

Lilit Tunyan (SBN 329351)  
[ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com](mailto:ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com)  
Artur Tunyan (SBN 349174)  
[atunyan@tunyanlaw.com](mailto:atunyan@tunyanlaw.com)  
**TUNYAN LAW, APC**  
535 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 285  
Glendale, California 91203  
Telephone: (323) 410-5050

Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTOWINE HOCKLEY,  
as an individual and on behalf of all employees similarly situated

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

ANTOWINE HOCKLEY, as an individual and  
on behalf of all employees similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROAD WARRIOR STAFFING, INC., a  
California Corporation; PERFORMANCE  
TEAM LOGISTICS LLC; a Delaware Limited  
Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50,  
inclusive

Defendants.

Case No.: CVRI2505366

[Assigned for all purposes to Hon. Harold W.  
Hopp, Dept. 1]

**CLASS AND PAGA REPRESENTATIVE  
ACTION**

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

Reservation ID: 995565959157  
Date: December 3, 2026  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Courtroom: Dept. 1  
Judge: Hon. Harold W. Hopp

Action Filed: September 19, 2025  
Trial Date: Not Set

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

3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on December 3, 2026, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the  
4 matter may be heard, in Department 1 of the above-captioned Court, located at 4050 Main Street,  
5 Riverside, CA 92501, Plaintiff ANTOWINE HOCKLEY (“Plaintiff”) will and hereby does move this  
6 Court for an order:

7 1. Granting class certification of the Class, solely for settlement purposes pursuant to  
8 Code of Civil Procedure § 382;

9 2. Preliminarily approving the JOINT STIPULATION OF CLASS AND PAGA  
10 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT (“Settlement” or “Agreement”) (attached as  
11 **Exhibit 1** to the Declaration of Lilit Tunyan;

12 3. Appointing counsel for Plaintiff, Tunyan Law, APC, as Class Counsel;

13 4. Appointing Plaintiff as the Class Representative;

14 5. Approving the use of the proposed notice procedure and related Class Notice Form  
15 attached as **Exhibit 1**, Exclusion Form attached as **Exhibit 2**, and Objection Form attached as  
16 **Exhibit 3** to the [Proposed] Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class and PAGA Action  
17 Settlement;

18 6. Approving Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as the third-party  
19 administrator;

20 7. Directing that the Class Notice, Exclusion Form, and Objection Form (collectively,  
21 “Notice Packet”) be mailed to the Class; and,

22 8. Scheduling a hearing date for motion for final approval of class action settlement  
23 and awards of attorneys’ fees and costs.

24 Good cause exists to grant this Motion because:

25 1. The Class meets all of the requirements for class certification for settlement  
26 purposes under Code of Civil Procedure § 382;

27 2. The Settlement Agreement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable compromise of the  
28 disputed wage and hour claims asserted by Plaintiff;

1                   3. Plaintiff and Class Counsel are adequate to represent the Class;

2                   4. The proposed notice procedures and related forms comply with California Rules of  
3 Court 3.766(d) and (e), adequately apprise Class Members of their rights, and fully comport  
4 with due process; and

5                   5. Based on the foregoing, notice should be directed to the Class Members and a final  
6 fairness hearing should be scheduled (Plaintiff suggests about 120 days after preliminary  
7 approval is granted).

8                   This Motion is made pursuant to Rule 3.769 and Rule 3.1113(e) of the California Rules of Court,  
9 which require approval by the Court of a class action settlement and permit the Court to extend the page  
10 limit for memoranda.

11                   This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the attached Memorandum of Points  
12 and Authorities, the Declarations of Class Counsel Lilit Tunyan, Plaintiff, Defendant Road Warrior  
13 Staffing, Inc., Defendants' counsel and the proposed Settlement Administrator in support thereof, all  
14 papers and pleadings on file with the Court in this action, all matters judicially noticeable, and on such  
15 oral and documentary evidence as may be presented in connection with the hearing on the Motion.

