BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
Norman B. Blumenthal (SBN #068687)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (SBN #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (SBN #248066)
Christine T. LeVu (SBN 288271)
Adolfo Sanchez Contreras (SBN 354371)
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858) 551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

SULLIVAN & YAECKEL LAW GROUP, APC
Eric K. Yaeckel [CSB No. 274608]
yaeckel@sullivanlawgroupapc.com
Cody D. Archer [CSB No. 361361]
cody@sullivanlawgroupapc.com
2330 Third Avenue
San Diego, California 92101
(619) 702-6760 * (619) 702-6761 FAX

Attorneys for *Plaintiff*

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY

JENNIFER GOLEMAN, on behalf of the State of California, as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PACKERS SANITATION SERVICES, LTD., LLC, a Limited Liability Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV003770

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO APPROVE PAGA SETTLEMENT; and,

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

Hearing Date: May 22, 2026
Hearing Time: 8:32 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Thomas W. Wills
Dept.: 15

Action Filed: July 5, 2023
Transferred: November 17, 2023
Trial Date: Not Set

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT at 8:32 a.m. on May 22, 2026, or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, in Department 15 of the above entitled Court before the Honorable Thomas W. Wills, Plaintiff Jennifer Goleman ("Plaintiff") will and hereby does move for an order approving the settlement of the PAGA claim alleged against Defendant Packers Sanitation Services, Ltd., LLC ("Defendant") in accordance with Labor Code §2699(l). The proposed settlement is set forth in the accompanying PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement").

This Motion will be based on this notice, the accompanying points and authorities, the Declaration of Christine T. LeVu ("Declaration of LeVu"), Declaration of Eric K. Yaeckel ("Declaration of Yaeckel"), the Agreement, and the complete files and records in this action. The Labor Workforce Development Agency has been served with this motion and the Settlement Agreement as set forth in the accompanying proof of service.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 28, 2026

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG
BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: ______________
Christine T. LeVu
Attorneys for Plaintiff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RELEVANT FACTS 2

III. TERMS OF THE PAGA SETTLEMENT 4

IV. THE PARTIES HAVE SETTLED THE PAGA CLAIMS 6

V. THE PARTIES REQUEST REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SETTLMENT OF THE PAGA CLAIM 7

- A. The PAGA Settlement Amount To Be Paid Is Fair And Reasonable 7
- B. The Remaining Settlement Terms Are Fair And Reasonable 9

VI. THE ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE 10

VII. CONCLUSION 12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases:

Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Mgmt., LLC, 69 Cal. App. 5th 521 (2021) 10

Boyd v. Bank of America, 2014 WL 6473804 (C.D. Cal. 2014)....................11

Cardenas v. McLane Foodservice, Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13126 (C.D. Cal. 2011) 8

Carrington v. Starbucks Corp., 30 Cal. App. 5th 504 (2018) 8

Chavez v. Netflix, Inc., 162 Cal.App.4th 43 (2008) 10

Fleming v. Covidien, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154590 (C.D. Cal. 2011)....................8

Hopkins v. Stryker Sales Corp., 2013 WL 496358 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013) 11

In re Taco Bell Wage & Hour Actions, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48557 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2016)....................8

Iskanian v. CLS Transportation, 59 Cal. 4th 348 (2014)....................1

Ketchum v. Moses, 24 Cal.4th 1122 (2001) 11

Kim v. Reins Int'l Cal., Inc., 9 Cal. 5th 73 (2020) 3

Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l Inc., 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016) 10, 11

Makabi v. Gedalia, 2016 Cal. App. Unpub. 1489 (2nd Dist. Ct. of App. Mar. 6, 2016) 8

Pellegrino v. Robert Half Intern., Inc., 182 Cal.App.4th 278 (2010) 11

Stetson v. Grissom, 821 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2016) 11

Vandervort v. Balboa Capital Corp., 8 F. Supp. 3d 1200 (C.D. Cal. 2014) 11

Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc., 91 Cal.App.4th 224 (2001)....................11

ZB, N.A. v. Superior Court, 8 Cal. 5th 175 (2019) 1, 4, 6

Statutes:

