D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
Emil@d.law
Alvin B. Lindsay (SBN 220236)
a.lindsay@d.law
Enoch Kim (SBN 261146)
e.kim@d.law
Melissa Rodriguez (SBN 352716)
m.rodriguez@d.law
450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Fax: (818) 962-6469

DAVID YEREMIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
david@yeremianlaw.com
450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Fax: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff STEPHEN T. TREMBLEY, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**COUNTY OF ORANGE**

| | |
|---|---|
| STEPHEN T. TREMBLEY, an individual, on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, and the State of California,<br><br>Plaintiff,<br><br>vs.<br><br>LITTLE SISTER OC, LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1-50,<br><br>Defendant. | Case No. 30-2023-01308822-CU-OE-CXC<br><br>Assigned To:<br>Hon. Melissa R. McCormick<br>Dept.: CX-104<br><br>**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**<br><br>[filed concurrently with Declarations of Enoch J. Kim and David Yeremian; and [Proposed] Order]<br><br>Hearing Date: April 24, 2025<br>Time: 2:00 p.m.<br>Department: CX-104 |

**TO THE COURT AND DEFENDANTS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 24, 2025, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in Department CX-104 of the Superior Court for the County of Orange located at 751 West Santa Ana Boulevard, Santa Ana, California, 92701, Plaintiff Stephen T. Trembley ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself, the State of California, and other similarly aggrieved employees (the "Aggrieved Employees") of Defendant Little Sister OC, LLC ("Defendant") (Plaintiff and Defendant collectively referred to herein as "the Parties"), will and hereby does move this Court for entry of an order: (1) approving the representative action settlement embodied in the Parties' PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement"); (2) approving PAGA Counsel's application for attorney's fees and litigation costs and costs for the Administrator; and (3) entering judgment approving the Settlement Agreement (the "Motion").

The grounds for this Motion, as set forth in the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities and supporting Declarations, are that this is a fair and reasonable settlement that benefits the Aggrieved Employees and was the product of informed, non-collusive negotiations by the parties who were represented by experienced and able counsel. *See Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal. App 4th 224, 244-45 (1996); *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1802 (1996); Manual for Complex Litigation, (Second), § 30.44 (1985).

Defendant does not oppose this Motion. Plaintiff bases this Motion on this Notice and the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declarations of Enoch J. Kim and David Yeremian, the complete pleadings, records, and files in the case, and such other further oral and documentary evidence which may be submitted at or before the hearing on this Motion.

DATED: March 7, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

By: ______________________________
Enoch J. Kim
Attorneys for Stephen T. Trembley on behalf of himself and Aggrieved Employees

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### STATE LAW

<u>STATUTES</u>

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. INTRODUCTION

Through this Motion, Plaintiff Stephen T. Trembley ("Plaintiff") requests that the Court grant approval of the parties' PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement") reached between Plaintiff and Defendant Little Sister OC, LLC ("Defendant") (Plaintiff and Defendant collectively referred to herein as "the Parties") to resolve claims brought exclusively under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code § 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA") seeking civil penalties for various violations of the California Labor Code and Industrial Wage Commission's Wage Orders. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will pay a gross settlement amount of $**100,000.00.** (Declaration of Enoch J. Kim ("Kim Decl."), Exhibit 1, ¶ 3.1.) For purposes of the Settlement, the group of aggrieved employees included in the Settlement is defined as "all current and former non-exempt employees who are or were employed by Defendant in California as servers and bussers and related positions during the PAGA Period (or if any such person is incompetent, deceased, or unavailable due to military service, the person's legal representative or successor in interest evidenced by reasonable verification)" ("Aggrieved Employees"). (Kim Decl., Exhibit 1, ¶ 1.4.) The PAGA Period is the period from December 19, 2021 through February 13, 2024. (*Id*., Exhibit 1, ¶ 1.18.)

Given the amount Defendant will pay to effectuate the Settlement, Plaintiff and his counsel ("PAGA Counsel") believe that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and in the best interests of the State and the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Plaintiff requests that the Court "review and approve" the Settlement pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(*l*)(2). If the Court deems the Settlement fair and acceptable, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter an order approving the Settlement in the form lodged herewith and ordering the Parties and Administrator to carry out the terms of the Settlement Agreement and enter a Final Judgment thereon.[1]

---

[1] Plaintiff has submitted the Settlement and this Motion to the LWDA by uploading it on the LWDA's website concurrently with the filing of this Motion as required by Labor Code § 2699(*1*)(2). (Kim Decl., ¶ 40, Exhibit 6.)