16  
17                   Respectfully submitted,

18                   Dated: September 22, 2026

18                   TUNYAN LAW, APC

19  
20                   By: \_\_\_\_\_

21                   Lilit Tunyan  
22                   Artur Tunyan

23                   Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTOWINE HOCKLEY  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | i   |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | iii |
| I. INTRODUCTION .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 1   |
| II. THE MAJOR TERMS OF SETTLEMENT .....                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 1   |
| III. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND .....                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 5   |
| A. Plaintiff's Claims .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 5   |
| B. Pre-Mediation Data Production and Analysis.....                                                                                                                                                                                               | 5   |
| C. Settlement.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 6   |
| IV. CLASS DEFINITION .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 6   |
| V. DISCUSSION.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 7   |
| A. The Court Should Conditionally Certify the Class Because It Meets All the<br>Requirements for Certification for Settlement Purposes Under CCP § 382.....                                                                                      | 7   |
| 1. The Members of the Class Are Both Objectively Ascertainable and<br>Sufficiently Numerous. ....                                                                                                                                                | 8   |
| 2. There Are Common Questions That Predominate Over Any Questions That<br>May Be Unique to Individual Class Members.....                                                                                                                         | 9   |
| 3. Plaintiff's Claims Are Typical of Those of the Class. ....                                                                                                                                                                                    | 10  |
| 4. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's Counsel Will Adequately Represent the Class.....                                                                                                                                                                    | 11  |
| 5. Proceeding as a Class Action is Superior to Individual Actions.....                                                                                                                                                                           | 12  |
| B. The Court Should Preliminarily Approve the Settlement Because It Is a Fair,<br>Adequate, and Reasonable Compromise of Disputed Wage Claims in View of<br>Defendantss' Potential Liability Exposure and the Risks of Continued Litigation .... | 12  |
| 1. Class Action Settlements Are Subject to Review and Approval. ....                                                                                                                                                                             | 12  |
| 2. The Parties Reached the Settlement Through Arms' Length Negotiations<br>Between Experienced Counsel with the Assistance of a Highly Qualified<br>Mediator After Sufficient Data Was Exchanged to Evaluate Settlement. ....                    | 13  |

|    |      |                                                                             |    |
|----|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1  | 3.   | The Settlement Represents a Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable Compromise of    |    |
| 2  |      | Class Members’ Claims Based on Defendants’ Estimated Liability Exposure     |    |
| 3  |      | Given the Risks Continued Litigation Would Entail. ....                     | 14 |
| 4  | 4.   | The Proposed Method for Allocating Settlement Funds Is Fair, Adequate, and  |    |
| 5  |      | Reasonable. ....                                                            | 18 |
| 6  | 5.   | The Proposed Service Payment to Plaintiff Is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable |    |
| 7  |      | and Warrants Preliminary Approval. ....                                     | 18 |
| 8  | 6.   | The Proposed Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Is Also Fair, Adequate,     |    |
| 9  |      | and Reasonable and Merits Preliminary Approval. ....                        | 19 |
| 10 | 7.   | The Proposed Payment to the Administrator Is Fair and Reasonable.....       | 20 |
| 11 | 8.   | The Proposed Class Notice Complies with Rule 3.766(d) and (e) .....         | 20 |
| 12 | a)   | The Notice Procedure Satisfies Due Process .....                            | 20 |
| 13 | b)   | The Notice is Accurate and Informative .....                                | 21 |
| 14 | 9.   | The PAGA Allocation is Reasonable.....                                      | 21 |
| 15 | VI.  | THE COURT SHOULD SCHEDULE A FINAL FAIRNESS HEARING.....                     | 22 |
| 16 | VII. | CONCLUSION .....                                                            | 22 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

