E-SERVICE
81301677
Nov 06 2026
02:32PM
File & ServeXpress™

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of San Francisco
NOV 06 2026
CLERK OF THE COURT
BY: Dan Kane
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

AMY REECE, an individual, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. WALKME, INC., a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1–50, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. CGC-22-602550 ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT

Before the court are unopposed motions by plaintiff Amy Reece (Reece) for final approval of the $1,394,871.70[1] class settlement of wage-and-hour claims, including a PAGA claim, reached with defendant WalkMe, Inc. (WalkMe) and for approval of attorney's fees, costs, and a service award. On November 6, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. in Department 613, the court heard argument on the motion. Daniel Valles (Valles Law, P.C.) appeared for Reece and the class. Chad Greeson and Daniel Xuli (Littler Mendelson, P.C.) appeared for defendant. No class members appeared at the hearing or objected, at the hearing or in writing, to the settlement. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motions for final approval and for attorney's fees, costs, and a service award are **GRANTED** with approved attorney's fees of **$390,000** costs of **$12,322.01**, and a service award of **$15,000**. A compliance hearing is reserved for **March 12, 2027, at 10:00 a.m.** with a compliance declaration from the administrator confirming the disbursements made due by **December 18, 2026**, and an updated compliance declaration with an

[1] The parties agreed to a gross settlement amount of $1,300,000, but the administrator determined that the escalator clause was triggered. (Forst Decl., ¶ 17.) Consequently, the final gross settlement amount is $1,394,871.70. (Forst Decl., ¶ 17.)

accounting of all funds, including the number and amount of uncashed checks, due in advance of the compliance hearing, namely by **February 26, 2027**. The court otherwise **ORDERS** as follows:

1. Except as otherwise specified here, the court adopts and incorporates by reference the terms and definitions of the settlement agreement.

2. The following Settlement Class is certified for settlement purposes (ASA, §§ 6, 11, 41):

   a. Expense Reimbursement Settlement Class: *All California employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time from October 24, 2018, through the later of January 29, 2026, or the date of preliminary approval.*

   b. Sales & Customer Success Employee Settlement Class: *All current and former exempt employees of Defendant who worked in the State of California as commissioned sales or customer success employees who did not manage two or more other employees more than 50 percent of the time from October 24, 2018, through the later of January 29, 2026, or the date of preliminary approval.*

3. The court finds that the Settlement Class meets the requirements for certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because: (1) the proposed Settlement Class is numerous and ascertainable; (2) there are predominant common questions of law or fact; (3) Reece's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the proposed Settlement Class; and (4) a class action is superior to other methods to efficiently adjudicate this controversy.

4. The notice and plan of distribution approved by this court met the requirements of due process and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. As set forth in the declaration of Jennifer Forst, administrator CPT Group, Inc. ("CPT") distributed notice in compliance with this court's preliminary approval order and the amended settlement agreement. The court finds the administration process to date was adequate and comported with due process, reaching all but two class members. (Forst Decl., ¶¶ 8–13.)

5. No class members requested to exclude themselves from the settlement. (Forst Decl., ¶ 15.)

6. No class members objected to the settlement. (Forst Decl., ¶ 14.)

7. The court has considered the *Dunk/Kullar* factors and finally approves the settlement as a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement.

8. The court hereby approves payment of administration expenses from the settlement fund to CPT in the amount of **$11,500.00**. (Forst Decl., ¶ 20.) Defendant is responsible for paying the additional $259.60 in administrative expenses related to the additional mailing. (Forst Decl., ¶ 20.) CPT shall continue to serve as settlement administrator and shall, *inter alia*, disburse payments to class members in accordance with the terms of the settlement agreement and this final approval order.

9. For settlement purposes only, Amy Reece is appointed as class representative. The court approves a service award for Reece in the amount of **$15,000** based on consideration of the pertinent criteria, including her active engagement in developing evidence in support of the litigation and mediation, her presence at and participation throughout the mediation, which required her to take off time from work, her role in the memorandum of understanding and the motion for preliminary approval, and potential for adverse employment consequences. The court also considered the estimated average payments to Expense Reimbursement Settlement Class Members ($65.39) and Sales & Customer Success Class Members ($4,669.99). (See *Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1394–95.)

10. For settlement purposes only, Valles Law, P.C. is appointed as Class Counsel. The court approves an award of reasonable attorney's fees in the amount of $390,000 (30 percent of the original gross settlement amount or 27.96 percent of the escalated settlement amount), and reimbursement of litigation expenses in the amount of **$12,322.01**. The court applied a lodestar cross check and determined that a multiplier of 1.4, rather than 1.69 is appropriate in view of the services provided, the complexity of the case and its resolution without engaging in formal discovery or motion practice. Applying those factors the court finds the fees requested in the amount of $464,957.23, based on 33 1/3% of the gross, escalated settlement, and a lodestar multiplier of 1.69 is not warranted. The principal purpose of the escalator clause is to prevent dilution of class members' settlement shares. The court declines, on this record, to base the award of attorney's fees on the escalated settlement amount. Ultimately, even using the escalated settlement amount to calculate the fee award, $390,000 is a reasonable fee constituting 27.96 percent of the fund. The court identified discrepancies in counsels' calculation of their baseline lodestar figure, and recalculated it as follows.

Attorney	**Hourly Rate**	**Hours**	**Counsel's Total**	**Actual Total**
Daniel Valles (Partner)	$795.00	317.7	$252,571.50	$252,571.50

Kayla Rathjen (Associate)	$495.00	26.3	$13,018.50	$13,018.50
Michiko Vartanian (Associate)	$495.00	19.5	$10,147.50	**$9,652.50**
Lodestar Total		363.5	$275,737.50	**$275,242.50**
Lodestar Multiplier			1.69	**1.4**

11. The court reserves a compliance hearing for **March 12, 2027, at 10:00 a.m.** with a compliance declaration from the administrator confirming the disbursements made due by **December 18, 2026**, and an updated compliance declaration with an accounting of all funds, including the number and amount of uncashed checks, due in advance of the compliance hearing, namely by **February 26, 2027**.

12. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, and rule 3.769(h) of the California Rules of Court—and without impacting the finality of this order—the court retains jurisdiction over plaintiff, all members of the Settlement Class, and defendant for the purpose of supervising the implementation, enforcement, construction, administration, and interpretation of the settlement agreement and this order.

13. Reece shall serve a copy of this order and the accompanying judgment on the LWDA within **five court days**.

Dated: November 6, 2026

JEFFREY S. ROSS
Judge of the Superior Court

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE
(CCP 1010.6 & CRC 2.251)

I, Sean Kane, a Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco, certify that I am not a party to the within action.

On November 6, 2026, I electronically served the attached document via File & ServeXpress on the recipients designated on the Transaction Receipt located on the File & ServeXpress website.

Dated: November 6, 2026

Brandon E. Riley, Court Executive Officer

By: _____
Sean Kane, Deputy Clerk