation, informal discovery, and
7 class-wide data analysis, they have not conducted extensive formal discovery. (*Id.*) Moreover,
8 preparation for class certification and a trial would remain for the Parties as well as the prospect of
9 appeals in the wake of a disputed class certification ruling for Plaintiff and/or any summary judgment
10 ruling. (*Id.*) As a result, the Parties would incur considerably more attorneys’ fees and costs through
11 trial. (*Id.*) In sum, this Settlement avoids the risks, burdens, and the accompanying expense of further
12 litigation. (*Id.*)

13 The proposed \$240,000.00 Settlement therefore represents a substantial recovery when
14 compared to the reasonably forecasted recovery for the Class. (*Id.* at ¶ 44.) When considering the risks
15 of litigation, the uncertainties involved in continued litigation, the burdens of proof necessary to
16 establish liability, and the probability of appeal, it is clear the Settlement amount is within the
17 “ballpark” of reasonableness, and that preliminary settlement approval is appropriate. (*Id.*; (*Kullar*,
18 *supra*, 168 Cal.App.4th at p. 133; *see Munoz, supra*, 186 Cal.App.4th at pp. 408–09.)

19 **3. The PAGA Settlement Is Fair Considering the Parties’ Respective Positions**
20 **and Significant Risks**

21 With regard to the PAGA claims, the Settlement is a fair and reasonable resolution that satisfies
22 PAGA’s dual statutory purposes of deterrence and punishment, on the one hand, and providing
23 Aggrieved Employees with genuine and meaningful relief, on the other. (Moon Decl., ¶ 39; Lab. Code
24 §§ 2698, *et seq.*) As a result of this litigation, Defendant has had to hire legal counsel, engage in informal
25 class-wide discovery, and participate in mediation. Defendant will also have to pay civil penalties to the
26 LWDA under the Settlement, assuming final settlement approval is granted. (Settlement, ¶ 3.2.5.) Not
27 including its own attorneys’ fees and costs as well as the employer’s share of payroll taxes, Defendant
28 will pay no less than \$240,000.00 to resolve this matter—of which \$20,000.00 is allocated toward the

1 PAGA claims and will be distributed, in compliance with Labor Code section 2699 as 65% (\$13,000.00)
2 to the LWDA and 35% (\$7,000.00) to Aggrieved Employees—and the release obtained under the
3 Settlement does not preclude Aggrieved Employees from pursuing any individual claims they may have
4 against Defendant or the other Released Parties. (Moon Decl., ¶ 39.)

5 Moreover, Plaintiff’s Counsel are of the opinion that because the issues here are fairly contested,
6 there is a possibility of the Court not awarding the PAGA penalties even if Plaintiff prevailed on the
7 merits due to the largely discretionary nature of awarding PAGA penalties. (*Id.*) Indeed, under PAGA,
8 a Court can reduce penalties “if, based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do
9 otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory.” (Lab. Code
10 § 2699(e)(2).) In other words, were this matter to go to trial, any award granted would be at the discretion
11 of the Court and subject to a substantial reduction. (Moon Decl., ¶ 39.) Further, Plaintiff’s Counsel took
12 into account the risk of not being able to proceed on a representative basis due to the potential
13 manageability issues and that even if Plaintiff prevailed at trial, penalties would likely be limited due to
14 the largely discretionary nature of awarding PAGA penalties and in light of other defenses available to
15 Defendant. (*Id.* at ¶ 40.) Thus, it is entirely possible that even if Plaintiff would be successful at trial,
16 assuming he is first able to certify the claims and defeat the manageability issues presented at litigation,
17 Plaintiff could be awarded substantially less than what was obtained through the Settlement. (*Id.*)

18 In sum, the \$20,000 PAGA Penalties allocation under the Settlement constitutes “genuine and
19 meaningful” relief that is “consistent with the underlying purpose of the statute to benefit the public.”
20 (*See O’Connor v. Uber Tech., Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2016) 201 F.Supp.3d 1110, 1133–35 [denying settlement
21 approval where allocation for PAGA claims was 0.1% of the estimated full worth].)