## II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

### A. Litigation Overview and Procedural History

On December 13, 2022, Plaintiff Stephen T. Trembley filed a claim online with the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (the "LWDA") pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1) and gave notice to the Defendant ("PAGA Notice"). (Kim Decl., ¶ 4.) The PAGA Notice sought civil penalties and alleged claims against Defendant for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay wages and overtime, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, unlawfully collecting or receiving wages in violation of Labor Code § 221, failure to issue accurate wage statements, failure to issue semimonthly payments in violation of Labor Code § 204, failure to keep records in accordance with Labor Code §1174, failure to pay waiting time penalties, failure to provide paid sick days, and failure to reimburse business expenses Labor Code § 2802. (*Id.*) The LWDA did not respond to the PAGA Notice and did not notify Plaintiff that it intended to investigate Plaintiff's allegations. (*Id.*)

On February 16, 2023, 65 days after Plaintiff's submission of the PAGA Notice, Plaintiff filed this representative lawsuit against Defendant in Orange County Superior Court, Case No, 30-2023-01308822-CU-OE-CXC, for civil penalties under PAGA (the "Action"). (Kim Decl., ¶ 5.) Plaintiff's complaint alleges nine causes of actions, including (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Under Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198; (3) Meal Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512(a), 516, and 1198; (4) Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 1198; (5) Violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 1174; (6) Violation of Labor Code § 204; (7) Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203; (8) Violation of Labor Code 2810.5; and (9) Failure to Reimburse Expenses under Labor Code § 2802. (*Id.*)

Before filing the lawsuit, PAGA Counsel investigated and researched the facts and circumstances underlying the pertinent issues and the law applicable thereto. (Kim Decl., ¶ 6.) This required thorough discussions and interviews between PAGA Counsel and Plaintiff, as well as preliminary research into the various legal issues involved in the case. (*Id.*) As a result of these efforts, PAGA Counsel determined that Plaintiff's claims were well-suited for representative action adjudication owing to what appeared to be a common course of conduct affecting a similarly situated group of employees. (*Id.*)

**B. Mediation and Settlement**

Prior to mediation, Plaintiff conducted comprehensive informal discovery and Defendant provided data and numbers and documents, including an Aggrieved Employee List (by employee number) with hire and termination dates and positions, an employee handbook entitled "2021 Employee Handbook for Little Sister OC LLC dba Little Sister Irvine", and a sampling of employee's timekeeping and payroll data. Defendant also provided information relating to the number of Aggrieved Employees, pay periods, and workweeks. (Kim Decl., ¶ 7.) The information and data exchanged by Plaintiff and Defendant prior to and during mediation and settlement negotiations were sufficient to reliably assess the merits of the Parties' respective positions, to compromise the issues on a fair and equitable basis, and to devise a formula for distribution of civil penalties among the Aggrieved Employees that took into consideration the strength of the PAGA claims. (Kim Decl., ¶ 8.)

On December 15, 2023, the Parties attended an all-day mediation with Steve Serratore, Esq. (Kim Decl., ¶ 9.) During mediation, the Parties exchanged further information and discussed all aspects of the case, including Plaintiff's claims, Defendant's defenses and the prospects of further litigation. (*Id*.) The Parties recognized that the issues presented in the Action are likely only to be resolved with extensive and costly pretrial and trial proceedings and that further litigation would lead to inconvenience, distraction, disruption, delay, and expense disproportionate to the potential benefits of litigation. (*Id*.) The Parties took into account the risk and uncertainty of the outcome inherent in any litigation. (*Id*.)

With the assistance of a highly respected wage and hour mediator, the Parties agreed to the general terms for settling this Action and finalized the long-form PAGA Settlement Agreement. (Kim Decl., ¶ 10.) The Parties also entered into a separate individual settlement agreement (the "Separate Individual Agreement") addressing the general release Plaintiff is providing to Defendant and the related consideration. (*Id*.)

The Parties believe and agree that the Settlement provides for a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the Action and have arrived at the Settlement after extensive, arm's length negotiations, considering all relevant factors, present and potential. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11.) PAGA Counsel believes that the Settlement confers real benefits upon the State and Aggrieved Employees and that an independent review of the Settlement by the Court in the approval process will confirm this conclusion. (*Id*.)