California Labor Code §2698 2
California Labor Code §2699 ....1, 4
California Labor Code §2699 (1)..........6, 9
California Labor Code §2699 (1)(2)..........1, 4
California Labor Code §2699 (e)(1)..........7
California Labor Code §2699 (g)(1)..........1, 6
California Labor Code §2699 (l)..........1, 7
California Labor Code §2699.5..........5

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Jennifer Goleman ("Plaintiff") reached a settlement of the California Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §2699, *et seq*. ("PAGA") claim asserted in this action against Defendant Packers Sanitation Services, Ltd., LLC ("Defendant") (collectively, the "Parties") which provides for a "Gross PAGA Settlement Amount" payment in the amount of $1,430,000.00. In accordance with California Labor Code §2699(l), Plaintiff now asks this Court to review and approve the settlement of Plaintiff's PAGA claims.[1] This is only a settlement of the PAGA claims for civil penalties and is not a class settlement and does not release the individual wage claims, if any, of the affected employees other than the Plaintiff herself. Cal. Labor Code § 2699(g)(1); *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation*, 59 Cal. 4th 348, 381 (2014); *ZB, N.A. v. Superior Court*, 8 Cal. 5th 175, 182 (2019) (unpaid wages are not recoverable under PAGA).

The PAGA settlement is set forth in the accompanying PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") and the form used for Agreement is the Los Angeles Superior Court's model form. A true and correct copy of the Agreement which sets forth the terms for the settlement of the PAGA claims is attached as Exhibit #1 to the Declaration of Christine T. LeVu ("Declaration of LeVu"), served and filed in support of this motion.. Capitalized terms shall have the same meaning as defined in the Agreement. The LWDA received notice of this Settlement, and this motion as set forth in the accompanying proof of service.

A proposed order confirming review and approval of the PAGA settlement is submitted herewith.

/ / /

/ / /

[1] Section 2699(1)(2) provides as follows: "The superior court shall review and approve any settlement of any civil action pursuant to this part."

II. RELEVANT FACTS

PAGA Counsel mailed the necessary correspondence to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") on January 3, 2023, on behalf of Plaintiff Goleman, requesting authorization from the LWDA to seek civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") for the wage and hour violations alleged in the PAGA Notice. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶3). The 65-day notice period for the LWDA to notify of its intent to investigate expired on March 9, 2023. On July 5, 2023, Plaintiff Goleman filed a Representative Action Complaint in this Court against Defendant Packers Sanitation Services, Ltd., LLC alleging a single cause of action for recovery of civil penalties for Violation of the PAGA [Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq*.] in the Superior Court for the Count of Imperial. On November 17, 2023, the case was transferred to the Monterey County Superior Court.

Subsequently, Plaintiff and Defendant agreed to mediate with Todd Smith, Esq on January 20, 2026. Prior to the mediation, the Parties conducted significant investigation and discovery of the facts and law. Defendant produced hundreds of documents relating to its policies, practices, and procedures regarding paying non-exempt employees for all hours worked, overtime, meal and rest period policies, payroll and operations policies, and more. Plaintiff was provided with sufficient records and data to determine the number of Aggrieved Employees and the number of pay periods in the PAGA Period. The Parties agree that the above-described investigation and evaluation, as well as the information exchanged during the settlement negotiations, are more than sufficient to assess the merits of the Parties' positions and to compromise the issues on a fair and equitable basis. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶3).

Plaintiff's theory of PAGA liability as argued at mediation alleged that Defendant required Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock during meal periods, contacted Aggrieved Employees after hours on personal cell phone for scheduling, and routinely altered time records to avoid payment of overtime. Plaintiff alleged Defendant is liable for miscalculating overtime and sick pay as a result of not including certain remunerations into the regular rate. For example, the following additional remunerations were not fully incorporated into the regular rate for the purpose of paying the correct overtime: SAFETY (7), SPECIAL (1), and SUPPORT (32). Moreover, Plaintiff also alleged at mediation that Defendant issued inaccurate wage statements to the Aggrieved Employees. For example, time spent completing assigned tasks outside of scheduled hours, including, but not limited to donning and offing personal protective equipment. Defendant maintained that it always complied with applicable wage and hour regulations. Specifically, Defendant argued that its policies, documents, and expert analysis supported a conclusion that the calculation of the regular rate accounted for all applicable renumeration consistent with applicable law.