22 **4. Plaintiff’s Counsel Have Extensive Experience in Class and PAGA Action**
23 **Litigation, Which Was Integral to Negotiating the Settlement**

24 The Settlement negotiations were conducted by highly capable counsel with considerable
25 experience and demonstrated competence with litigating wage-and-hour class actions. (Moon Decl., ¶¶
26 49–68.) Plaintiff’s Counsel have a strong record of vigorous and effective advocacy for their clients
27 and are experienced in handling complex wage-and-hour class action litigation. (*Id.*) Their experience
28 was helpful in assessing the reasonableness of the Settlement at issue here, and from this experience

1 they concluded that this litigation could not have been settled on better terms than provided under the
2 Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶ 69.) Although Plaintiff and his counsel were prepared to try the claims alleged in
3 the litigation, they support the proposed Settlement as being in the best interest of the Class based on
4 objective evidence that has been considered and weighed against the risks, expenses, and time
5 consumption to both sides of continued litigation. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 10, 31.)

6 **B. The Proposed Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Are Reasonable**

7 Subject to the Court’s approval, the Settlement provides for attorneys’ fees payable to Class
8 Counsel in an amount up to thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (currently
9 estimated to be \$84,000.00), and litigation costs up to \$20,000.00. (Settlement, ¶ 3.2.2.) These amounts
10 are disclosed to Class Members in the proposed Class Notice and are reasonable. (*Id.* at Ex. A.)

11 **1. Counsel Request a Fees Award Based On the “Common Fund” Method**

12 California courts have long awarded attorneys’ fees as a percentage of the benefit created by
13 counsel in pursuing claims on behalf of a class. (*See, e.g., Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25.) The
14 California Supreme Court has held, “when a number of persons are entitled in common to a specific
15 fund, and an action brought by a plaintiff or plaintiffs for the benefit of all results in the creation or
16 preservation of that fund, such plaintiff or plaintiffs may be awarded attorney’s fees out of the fund.”
17 (*Id.* at p. 34.)

18 Plaintiff’s Counsel seek an award of attorneys’ fees on the “percentage of recovery/common
19 fund” theory. (Moon Decl., ¶ 71.) The purpose of this approach is to “spread litigation costs
20 proportionately among all the beneficiaries so that the active beneficiary does not bear the entire burden
21 alone.” (*Vincent v. Hughes Air W., Inc.* (9th Cir. 1977) 557 F.2d 759, 769.) In *Quinn v. State of*
22 *California* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 162, the California Supreme Court stated, “one who expends attorneys’
23 fees in winning a suit which creates a fund from which others derive benefits, may require those passive
24 beneficiaries to bear a fair share of the litigation costs.” (*Id.* at p. 167.) Similarly, in *City and County*
25 *of San Francisco v. Sweet* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 105, the California Supreme Court recognized that the
26 common fund doctrine has been applied “consistently in California when an action brought by one
27 party creates a fund in which other persons[] are entitled to share.” (*Id.* at pp. 110–11 [pincite
28 omitted].)

1 The California Supreme Court affirmed in *Laffitte v. Robert Half International Inc.* (2016) 1
2 Cal.5th 480 that, “when class action litigation establishes a monetary fund for the benefit of the class
3 members, and the trial court in its equitable powers awards class counsel a fee out of that fund, the
4 court may determine the amount of a reasonable fee by choosing an appropriate percentage of the fund
5 created.” (*Id.* at p. 503.) The court explained: “The recognized advantages of the percentage method—
6 including relative ease of calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better
7 approximation of market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement it provides counsel
8 to seek an early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging the litigation[]—convince us the
9 percentage method is a valuable tool that should not be denied our trial courts.” (*Id.* [internal citations
10 omitted].) This line of legal authority supports a request for attorneys’ fees based on the percentage of
11 recovery/common fund method.

12 **2. The Requested Fee Award Is in Line with Typical Cases**

13 According to a leading treatise on class actions: “No general rule can be articulated on what is
14 a reasonable percentage of a common fund. Usually 50% of the fund is the upper limit on a reasonable
15 fee award from a common fund in order to assure that the fees do not consume a disproportionate part
16 of the recovery obtained for the class, although somewhat larger percentages are not unprecedented.”
17 (Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* (3rd ed. 1992) § 14.03.) Attorneys’ fees that are fifty percent of
18 the fund are typically considered the upper limit, with thirty to forty percent commonly awarded in
19 cases where the settlement is relatively small. (*Id.*; see also *Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (N.D.
20 Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294, 297 [stating that most cases where 30–50% was awarded involved
21 “smaller” settlement funds of under \$10 million].)