|                                                                                                    |                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> , 85 Cal. App. 4th 1135 (2000)..... | 13               |
| <i>Amaral v. Cintas Corp.</i> , 163 Cal. App. 4th 1157 (2008).....                                 | 22               |
| <i>Bell v. Farmers Ins. Exchange</i> , 115 Cal. App. 4th 715 (2004) .....                          | 18               |
| <i>Bowles v. Superior Court</i> , 44 Cal. 2d 574 (1955) .....                                      | 9                |
| <i>Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super. Ct.</i> , 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012).....                            | 10, 17           |
| <i>Cartt v. Sup. Ct.</i> , 50 Cal. App. 3d 960 (1975) .....                                        | 20               |
| <i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> , 162 Cal. App. 4th 43 (2008) .....                                 | 19               |
| <i>Classen v. Weller</i> , 145 Cal. App. 3d 27 (1983).....                                         | 11               |
| <i>Clothesrigger, Inc. v. GTE Corp.</i> , 191 Cal. App. 3d 605 (1987).....                         | 9                |
| <i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794 (1996).....                                    | 8, 9, 13, 19, 20 |
| <i>Duran v. US Bank Nat’l Ass’n</i> , 59 Cal. 4th 1 (2014).....                                    | 15               |
| <i>Fireside Bank v. Superior Court</i> , 40 Cal. 4th 1069 (2007) .....                             | 10               |
| <i>Ghazaryan v. Diva Limousine, Ltd.</i> , 169 Cal. App. 4th 1524 (2008).....                      | 10               |
| <i>Global Minerals &amp; Metals Corp. v. Superior Court</i> , 113 Cal. App. 4th 836 (2003) .....   | 8                |
| <i>Hebbard v. Colgrove</i> , 28 Cal. App. 3d 1017 (1972).....                                      | 8                |
| <i>Jaimez v. Daiohs USA, Inc.</i> 181 Cal. App. 4th 1286 (2010).....                               | 7, 9, 10         |
| <i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i> , 168 Cal. App. 4th 116 (2008) .....                     | 13               |
| <i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.</i> , 1 Cal. 5th 480 (2016) .....                          | 19               |
| <i>Linderv. Thrifty Oil Co.</i> , 23 Cal. 4th 429 (2000).....                                      | 7, 12            |
| <i>Malibu Outrigger Bd. of Governors v. Superior Court</i> , 103 Cal. App. 3d 573 (1980).....      | 12               |
| <i>Mallick v. Superior Court</i> , 89 Cal. App. 3d 434 (1979) .....                                | 13, 20           |
| <i>McGhee v. Bank of America</i> , 60 Cal. App. 3d 442 (1976).....                                 | 11               |
| <i>Miller v. Woods</i> , 148 Cal. App. 3d 862 (1983) .....                                         | 8                |
| <i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i> , 186 Cal. App. 4th 399 (2010) .....     | 13               |
| <i>Noel v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.</i> , 7 Cal. 5th 955, 980 (2019).....                             | 8                |

|    |                                                                                                         |          |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| 1  | <i>Reyes v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Supervisors</i> , 196 Cal. App. 3d 1263 (1979) .....              | 9        |
| 2  | <i>Sav-on Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> , 34 Cal. 4th 319 (2004).....                         | 7, 9, 10 |
| 3  | <i>Seastrom v. Neways, Inc.</i> , 149 Cal. App. 4th 1496 (2007).....                                    | 11       |
| 4  | <i>Stambaugh v. Superior Court</i> , 62 Cal. App. 3d 231 (1976).....                                    | 12       |
| 5  | <i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> , 91 Cal. App. 4th 224 (2001) .....                              | 14       |
| 6  |                                                                                                         |          |
| 7  | <b>FEDERAL DECISIONAL AUTHORITY</b>                                                                     |          |
| 8  | <i>Air Line Stewards &amp; Stewardesses Ass’n, Local 550 v. American Airlines, Inc.</i> ,               |          |
| 9  | 455 F.2d 101 (7th Cir. 1972).....                                                                       | 14       |
| 10 | <i>Alaniz v. California Processors, Inc.</i> , 73 F.R.D. 269 (N.D. Cal. 1976) .....                     | 8        |
| 11 | <i>Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.</i> , 976 F.2d 497 (9th Cir. 1992).....                                  | 11       |
| 12 | <i>In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, Inc.</i> , 960 F.2d 285 (2d Cir. 1992),                          |          |
| 13 | cert. dismissed, 506 U.S. 1088, 122 L. Ed. 497, 113 S. Ct 1070 (1993).....                              | 8        |
| 14 | <i>O’Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc.</i> , 201 F.Supp.3d 1110 (N.D. Cal. 2016) .....                  | 21       |
| 15 | <i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n of San Francisco</i> , 688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982).....  | 13       |
| 16 | <i>Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts</i> , 472 U.S. 797 (1985) .....                                     | 21       |
| 17 | <i>Schwartz v. Harp</i> , 108 F.R.D. 279 (C.D. Cal. 1985) .....                                         | 11       |
| 18 | <i>Shaw v. Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc.</i> , 91 F.Supp.2d 942, 972 (E.D. Tex. 2000) ..... | 19       |
| 19 | <i>Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i> , 901 F.Supp. 294 (N.D. Cal. 1995) .....                   | 18       |
| 20 | <i>Viceral v. Mistras Group</i> , 2016 WL 5907869 (N.D. Cal. 2016) .....                                | 22       |
| 21 | <i>Willis v. Xerox Bus. Servs., LLC</i> , 2013 WL 6053831 (E.D. Cal. 2013) .....                        | 22       |
| 22 |                                                                                                         |          |
| 23 | <b>STATUTES</b>                                                                                         |          |
| 24 | Code of Civil Procedure § 382 .....                                                                     | 7        |
| 25 | Labor Code § 2699.....                                                                                  | 15       |
| 26 |                                                                                                         |          |
| 27 | <b>RULES</b>                                                                                            |          |
| 28 | Rules of Court, rule 3.766.....                                                                         | 20       |