On January 20, 2026, the Parties engaged in an all-day mediation session before Mediator Smith, a respected and experienced mediator knowledgeable of both the wage and hour laws and representative claims at issue in this action. Through arms-length negotiations with the assistance of the mediator, the Parties reached an agreement to settle the PAGA claims in this action which led to the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding memorializing the settlement.[2] (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶3).

The settlement was negotiated in light of all known facts and circumstances and the uncertainty associated with litigation – including the risk of Plaintiff not being able to maintain representative claims, the difficulty of proving Plaintiff's claims in a manageable trial, the merits of Defendant's potential defenses, and the significant delay and potential appellate issues inherent to litigation – and was reached after extensive arm's length negotiations, with the assistance of Mediator Smith. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶3).

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

---

[2] In addition to the Gross PAGA Settlement Amount, Defendant has agreed to separately settle Plaintiff's individual claims pursuant to separate confidential Individual Settlement Agreement ("Individual Settlement") (Settlement Agreement at ¶ 2.2). The individual claims were not at issue in this action and exist independent and apart from the PAGA claims at issue before the Court. *See Kim v. Reins Int'l Cal., Inc.*, 9 Cal. 5th 73, 80 (2020) (the "[s]ettlement of individual claims does not strip an Aggrieved Employee of standing, as the state's authorized representative, to pursue PAGA remedies" nor resolve the PAGA claims.).

III. TERMS OF THE PAGA SETTLEMENT

The PAGA settlement is subject to Court approval consistent with Labor Code §2699(1)(2). (Agreement at ¶¶ 6.1-6.3). The Agreement negotiated by the Parties provides for a "Gross PAGA Settlement Amount" payment in the amount of $1,430,000 to resolve the Released PAGA Claims (hereinafter referred to as the "PAGA Settlement"). From this PAGA Settlement of $1,430,000, there is a deduction of attorneys' fees ("PAGA Counsel Fees Payment") in the amount of $476,666 (which is one-third of the PAGA Settlement), reimbursement of incurred costs ("PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment") in an amount not to exceed $42,000, Service Award to Plaintiff in the amount of $15,000 ("Service Payment"), and Settlement Administration Costs ("Administration Expenses Payment") not to exceed $12,950. (Agreement at ¶¶ 3.2.1-3.2.3).[3] After these deductions, the amount remaining is the "PAGA Payment", which is estimated to be no less than $883,384.

Of the PAGA Payment amount, seventy-five percent (75%) (no less than $662,538) will be paid to the LWDA and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) (no less than $220,846) will be paid to the Aggrieved Employees (Agreement at ¶ 3.2.3).[4] This 75/25 allocation is required by Labor Code §2699 as explained by *ZB, N.A. v. Superior Court*, 8 Cal.5th 175 (2019).

The Individual PAGA Payment for each Aggrieved Employee shall be based on the number of pay periods each Aggrieved Employee worked during the PAGA Period as an Aggrieved Employee, as a percentage of the total pay periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during from July 5, 2022 to March 20, 2026.[5] The PAGA Period is the time period

---

[3] If the Court approves a PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and/or a PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder of these amounts to the PAGA Payment. (Settlement Agreement at ¶ 3.2.1). To the extent the Administration Expenses are less, or the Court approves payment less than $12,950, the Administrator will allocate the remainder of this amount to the PAGA Payment (*Id*. at ¶ 3.2.2).

[4] "Aggrieved Employee" means all individuals who are or previously were employed Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee during the period from July 5, 2022 to March 20, 2026. (Settlement Agreement at ¶¶ 1.4, 1.23).

[5] See Settlement Agreement at ¶ 3.2.3 ("The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Payment by

from July 5, 2022 to March 20, 2026. (Agreement at ¶ 1.23). Based on a review of its records to date, Defendant estimates there are 2,386 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 90,074 PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period. (Agreement at ¶ 4.1).