22 Here, Plaintiff’s Counsel’s fees request for thirty-five percent (35%) of the GSA, is in line with
23 the prevailing guidelines established in California case law and academic literature and is consistent
24 with awards in California. (*Compare* Settlement, ¶ 3.2.2, with *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162
25 Cal.App.4th 43, 66, n.11 [“Empirical studies show that, regardless whether the percentage method or
26 the lodestar method is used, fee awards in class actions average around one-third of the recovery.”].)
27 Accordingly, Plaintiff requests the Court preliminarily approve the attorneys’ fees as negotiated by the
28 Parties.

1 **3. This Matter Involves a “Fee-Shifting” Provision of the Labor Code**

2 Labor Code sections 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699, and 2802 provide for the recovery of reasonable
3 fees and costs of suit, for the claims made in this action. (Lab. Code §§ 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(k)(1),
4 2802(d).) Under these sections, Plaintiff would be permitted to recover his actual attorneys’ fees, even
5 if those fees were larger than the total class recovery at the conclusion of this case. (*Id.*) This Settlement
6 is beneficial in that it limits the risk of continued expenses and consumption of time, energy, and
7 resources facing Defendant while at the same time rewarding Plaintiff’s Counsel for their decision to
8 assume risk by taking on this matter on a contingent basis with no guarantee of recovery. (Moon Decl.,
9 ¶¶ 72–75.) In fact, prosecution of this action involved significant financial risk for Plaintiff’s Counsel.
10 (*Id.*) Once Plaintiff’s Counsel undertook this litigation, they committed to pursue it to its conclusion,
11 placing their fiduciary duty to the Class ahead of all other concerns. (*Id.* at ¶ 74.)

12 **4. Counsel’s Experience, Reputation, and Ability Support the Fees Request**

13 As demonstrated by their past experience in pursuing class actions on behalf of consumers and
14 employees, Plaintiff’s Counsel possess considerable expertise in litigating class actions. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 49–
15 68.) Plaintiff’s Counsel have been involved as lead counsel or co-counsel in numerous class actions
16 that resulted in millions in recovery. (*Id.*) As noted above, their experience in wage-and-hour litigation
17 was integral in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the case against Defendant and the
18 reasonableness of the Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶ 69.) Practice in the narrow field of wage-and-hour litigation
19 requires skill and knowledge concerning the rapidly evolving substantive law (state and federal) as well
20 as the procedural law of class action litigation. (*Id.* at ¶ 67.) Based on these and other factors, Plaintiff’s
21 Counsel have frequently received fee awards of this percentage from the gross recovery for the class.
22 (*See id.* at ¶¶ 53, 58, 62.) Because it is reasonable to compensate counsel commensurate with their skill,
23 reputation, and experience, the requested fee award is supported here.

24 **C. The Service Payment to Plaintiff Is Reasonable**

25 Named plaintiffs in class action lawsuits “are eligible for reasonable incentive payments to
26 compensate them for the expense or risk they have incurred in conferring a benefit on other members
27 of the class.” (*Munoz, supra*, 186 Cal.App.4th at p. 412.) Courts routinely grant approval of class action
28 settlement agreements containing enhancements for the class representatives, which are necessary to

1 provide incentive to represent the class and are appropriate given the benefit the class representatives
2 help to bring about for the class. (*See Rodriguez v. W. Publ'g Corp.* (9th Cir. 2009) 563 F.3d 948, 958–
3 59.) Service awards are particularly important to plaintiffs in wage-and-hour cases because they
4 promote the important public policies underlying the wage-and-hour laws. This strong policy is
5 codified in California Labor Code section 90.5, which provides, “[i]t is the policy of this state to
6 vigorously enforce minimum labor standards in order to ensure employees are not required or permitted
7 to work under substandard unlawful conditions . . .” (Lab. Code § 90.5.) Nonetheless, the California
8 Supreme Court has noted that “retaliation against employees for asserting statutory rights under the
9 Labor Code is widespread,” despite anti-retaliation statutes designed to protect employees. (*Gentry v.*
10 *Super. Ct.* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 443, 460–61.) In this context, class representatives should be rewarded for
11 assuming the risk of retaliation for the sake of class members. (*See Frank v. Eastman Kodak Co.*
12 (W.D.N.Y. 2005) 228 F.R.D. 174, 187.)