|                                  |           |
|----------------------------------|-----------|
| Rules of Court, Rule 3.769 ..... | 8, 12, 21 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|

**TREATISES**

|                                                     |   |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---|
| Newberg on Class Actions (3d ed. 1991) § 11.27..... | 8 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---|

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

|                                                                                      |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <i>Findings of the Study of California Class Action Litigation</i> , 2000-2006 ..... | 17 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

|                                                       |   |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Manual for Complex Litigation, 2d (1993) § 30.45..... | 8 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---|

1     **I.     INTRODUCTION**

2             Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rules 3.769(d) and (e), Plaintiff ANTOWINE HOCKLEY  
3     (“Plaintiff”) respectfully requests that this Court preliminarily approve the proposed class action  
4     settlement set forth in the JOINT STIPULATION OF CLASS AND PAGA REPRESENTATIVE  
5     ACTION SETTLEMENT (“Settlement” or “Agreement”) with Defendants ROAD WARRIOR  
6     STAFFING, INC. and PERFORMANCE TEAM LOGISTICS LLC (now known as MAERSK  
7     LOGISTICS & SERVICES USA INC.) (“Defendants”).

8             Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and alleged various wage and hour violations, which  
9     Defendants deny. After informal discovery, the exchange of documents, and an arm’s-length mediation  
10    session with a mediator Kevin T. Barnes, Esq., Plaintiff and Defendants (collectively referred to herein  
11    as the “Parties”) reached a proposed class and PAGA representative action settlement with a gross  
12    settlement amount (“GSA”) of **\$65,000.00** in compromise of disputed claims asserted on behalf of the  
13    below-defined Class consisting of approximately **54** members. Plaintiff believes that this settlement is a  
14    fair, adequate, and reasonable compromise of the disputed claims for alleged unpaid wage and hour  
15    violations and penalties asserted in this case.

16            Plaintiff now submits this Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class and PAGA Representative  
17    Action Settlement, along with the Settlement (attached to the Declaration of Lilit Tunyan [“Tunyan  
18    Decl.”], **Exhibit 1** thereto). In order to efficiently present the Court with necessary information to  
19    determine whether to grant preliminary approval of the Settlement and to address the requirements set  
20    forth in the Class Action Case Management Order #1 (“CMO”), Plaintiff also moves for an order  
21    permitting the filing of this single consolidated memorandum, although it exceeds the page limit  
22    established by California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1113(d), instead of filing several separate motions. For  
23    the Court’s convenience, below is a summary of the key provisions of the Settlement.