## III. PAGA ACTIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS

### A. The PAGA Statutory Scheme

PAGA creates a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code on behalf of the LWDA. *Brown v. Ralphs Grocery Co*. (2011) 197 Cal. App. 4th 489, 501, *review den.* (Oct. 19, 2011, No. S195850), *cert. denied* 132 S.Ct. 1910 (Apr. 16, 2012). A plaintiff may not — and Plaintiff here does not — bring a PAGA claim simply on his or her own behalf as an individual claim, but "as the proxy or agent of the state's labor law enforcement agencies." *Id*., at 986; *see also Reyes v. Macy's, Inc*. (2011) 202 Cal. App. 4th 1119, 1123-1124; *Iskanian v. CLS Transp. Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348, 380. When an aggrieved employee brings a PAGA claim, "the government is always the real party in interest." *Securitas Sec. Servs. USA, Inc. v. Sup. Ct. of San Diego Cnty*. (2015) 234 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 1119; *Montano v. The Wet Seal Retail, Inc*. (2015) 232 Cal. App. 4th 1214, 1222 ("[A] PAGA action is a dispute between an employer and the State agency."). Accordingly, a plaintiff that brings a PAGA claim represents "the same legal right and interest as state labor law enforcement agencies," in that the plaintiff seeks to recover those civil penalties that the LWDA otherwise would assess and collect. *Arias v. Super. Ct.* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, 986; Labor Code § 2699(a) & (f); *Securitas, supra*, 234 Cal. App. 4th at 1119; *see also Medina v. Vander Poel* (E.D. Cal. 2015) 523 B.R. 820, 825 (holding "PAGA plaintiffs do not have property rights in their cases."), and *Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 993, 1003.

Therefore, when a plaintiff brings a PAGA claim, he or she is properly viewed as a private attorney general prosecuting violations of California's labor laws on behalf of the state. An employee may commence a PAGA action by fulfilling the requirements of California Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1), which simply states: "The aggrieved employee or representative shall give written notice by certified mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violation." Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1). As explained above, Plaintiff complied with the notice requirements and properly pled a PAGA claim. (Kim Decl. ¶¶ 4-5.)

### B. The Court Has Discretion When Awarding the Amount of Penalties.

PAGA provides for penalties in the amount of $100 for each violation per aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and $200 for each violation per aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation. Labor Code § 2699(f)(2). "PAGA penalties...are mandatory, not discretionary" and must be awarded upon a showing that Defendants violated the Labor Code. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1213. However, PAGA provides the Court with discretion when it finds liability and awards these penalties as part of a judgment. Labor Code § 2699(e)(2) states that "a court may award a lesser amount than the maximum civil penalty amount specified by this part if, based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory."

### C. PAGA Authorizes the Payment of PAGA Counsel's Fees and Costs

PAGA provides for the recovery of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Labor Code § 2699(g)(1) ("Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs, including any filing fee paid…"). The monetary settlement and programmatic relief make Plaintiff a "prevailing party." *Folsom v. Butte County Ass'n of Gov'ts* (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 668,671; *Santisas v. Goodin* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 599, 621. Even if Labor Code § 2699(g)(1) did not authorize fees, Plaintiff would be entitled to fees as a Private Attorney General under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 because Plaintiff brought this action to, and the action does, benefit the public. *Arias*, 46 Cal.4th at 985–986.

## IV. <u>THE SETTLEMENT</u>

Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will pay the total amount of $100,000.00 ("Gross Settlement Amount") in full and final settlement of the PAGA claim alleged in the Action. (Kim Decl., ¶ 13, Exhibit 1, ¶ 3.1.)

Pending Court approval, the Gross Settlement Amount will be allocated as follows: (1) attorneys' fees of up to 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is **$35,000.00** ("PAGA Counsel Fees Payment"); (2) actual litigation costs incurred in this matter in the amount of **$18,206.96**

(**“**PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment”); (3) settlement administration costs of up to **$5,000.00** to be paid to the Settlement Administrator, ILYM Group Inc., for sending notices and for calculating settlement shares and preparing all checks and mailings (“Administration Expenses Payment”); and (4) PAGA Penalties in the amount of $41,793.04, with 75% ($31,344.78) allocated to the LWDA (“LWDA PAGA Payment”) and 25% ($10,448.26) allocated to the Aggrieved Employees (“Individual PAGA Payments”). (Kim Decl., ¶ 13.) The Individual PAGA Payments will be calculated based on the number of pay periods the Aggrieved Employee worked during the PAGA Period of December 19, 2021 through February 13, 2024 (“PAGA Pay Periods”). (Kim Decl., Exhibit 1, ¶¶ 1.10, 1.19.)