13 Under the Settlement here, subject to the Court’s approval, a Class Representative Service
14 Payment of \$10,000.00 will go to Plaintiff, in addition to his amount as a Class Member. (Settlement,
15 ¶¶ 1.14, 3.2.1.) This award is for initiating the action, his services in support of the Action and his
16 General Release. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.14.) Plaintiff has devoted a great deal of time and work assisting counsel in
17 the case and communicated with counsel frequently for litigation and to prepare for mediation. (Moon
18 Decl., ¶¶ 45–48; Plaintiff Decl., ¶¶ 11–21.) The requested award is fair and reasonable, particularly
19 considering the substantial benefits Plaintiff generated for all Class Members. (Moon Decl., ¶¶ 45–48.)

20 When compared with the amounts awarded in typical class action cases, the amount requested
21 here is particularly reasonable. A 2006 study examining the average incentive award given to class
22 action plaintiffs from 1993 to 2002 found that the “average award per class representative was \$15,992
23 and the median award per class representative was \$4357.” (Eisenberg & Miller, *Incentive Awards to*
24 *Class Action Plaintiffs: An Empirical Study* (2006) 53 UCLA L. Rev. 1303, 1307–08.) The same study
25 found that named plaintiffs in employment discrimination class actions received an average award of
26 \$69,850 and a median award of \$31,081, while named plaintiffs in other employment class actions
27 received an average award of \$12,121 and a median award of \$13,059. (*Id.* at p. 1333.) The authors of
28 the study found that higher awards in employment cases reflected the “courts’ wish to make

1 representative plaintiffs whole by compensating them for the high costs of their service to the class,
2 including risks of stigmatization or retaliation on the job.” (*Id.* at p. 1308.)

3 **IV. CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES IS WARRANTED**

4 **A. Legal Standard**

5 The proposed Settlement Class is well suited for class certification. The claims all derive from
6 a core set of alleged violations of California’s wage and hour laws and regulations. (Moon Decl., ¶¶ 4–
7 5.) For the reasons set forth more fully below, the Class, for purposes of Settlement, satisfies the
8 prerequisites for certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.) Section 382 provides that
9 “when the question is one of a common or general interest, of many persons, or when the parties are
10 numerous, and it is impracticable to bring them all before the court, one or more may sue or defend for
11 the benefit of all.” (*Id.*) There are two requirements to section 382: “(1) there must be an ascertainable
12 class[]; and (2) there must be a well defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact
13 involved affecting the parties to be represented.” (*Daar v. Yellow Cab Co.* (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 695, 704
14 [internal citations omitted].) To clarify these requirements, the California Supreme Court has looked to
15 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 to explain that the community-of-interest requirement itself
16 embodies three factors: “(1) predominant common questions of law or fact; (2) class representatives
17 with claims or defenses typical of the class; and (3) class representatives who can adequately represent
18 the class.” (*Richmond v. Dart Indus., Inc.* (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 462, 470.)

19 California law and policy favor the fullest and most flexible use of the class action device. (*Id.*
20 at pp. 469–73.) Indeed, “Courts long have acknowledged the importance of class actions as a means to
21 prevent a failure of justice in our judicial system” particularly where the rights of consumers are at
22 issue. (*Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 429, 434.) Any doubt as to the appropriateness of
23 class treatment should be resolved in favor of certification. (*Richmond, supra*, 29 Cal.3d at pp. 473–
24 75.)

25 **B. The Criteria for Class Certification Are Satisfied**

26 **1. The Class Is Ascertainable and Numerous**

27 When determining whether a class is ascertainable, California courts focus on the following
28 three factors: “(1) the class definition, (2) the size of the class and (3) the means of identifying class