24    **II.    THE MAJOR TERMS OF SETTLEMENT**

25            The provisions of the proposed Settlement include the following:

- 26            • Defendants agree not to oppose certification of a Class for purposes of Settlement only  
27            (Settlement, ¶ 18);
- 28            • **Settlement Amount:** Defendants will pay a maximum of **\$65,000.00**, referred to as the

Gross Settlement Amount (or GSA herein), resulting in an estimated average **gross** payment per Class Member of approximately **\$1,203.70** (Settlement, ¶ 25(c));

- **CMO ¶¶ G (3) (a) (i). Class Size:** approximately **54** individuals who worked **1,129** workweeks from September 19, 2021 to the mediation date, i.e. July 22, 2026. (Settlement, ¶ 4, Tunyan Decl., ¶ 16.)
- **CMO ¶¶ G (3) (a) (i). PAGA Group Size:** approximately **36** individuals who worked **564** pay periods from September 19, 2021 to the mediation date, i.e. July 22, 2026. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 17);
- **Escalator Clause:** Defendants represented that as of June 30, 2026 the number of workweeks worked by Class Members is estimated to be **1,129**. The parties stipulate to a 10% escalation of the estimated workweeks and pay periods without any increase to the Gross Settlement Amount. If the number of Covered Workweeks during the Class Period exceeds 10% of the estimated workweeks (i.e., exceeds 1,242 workweeks), Defendants shall increase the Gross Settlement Amount by a pro-rata dollar value equal to the number of workweeks in excess of **1,242** workweeks. For example, if there is a 1% increase over 10% (over 1,241 workweeks) then the Gross Settlement Amount increases by 1% (the “Escalator Clause”). (Settlement, ¶ 25(d).)
- **Kullar/Munoz Analysis:** Plaintiff addresses the claims analysis herein, at Part V.B.3, and in more detail the Declaration of Tunyan, at Paragraph 18;
- **No Reversion:** The Settlement is a ***non-reversionary*** settlement (Settlement, ¶ 25(e));
- **Certification:** Plaintiff addresses certification requisites herein, at Part V.A., and in the Declaration of Tunyan, at Paragraphs 36-42;
- **No Claim Form:** No claim form is required (Settlement., ¶ 25(f));
- **Class Release:** The Settlement will release specified wage-and-hour claims for Class Members (those Class Members who do not opt out of the Settlement) as defined by the First Amended Complaint and LWDA notice (Settlement, ¶ 37);
- **PAGA Release:** The Class Members will release the PAGA Claims set forth in this Action, that were identified in the Complaint and Plaintiff’s LWDA Notice Letter,

1 regardless of whether they opt out of the class portion of the Settlement (Settlement, ¶  
2 37(c)(2));

- 3 • **Release Effective Date:** The Release is not active until Defendants tenders all payments  
4 required under the Settlement to the Settlement Administrator (Settlement, ¶ 37(b));
- 5 • **Net Class Settlement Amount Available to the Class:** After deducting Class Counsel's  
6 attorneys' fees and costs, service payment to Plaintiff, administration costs, the payment to  
7 the LWDA and the PAGA payment to PAGA Employees, the remainder will be available  
8 for distribution to Class Members who do not opt out, with each Class Member receiving a  
9 share based on the number of workweeks each Class Member worked for a Defendants  
10 within the Class Period. The Net Class Settlement Amount is estimated to be at least  
11 **\$14,333.33**, resulting in an average **net** payment per Class Member of at least **\$265.43**,  
12 before any tax withholdings. (Settlement, ¶ 25(g));
- 13 • **Tax Allocation:** The amounts distributed to Class Members will be characterized as 20%  
14 alleged unpaid wages, 80% as unpaid penalties and unpaid interest, and PAGA Settlement  
15 Payments will be allocated as 100% penalties. (Settlement, ¶ 25(k));
- 16 • **Employer's Portion of Payroll Taxes Paid Separately:** Defendants' portion of payroll  
17 taxes (e.g., FICA, FUTA, etc.) owed on any settlement payments to Class Members that  
18 constitute wages will be paid separate and apart from the GSM (Settlement, ¶ 25(h));
- 19 • **Settlement Administrator:** The notice portion of the Settlement and distribution of funds  
20 will be administered by a third-party Administrator, Phoenix Class Action Administration  
21 Solutions. Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions' low bid for settlement  
22 administration services in the amount of **\$5,000.00** was selected as the lowest bid from a  
23 competitive bidding process. (Settlement, ¶ 25(p));
- 24 • **Class Data for Administration:** The Settlement Administrator will receive the Class List  
25 within 15 calendar days of Preliminary Approval, use the NCOA database to update the  
26 Class List, and then use skip tracing on returned Notices (Settlement, ¶ 32(a));
- 27 • **Notice:** The Notice will issue within 14 days of receipt of the Class List (Settlement, ¶  
28 32(b)). The Notice describes how to dispute workweeks, submit and objection in writing,

in person, or through an attorney, or request exclusion (Settlement, ¶ 25(s)).