Upon entry of final judgment, the Released Parties shall be entitled to a release from the Aggrieved Employees for any "Released PAGA Claims", which means all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint, and the PAGA Notices submitted by Plaintiff to the LWDA, which occurred during the PAGA Period, including violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204 et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 et seq., 510, 512, 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), violation of applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) including but not limited to IWC Wage orders 4-2001 and 5-2001, and pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.5, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and California class claims, and Plaintiff's individual claims that are subject to a separate release, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA period. *(*Agreement at ¶ 5.1*)*

Within fourteen (14) days after Defendant funds the Gross PAGA Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, and the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and PAGA Counsel Expenses Payment. (Agreement at ¶ 4.4).[6] Checks will remain negotiable for one hundred eighty (180) days. (*Id*. at ¶ 4.4.1) For any Individual PAGA Payment check that is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds

---

the total number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Period Pay Periods.")

[6] Disbursement of the PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment shall not precede disbursement of the Individual PAGA Payments. (*Id.*).

represented by such checks to Legal Aid at Work in the name of the individual who failed to cash their check, subject to Court approval. (*Id*. at ¶ 4.4.3).

Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699(1), Plaintiff is providing a copy of the Agreement and this motion to the LWDA concurrently with the filing of the instant motion for settlement approval as set forth in the accompanying proof of service in compliance with Labor Code section 2699(1). In addition, Plaintiff shall submit to the LWDA a copy of the Court's judgment and order approving the Agreement within ten (10) days after entry of judgment or order.

IV. THE PARTIES HAVE SETTLED THE PAGA CLAIMS

The claim before this Court is solely the representative claim under PAGA on behalf of the State of California for civil penalties pursuant to the PAGA. The parties have agreed to settle this PAGA claim in its entirety after investigation and an arm's length mediation session. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶4.) The settlement is intended to fully and finally resolve the Released PAGA Claims asserted by Plaintiff on behalf of the State of California. This is only a settlement of the PAGA claims for civil penalties and is not a class settlement and does not release the individual claims, if any, of the Aggrieved Employees, other than any claims under PAGA. This settlement does not release any claim that is not a PAGA claim.[7] PAGA Counsel Fees equal to one-third of the Gross PAGA Settlement amount ($476,666), and PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed $42,000 will also be paid to PAGA Counsel as part of the settlement in accordance with California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), as set forth in the Agreement.[8] Lastly, payment to the Administrator in an amount not to exceed $12,950 to perform the administrative duties to distribute the settlement money shall also be paid. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶¶ 4-5.)

---

[7] As explained by the Supreme Court in *ZB, N.A.*, 8 Cal. 5th at 196: "Nonparty employees are bound by the judgment in an action under the PAGA, but only with respect to recovery of civil penalties."

[8] As set forth in the accompanying Declaration of LeVu, PAGA Counsel incurred costs in the current amount of $29,116.24, which is less than the cost allocation in the Settlement Agreement. See Declaration of LeVu at ¶ 9.

V. THE PARTIES REQUEST REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SETTLMENT OF THE PAGA CLAIM

Labor Code § 2699(l) requires that the Court "shall review and approve any settlement of any civil [PAGA] action filed pursuant to this part. The proposed settlement shall be submitted to the agency at the same time that it is submitted to the court." Consequently, the parties respectfully ask the Court to review and approve the settlement of the PAGA claims and the PAGA Payment to be paid as part of the proposed settlement.

A. The PAGA Settlement Amount To Be Paid Is Fair And Reasonable

The Parties believe that the PAGA Settlement amount is fair and reasonable and therefore "shall" be reviewed and approved. Here, the Gross PAGA Settlement Amount of $1,430,000 is more than other PAGA settlements as it constitutes approximately $15.88 per PAGA Pay Period.[9] (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶6.)

This PAGA Settlement amount compares favorably to the estimated amount of PAGA penalties. With the assistance of an expert, Plaintiff calculated that the maximum amount of statutory PAGA civil penalties was potentially $9,007,400 based on 90,074 PAGA pay periods applicable to the Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period.[10] (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶6.) Importantly, however, these calculations were performed at the maximum statutory rate for the penalties, when in fact, it is likely that any penalties awarded would be at a lower rate. California Labor Code Section 2699(e)(1) permits a Court to award a lesser amount than the maximum civil penalty if based on the facts and circumstances to do otherwise would result in an award that is "unjust, arbitrary and oppressive or confiscatory."