members.” (*Miller v. Woods* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 862, 873.) Here, Plaintiff maintains there is an easily ascertainable Class, defined by objective and precise criteria. (Settlement, ¶¶ 1.4, 1.8, 1.12) The proposed Class that Plaintiff seeks to represent is ascertainable because (1) the Class definition is sufficiently precise, (2) the Class consists of about 188 individuals, and (3) Class Members can be readily identified by Defendant’s records. (Sarhadi Decl., ¶ 3; Settlement, ¶¶ 1.4, 1.12.) Because Class Members are identified using specific criteria in the regular business records of Defendant—their employment by Defendant in California, non-exempt classification, hourly wage, and actual work during the Class Period—the Class is ascertainable. (*See Wilner v. Sunset Life Ins. Co.* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 952, 959–60 [class membership defined by ownership of product that is the subject of the lawsuit is sufficient to make the class ascertainable].) “The requirement of Code of Civil Procedure section 382 that there be ‘many’ parties to a class action suit is indefinite and has been construed liberally.” (*Rose v. City of Hayward* (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 926, 934.) “Where a question is of common interest to ‘many’ persons, an action may be maintained as a class action even where the parties are numerous and it is in fact practicable to join them all.” (*Id.*) “No set number is required as a matter of law for the maintenance of a class action.” (*Id.*) “Thus, our Supreme Court has upheld a class representing the 10 beneficiaries of a trust in an action for removal of the trustees.” (*Id.* [citing *Bowles v. Super. Ct.* (1955) 44 Cal.2d 574]; *see also Collins v. Rocha* (1972) 7 Cal.3d 232 [upholding a class of 9 plaintiffs and 35 members].) Therefore, numerosity is plainly satisfied.

2. There Are Many Common Issues of Law and Fact Which Predominate

To satisfy the community of interest requirement, a proponent must show (1) common questions of law and fact that predominate over individual issues, (2) class representatives have claims or defenses typical of the class, and (3) class representatives adequately represent the class. (*Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at p. 1806.) This inquiry tests whether proposed classes are sufficiently cohesive to rationally warrant adjudication by representation. (*See, e.g., Clothesrigger, Inc. v. GTE Corp.* (1987) 191 Cal.App.3d 605, 611–12.)

Here, Plaintiff’s claims satisfy all three requirements. The employment practices at issue include whether Defendant: paid employees all minimum, overtime, double time, and meal premium, wages owed; reimbursed employees for necessary business expenses; provided employees with and

1 authorized meal and rest periods or paid premiums for non-compliant breaks; paid all final wages to
2 employees at the time of termination; intentionally failed to pay all final wages; provided inaccurate
3 itemized wage statements and whether Class Members were harmed; engaged in unfair business
4 practices; and violated civil penalty provisions under PAGA. (Moon Decl., ¶¶ 4–5.) Plaintiff contends
5 the factual and legal issues are the same for all Class Members, and further that all Class Members
6 suffered from and seek redress for the same alleged injuries. (Plaintiff Decl., ¶¶ 5–7.) Considering Class
7 Members would need to prove the same issues of law and fact to prevail, and their legal remedies are
8 identical, it would be preferable to resolve all claims through a settlement than to force each Class
9 Member to litigate their own individual claims. Thus, the Court should grant conditional class
10 certification for settlement purposes because common questions of law and fact predominate over any
11 individual questions within the Class.

12 **3. Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical of the Claims of the Class**

13 The typicality requirement does not focus on the individual characteristics or circumstances of
14 the representative plaintiff compared to those of the remainder of the class, but rather, upon the
15 typicality of the proposed representative’s claims as they relate to the defendant’s conduct and
16 activities. (*Classen v. Weller* (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 27, 47 [“The only requirements are [sic] that
17 common questions of law and fact *predominate* and that the class representative be *similarly* situated”
18 vis-à-vis the class.] [emphasis in original].) A representative plaintiff’s claims are typical of the class
19 if they arise from the same event, practice, or course of conduct, and if the claims rest on the same legal
20 theories. (*Id.*) That is precisely the case here. Plaintiff is a former employee of Defendant and alleges
21 he was subject to the same policies and practices as other similarly situated employees. (Plaintiff Decl.,
22 ¶¶ 2–7.)