Based on its records, Defendant represents that there are approximately 3,750 PAGA Pay Periods in the aggregate from December 19, 2021 through February 13, 2024. (Kim Decl., ¶ 12, Exhibit 1, ¶ 4.1.) In the event that the total PAGA Pay Periods are greater than 10% more than 3,750, either the Gross Settlement Amount will increase proportionately according to the percentage increase in PAGA Pay Periods above 10% (i.e., a 12% increase above 3,750 results in a 2% increase in the Gross Settlement Amount) or Defendant may elect to limit the last day of the PAGA Period to the date on which the PAGA Pay Periods reached 10% more than 3,750. (*Id*.)

Based on this information, Plaintiff estimates that the average payment to the Aggrieved Employees will be approximately $62.94 ($10,448.26 divided by 166 which is the approximate number of Aggrieved Employees based on the data given at the time of mediation). (Kim Decl., ¶ 13.)

## V. ARGUMENT

### A. The Court Should Approve the Settlement Agreement.

Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(*l*), the Parties must obtain Court approval of a settlement of a PAGA action on a representative basis. However, as explained in *Arias v. Superior Ct*. (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, the Parties need not follow the class action procedural rules in PAGA cases, and therefore, need not obtain approval of the PAGA settlement through a motion for preliminary or final approval. Nonetheless, to comply with the requirements of Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff submits this Motion and the Settlement Agreement for Court approval.

### B. The Risks of Moving Forward with Plaintiff's PAGA Claim

To help the Court evaluate the fairness of the Settlement, below is a discussion of the risk evaluation made by Plaintiff and PAGA Counsel. They considered the arguments and defenses asserted by Defendant at mediation and assessed the risks of moving forward to trial and what this Court could do in awarding penalties even if Plaintiff prevailed at trial.

Plaintiff estimated that the maximum potential exposure on the PAGA claim is $375,000.00, calculated by multiplying the total number of PAGA Pay Periods (3,750) by $100 per violation. (Kim Decl., ¶ 18.) Plaintiff's calculation of the total potential exposure on the PAGA claim was based on one PAGA penalty per PAGA Pay Period (i.e., Plaintiff did not stack the PAGA penalties in his damages calculation). (*Id*.) Case law supports the notion that it is inappropriate to "stack" penalties for multiple violations, particularly when those violations all stem from the same alleged "injury." (*Id*. at ¶ 19.)

The Gross Settlement Amount of $100,000.00 is approximately 26.67% of the maximum potential exposure of $375,000.00. (*Id*. at ¶ 21.) The Gross Settlement Amount therefore represents a strong value at approximately $26.67 per PAGA Pay Period. (*Id*.) From PAGA Counsel's review of the facts, strengths and weaknesses of the case, the risks and delays posed by further litigation, PAGA Counsel believes that the recovery for the State and Aggrieved Employee is fair and reasonable. (*Id*.)

### C. Trial of Plaintiff's PAGA Claims Would Have Presented Many Hurdles.

Defendant denied and continues to deny all of the claims made by Plaintiff in this Action and contends that it acted at all relevant times in conformance with the law. (*Id*. at ¶ 16.) Defendant contends that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were paid for all hours worked and that Defendant prohibited Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees from working beyond their scheduled shifts; that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees signed a meal period waiver for shifts between five and six hours and therefore Defendant was not required to provide Aggrieved Employees with meal periods for shifts of less than six hours; that Defendant paid all wages due on a timely basis; that Defendant paid all wages due on a timely basis and using Labor Code compliant instruments; that Defendant's wage statements complied with the law; and that neither Plaintiff nor any Aggrieved Employees incurred reasonable business-related expenses for which they were not reimbursed. (*Id*.) As a result, PAGA Counsel had to appropriately discount the amount recoverable from Defendant in a settlement. (*Id*.)

**D. The Court May Have Exercised Its Discretion to Reduce Civil Penalties.**

"PAGA penalties…are mandatory, not discretionary" and the Court must award penalties upon a showing that Defendant violated the Labor Code. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1157, 1213; *Moreno v. Autozone, Inc*. (N.D. Cal. June 5, 2007) No. C05-04432 MJJ, 2007 WL 1650942, at *3. However, PAGA does provide the Court with discretion when it awards these penalties. In departing from the $100/pay period calculation to arrive at the $100,000.00 Gross Settlement Amount in this case, Plaintiff considered various reasons why the Court may reduce any eventual recovery at its discretion and considered that PAGA penalties are not mandatory but permissive. (Kim Decl., at ¶ 20.) Labor Code § 2699(e)(2) states that "a court may award a lesser amount than the maximum civil penalty amount specified by this part if, based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory." (*See also Thurman v. Bayshore* (2012) 203 Cal. App. 4th 1112 (reducing PAGA penalties by 30% under this provision).