---

[9] A Based on a review of its records to date, Defendant estimates there are 2,386 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 90,074 PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period. (Settlement Agreement at ¶ 4.1)

[10] Stacking is where more than one civil penalty is imposed in a pay period for the same conduct. The valuation of $9,007,400 is the civil penalty amount without stacking. If stacking is permitted, then the valuation increases with each additional penalty added to each pay period. Plaintiff, however, is not aware of any PAGA award which permitted stacking and in the cases cited herein, only one penalty per pay period was assessed.

In *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp*., 30 Cal. App. 5th 504 (2018), the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment after trial which only provided for a PAGA penalty of $5 per pay period. Therefore, at trial, any PAGA penalties awarded could be significantly less than Plaintiff's calculation even where Plaintiff prevailed on the PAGA claim. If the amount of $5 per pay period from *Carrington v. Starbucks* is used, the potential recovery of civil penalties would be only $450,370, which is far less than this settlement provides. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶6.)

Under PAGA, Courts have considerable discretion to reduce the penalty award. In *Fleming v. Covidien*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154590 (C.D. Cal. 2011), a federal court reduced PAGA penalties from $2,800,000 to $500,000, a reduction of 82.2%, because the court found maximum penalties "unjust" because the employees had suffered no injuries. Some trial courts have actually awarded no civil penalties, even when Labor Code violations are established. See *Makabi v. Gedalia*, 2016 Cal. App. Unpub. 1489, *5-7 (2nd Dist. Ct. of App. Mar. 6, 2016) (no PAGA penalties were awarded by the Los Angeles County Superior Court) (unpublished decision); *In re Taco Bell Wage & Hour Actions*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48557, *40-43 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2016) (PAGA penalties denied after trial).

In order to recover any PAGA penalties, Plaintiff would be required at trial to prove each of the underlying Labor Code violations. See *Cardenas v. McLane Foodservice, Inc*., 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13126, *10 (C.D. Cal. 2011) ("Given the statutory language [of PAGA], a plaintiff cannot recover on behalf of individuals whom the plaintiff has not proven suffered a violation of the Labor Code by the defendant."). Here, Plaintiff would need to prove that each Aggrieved Employee suffered a violation for each period the employee worked in relation to meal or rest period violations, failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime and sick pay wages, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to reimburse employees for required expenses, and failure to pay wages when due.

Defendant maintains that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were properly compensated, and that it did not violate the Labor Code. Accordingly, Defendant disputes and denies Plaintiff's allegations and claims asserted in both the PAGA Notice and the Operative Complaint, which are resolved by the Agreement. Defendant asserted additional defenses to the PAGA claim, not only as to liability but also as to the amount of the penalties. Defendant could argue that no penalties prior to the PAGA notification should be awarded because the violations were not intentional, and at least one Court has so ruled. These defenses present a risk to the PAGA claims and the potential that some or all of the PAGA penalties sought may not be awarded. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶7.)

Given Defendant's potential defenses to the violations at issue, the risks and costs of continued litigation, Plaintiff and her attorneys believe that the PAGA Settlement is fair and reasonable. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶7.) Defendant has similarly concluded that it is desirable that the action is settled in the manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement in order to avoid further expense, inconvenience and distraction of further legal proceedings, as well as the uncertainty of litigation. Defendant has determined that it is desirable and beneficial to put to rest the claims in this action and Defendant agrees that the PAGA Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

PAGA Counsel have significant experience litigating wage and hour claims including claims for PAGA penalties, and the PAGA Settlement here is similar to settlements that courts have approved. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶¶ 7, 10.) The PAGA Settlement, along with the other terms of the proposed settlement, were negotiated by experienced counsel at arm's length with the assistance of a private mediator, Todd Smith, Esq. (Declaration of LeVu, at ¶7.)

As set forth in the accompanying proof of service, the LWDA has been provided notice of this motion and the PAGA settlement. The decision of the LWDA to accept the PAGA Settlement and not oppose the motion should be given considerable weight. This is not a situation where the Court needs to be concerned about the rights of absent employees as in a class settlement, as this PAGA-only settlement does not release the individual claims of absent employees other than PAGA claims, and the LWDA is a sophisticated government entity that is more than able to look out for its own rights.