23 **4. Plaintiff and His Counsel Meet the Adequacy Requirement**

24 The adequacy of representation requirements is met by fulfilling two conditions: (1) a named
25 plaintiff must be represented by counsel qualified to conduct the pending litigation, and (2) a named
26 plaintiff’s interests cannot be antagonistic to those of the class. (*McGhee v. Bank of Am.* (1976) 60
27 Cal.App.3d 442, 450.)
28

1 Here, all requirements are met. Plaintiff retained counsel with extensive experience in
2 prosecuting complex class actions, including similar class actions that previously settled. (Moon Decl.,
3 ¶¶ 49–68.) Based on their experience, Plaintiff’s Counsel unquestionably are “qualified, experienced
4 and generally able to conduct the proposed litigation.” (*Miller, supra*, 148 Cal.App.3d at p. 874.)
5 Plaintiff has, with counsel, litigated this case and diligently reviewed the settlement terms, showing
6 dedication, and with full knowledge and acceptance of duties, he has committed to his role as Class
7 Representative. (Plaintiff Decl., ¶¶ 11–21.) In addition, Plaintiff and his Counsel have no conflicts with
8 one another, other Class Members, or the proposed Administrator. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 8–10; Moon Decl., ¶ 70.)

9 **5. A Class Action Is Superior to a Multiplicity of Litigation**

10 Finally, in making its class certification decision, the Court must determine that a class action
11 would be superior to alternative means for the fair and efficient adjudication of the litigation. (*See*
12 *Leyva v. Medline Indus. Inc.* (9th Cir. 2013) 716 F.3d 510, 514–15.) By consolidating many potential
13 individual actions into a single proceeding, this Court’s use of the class action device enables it to
14 manage this litigation in a manner that serves the economics of time, effort, and expense for the litigants
15 and the judicial system. (*Id.*) Absent class treatment, similarly situated employees with small, but
16 nevertheless meritorious, claims for damages would, as a practical matter, have no means of redress
17 because of the time, effort, and expense required to prosecute individual actions. (*Id.* at p. 515; *Gentry*,
18 *supra*, 42 Cal.4th at pp 457–62.) Moreover, in the context of settlement, the superiority concerns are
19 essentially non-existent. (*See generally, e.g., Stamburgh, supra*, 62 Cal.App.3d.)

20 **V. THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS CONSTITUTIONALLY SOUND AND** 21 **SATISFIES RULES OF COURT**

22 Class Notice requirements are set forth in the California Rules of Court. (Cal. Rules of Court,
23 rule 3.766 (e)–(f), rule 3.769(f).) Here, the proposed Class Notice, in the form attached to the Settlement
24 as **Exhibit A**, meets all the requirements of California Rules of Court. The Class Notice summarizes
25 the proceedings to date and the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement in an informative and
26 coherent manner. (Settlement, ¶ 7.4, Ex. A.) It also states that the final approval decision has yet to be
27 made, and provides the date, time, and location of the Final Approval Hearing. (*Id.*) It explains the right
28 and procedures to opt-out or submit any written objections and/or arrange to appear at the Final

1 Approval Hearing and verbally state any objections. (Settlement, ¶ 7.6.) It makes clear the Settlement
2 does not constitute an admission of liability by Defendant, who denies all liability, and it recognizes
3 that this Court has not ruled on the merits of the action. (Settlement, Ex. A.) Thus, the proposed Notice
4 meets all the requirements of California Rule of Court 3.769(f). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.769(f).)

5 The Class Notice also fulfills the requirement of neutrality in class notices. (Newberg, Newberg
6 on Class Actions (3rd ed. 1992) § 8.39.) Accordingly, the Class Notice complies with the standards of
7 fairness, completeness, and neutrality required of a combined settlement-certification class notice.

8 California law vests the Court with broad discretion in fashioning an appropriate notice
9 program. (*Cartt v. Super. Ct.* (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 960, 970, 973–74.) There is no statutory or due
10 process requirement that all class members receive actual notice, but in this matter, Class Members will
11 receive direct mailed notice, which is the best possible form of notice under the circumstances.
12 (Settlement, ¶ 7.4.) As the Court of Appeals has explained, “[t]he notice given should have a reasonable
13 chance of reaching a substantial percentage of the Class Members . . .” (*Cartt*, 50 Cal.App.3d at p. 974.)

14 **VI. CONCLUSION**

15 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant this motion, enter the
16 proposed order submitted herewith regarding preliminary approval, and set a final approval hearing no
17 earlier than 120 days from the preliminary approval order.

18 Respectfully submitted,

19 Dated: August 27, 2026

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

20
21 By: _____

Kane Moon
Allen Feghali
Enzo Nabiev
Jason Kwak

Attorneys for Plaintiff