**VI. <u>THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS</u>**

**A. The Court Should Approve the Requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs**

PAGA Counsel is requesting a PAGA Counsel Fees Payment of **$35,000.00** and a PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of **$18,206.96.** (Kim Decl., at ¶ 22.)

Prior to the enactment of PAGA, when the State had the resources to seek civil penalties on behalf of the public, it paid its employees (including their attorneys) their salaries and benefits for pursuing such penalties. The Legislature enacted PAGA because the Labor Commissioner and other agencies were hampered in their enforcement of civil penalties by inadequate funding and staffing constraints. *Iskanian*, *supra*, 59 Cal.4th at 379. To facilitate broader enforcement, the Legislature enacted PAGA, authorizing "aggrieved employees" to pursue civil penalties on the state's behalf. Labor Code § 2699(a). In creating PAGA, the Legislature expressly provided that the private counsel retained by the Plaintiff to represent the public's interest can recover fees if the Plaintiff is the prevailing party. Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

1) <u>PAGA Counsel Are Entitled to Fees from the Civil Penalties Recovered</u>

As previously indicated, this is *not* a class action. However, like a class action, it is a representative action where instead of a class, the Plaintiff represents the State and the public. As a matter of law and substance, counsel's client is the public at large and the State of California. The Plaintiff is simply a "proxy" for the State. On August 11, 2016, the California Supreme Court decided *Laffitte v. Robert Half International*, which addressed, in a class action context, the correct methodology for awarding fees in a representative action settlement. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc*. (2016) 205 Cal.Rptr.3d 555, 573. The *Laffitte* Court approved awarding fees as a percentage of the settlement fund.:

> We join the overwhelming majority of federal and state courts in holding that when class action litigation establishes a monetary fund for the benefit of the class members, and the trial court in its equitable powers awards Class Counsel a fee out of that fund, the court may determine the amount of a reasonable fee by choosing an appropriate percentage of the fund created.

*Id*. at p. 573. Here, the $100,00.00 common fund created for the benefit of the public is, with Plaintiff as a proxy for the State, not unlike the fund created in class action settlements, with the public the equivalent of the class referenced in *Laffitte*.

The Court, in *Laffitte,* pointed out several reasons why the percentage-of-the-fund method is preferred over the alternative lodestar-multiplier approach in California courts:

> The recognized advantages of the percentage method—including relative ease of calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better approximation of market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement it provides counsel to seek an early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging the litigation [citations]—convince us the percentage method is a valuable tool that should not be denied our trial courts.

*Id*. at 573.

An award of 35% of the civil penalties realized in the Settlement is appropriate here under the "substantial benefit" theory. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co*. (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1810; *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 224, 254. That theory permits a litigant who has sued in a representative capacity to recover fees from the beneficiaries of that representation. Courts exercise their inherent equitable powers to assess attorneys' fees against the entire fund, thereby spreading the cost of those fees among the public who benefits from PAGA actions. *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 35 (*Serrano III).* As this approach "better approximates the workings of the marketplace than the lodestar approach," there is "a greater judicial willingness to evaluate a fee award as a percentage of the recovery." *Lealao v. Beneficial Calif., Inc*. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 19, 31, 48.

2) <u>The Attorneys' Fees Request Is Within the Range of Reasonable Fees</u>

PAGA Counsel at D.Law, Inc. are experienced employment attorneys with expertise in wage and hour class and representative actions. (Kim Decl., ¶¶ 31-37; *See* Declaration of David Yeremian ("Yeremian Decl."), ¶¶ 4-10.) Throughout this case, PAGA Counsel have borne, and continue to bear, the entire risk and cost of litigation associated with this Action on a purely contingency basis. (Kim Decl., ¶ 24.) As a result, PAGA Counsel have yet to receive any compensation for the amount of time and money invested in the case to date. (*Id*.) Moreover, courts in this county and others have approved attorneys' fees awards in other PAGA settlements on a common fund basis at higher percentages than the 35% Plaintiff is requesting here. (*Id*. at ¶¶ 26-27.)