B. The Remaining Settlement Terms Are Fair And Reasonable

Although PAGA requires that a court approve the proposed PAGA settlement, Labor Code § 2699(1) does not require that a court approve any other elements of the proposed settlement. Because there are no class allegations for which Plaintiff seeks approval, the approval provisions applicable to class settlements under Cal. Code Civil Proc. §382 do not apply. Accordingly, the Court only needs to approve the settlement of the civil penalties sought in the PAGA claim. Nevertheless, as explained herein, the settlement terms for attorneys' fees and costs are reasonable.

VI. THE ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE

PAGA Counsel seek approval of attorneys' fees from the PAGA settlement in the amount of $476,666 representing one-third of the $1,430,000 Gross PAGA Settlement Amount. PAGA does not have any requirements for reviewing attorneys' fees, and Plaintiff's position is that the payment of attorneys' fees and costs in this settlement is a matter of contract for contingent representation. Nevertheless, should this Court review the requested attorneys' fees, it is clear that the requested fees and costs are reasonable.

First, the requested fees are justified by the result achieved. PAGA Counsel negotiated a recovery of $1,430,000.00, and this result justifies the requested fees equal to one third of this recovery. This percentage is within the standard contingent recovery percentage of one-third, and this percentage is what was expressly approved by the Supreme Court in *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 504, (2016); *Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Mgmt., LLC*, 69 Cal. App. 5th 521, 545 (2021) (recognizing that "'fee awards in class actions average around one-third of the recovery'" regardless of "'whether the percentage method or the lodestar method is used.'" (*quoting Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66, fn. 11 (2008)).

Second, the fee award is justified by the work performed and contributions to the case. As detailed in the accompanying Declaration of LeVu at ¶8 ($96,562.50) and Declaration of Eric K. Yaekel ("Declaration of Yaekel"), at 11 ($18,875), the fee award represents PAGA Counsel's current lodestar of $115,437.50 with a reasonable multiplier of 4.1, with significant additional work to be performed such that the multiplier will ultimately be even less.[11]

[11] A true and correct copy of PAGA Counsel's billing records are attached as Exhibit #2 to the Declaration of LeVu and Declaration of Yaekel, at ¶11, filed herewith.

Generally, the Ninth Circuit and California Courts award positive multipliers between 2 to 4 times the lodestar to reward counsel for accepting the contingent risks of the litigation or obtaining good results. See, e.g., *Laffitte*, 1 Cal. 5th at 506 (approving one-third fee award with multiplier between 2.03 and 2.13); *Pellegrino v. Robert Half Intern., Inc.*, 182 Cal.App.4th 278 (2010) (noting reasonable multipliers of 2.0 to 4.0 are often applied and affirming 1.75 multiplier); *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc*., 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 254 (2001) (noting that multipliers can range from 2 to 4 or higher); *Vandervort v. Balboa Capital Corp*., 8 F. Supp. 3d 1200, 1210 (C.D. Cal. 2014) (awarding one-third of fund, which was a 2.52 multiplier of lodestar); *Boyd v. Bank of America*, 2014 WL 6473804, at *11 (C.D. Cal. 2014) (awarding one-third of fund, which was a 2.58 multiplier of lodestar); *Hopkins v. Stryker Sales Corp*., No. 11-CV-02786-LHK, 2013 WL 496358, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013) (approving fee award that represented a multiplier of 2.76 as falling within the "majority" range for risk multipliers).

Third, consideration of the service factors justify the service of the lodestar. Courts multiply the lodestar by a factor to account for the risk of non-payment, delay in payment, the quality of work, and the novelty and difficulty of the issues involved. See *Ketchum v. Moses*, 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132 (2001). Failure to apply a risk multiplier in cases that meet these criteria is an abuse of discretion. *Stetson v. Grissom*, 821 F.3d 1157, 1166 (9th Cir. 2016).

Finally, as to litigation expenses, PAGA Counsel will be recovering litigation expenses in the total amount of $29,116.24 which is less than the $42,000 allocation for costs in the Agreement, so the difference of $12,883.76 will be added to the PAGA Payment amount. These expenses are documented in the accompanying Declaration of LeVu at ¶9.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

VII. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Court approve the PAGA settlement as set forth in the Agreement and enter the proposed order and judgment submitted herewith.

Dated: April 28, 2026

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: ______________________
Christine T. LeVu
Attorney for Plaintiff