For these reasons, PAGA Counsel's requested fee of 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount is well within the range of reasonableness and is fair compensation for undertaking this complex and risky litigation on a contingent basis.

3) <u>PAGA Counsel's Fee Request Is Reasonable Under the Lodestar Crosscheck.</u>

PAGA Counsel's fee request is reasonable when calculated using the lodestar method. Under the lodestar method, a base fee amount is calculated from a compilation of time reasonably spent on the case and the reasonable hourly compensation of the attorney. *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 48. The court then may enhance this lodestar figure by a "multiplier" to account for a range of factors, such as the novelty and difficulty of the case, its contingent nature, and the degree of success achieved. *Id*. at 49; *see also Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-36; *Thayer v. Wells Fargo Bank* (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 819, 834, ("[t]here is no…rule limiting the factors that may justify an exercise of judicial discretion to [adjust the] lodestar").

Here, the lodestar cross check establishes that the fees requested are <u>less</u> than the amount warranted by lodestar analysis; therefore, the factors warranting positive multipliers do not come into play, even though they were apparent in this case.

PAGA Counsel worked at least 66.13 hours on this matter and calculated the base lodestar at $36,862.00 at rates reflecting those currently earned in the marketplace. (Kim Decl.,¶¶ 27-29.) Attorney Alvin B. Lindsay records indicate at least 9.9 hours on this matter with an hourly rate of $800. (*Id*.) Attorney Melissa Rodriguez's records indicate at least 39.23 hours on this matter with an hourly rate of $400. (*Id*.) Attorney Enoch Kim's records indicate at least 12 hours on this matter with an hourly rate of $750. Attorney David Yeremian's records indicate at least 5 hours on this matter with an hourly rate of $850 (Kim Decl.,¶¶ 28-29; Yeremian Decl., ¶ 17). Thus, consideration of the lodestar method as a cross-check to the percentage figure sought strongly supports the reasonableness of the requested fee award. PAGA Counsel respectfully request the Court grant their request for $35,000.00 in fees, which requires **no multiplier**.

4) <u>The Court Should Approve the Reimbursement of PAGA Counsel's Costs.</u>

The litigation expenses incurred by PAGA Counsel in this Action are also to be reimbursed under the Settlement Agreement. The Parties, in their Settlement Agreement, agreed to an amount of up to $10,000.00 for PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. (Kim Decl., ¶ 22.) However, at the time the Parties settled, PAGA Counsel underestimated the expenses incurred. (*Id*.) PAGA Counsel is now seeking and requesting a PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of $18,206.96 in reimbursement for actual litigation costs, which Defendant does not oppose. (*Id*.) The lion's share of these costs were incurred in connection with mediation, and the others listed were all reasonably incurred and necessary to the prosecution of this Action. (*Id*.) Thus, PAGA Counsel respectfully request the Court approve their request for reimbursement in the amount of $18,206.96.

## VII. <u>THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION AND NOTICE</u>

The Parties agreed to use ILYM Group, Inc. ("ILYM") as the third-party settlement administrator in this case. (Kim Decl., ¶ 38.) ILYM will be responsible for updating the addresses for Aggrieved Employees, mailing a notice of Settlement and calculating and distributing the settlement checks, among other duties. (*Id*.) ILYM capped its fees at $5,000.00 for administering the Settlement, and based on PAGA Counsel's experience in other class and PAGA settlements, ILYM's costs for administering this Settlement are fair and reasonable. (*Id*.)

The Settlement Administrator will mail the Individual PAGA Payment along with a letter providing notice of the Settlement and release of claims to Aggrieved Employees ("Notice of PAGA Settlement and Release of Claims"). (*Id*. at ¶ 39.) The Notice of PAGA Settlement and Release of Claims includes, among other things, an explanation of PAGA, a description of the allegations in the Action and the scope of released claims, and a statement of the Gross Settlement Amount and payment allocations from the Gross Settlement Amount. (*Id*.)

## VIII. CONCLUSION

Plaintiff and PAGA Counsel submit that the proposed Settlement, as documented in the Settlement Agreement, is fair, adequate, reasonable, and in the best interest of Plaintiff, Defendant, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court approve the Settlement and order the Parties to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the Settlement Agreement and enter the concurrently filed [Proposed] Order Granting Approval and Judgment to that end.

DATED: March 7, 2025

D.LAW, INC

By ______________________

Enoch J. Kim
Attorney for Plaintiff Stephen T. Trembley on behalf of himself and Aggrieved Employees