- **Notice Language:** Notice will issue in English and Spanish (Settlement, ¶ 25(t));
- **Objections:** Objections can be submitted in person, through an attorney, or in writing to the Settlement Administrator (Settlement, ¶ 25(x));
- **Exclusion Requests:** The procedure for exclusion requests, mailing a request to the Settlement Administrator, is the same as the procedure for submitting a writing objection (Settlement, ¶ 25(w));
- **PAGA Allocation:** From the GSA, **\$5,000.00** will be allocated to settle claims brought pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2699 *et seq.* (“PAGA”), and sixty-five percent (65%), or **\$3,250**, will be paid to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency. (Settlement, ¶ 8.)
- **Notice to LWDA:** Notice was provided prior to the filing of this Motion. Evidence is attached to Tunyan Declaration.
- **Service Payment to Plaintiff:** Defendants will not oppose the application for Class Representative Service Payment of **\$5,000.00** for Plaintiff, to be paid from the GSA (Settlement, ¶ 25(n));
- **Fees and Costs:** Defendants will not oppose Class Counsel’s application for fees not to exceed 33 1/3% of the GSA (**\$21,666.67**), and actual costs, in an amount not to exceed **\$14,000**, to be paid out of the GSA (Settlement, ¶ 25(m)).
- **Check Void Period:** Settlement checks will be valid for 180 days (Settlement, ¶ 34);
- **CMO ¶¶ G (3) (c) (i). Uncashed Checks:** Any settlement checks that are mailed to the Class Members and remain uncashed after 180 days of the date of issuance will be cancelled, and the moneys will be redistributed to those class members who have cashed their checks (Settlement, ¶ 35);
- **Judgment Notice:** Judgment will be posted on the Settlement Administrator’s website after entry (Settlement, ¶ 30);
- **Confidentiality Provisions:** The Settlement permits Class Counsel to discuss the Settlement with Class Members (Settlement ¶ 60).

(Tunyan Decl., ¶¶ 8-9 and Exhibit 1 thereto.)

### **III. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

#### **A. Plaintiff's Claims**

On September 19, 2025, Plaintiff filed a putative class action alleging the following labelled causes of action: (1) failure to pay all wages and sick pay; (2) failure to provide meal periods; (3) failure to provide rest periods; (4) failure to keep accurate itemized wage statements; (5) failure to pay wages upon termination of employment; (6) failure to reimburse for necessary expenditures; (7) Unfair Business Practices. On December 1, 2025, Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint adding the eighth case of action for civil penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 [Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.] (“PAGA”) (The “Action.”) In the Complaint, Plaintiff sought to represent all persons that worked for Defendants ROAD WARRIOR STAFFING, INC. and PERFORMANCE TEAM LOGISTICS LLC (“Defendants”) in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before the filing of the initial complaint and ending when Notice to the Class is sent. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 3.)

Plaintiff satisfied the administrative exhaustion requirement that is a prerequisite to filing a claim for Civil Penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 [Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.] (“PAGA”). (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 4.)

#### **B. Pre-Mediation Data Production and Analysis**

The Parties have conducted informal discovery and investigation of the facts and law. Such discovery and investigation have included, inter alia, the exchange of data and discoverable information in preparation for the mediation session. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 5.) The Parties have analyzed payroll and other data pertaining to Plaintiff and the Class during the relevant Class Period, including but not limited to the numbers of former and current members of the Class, average workweeks, and average rate of hourly pay. (*Id.*) After reviewing the provided documents and data, Class Counsel were able to evaluate the probability of class certification, success on the merits, and the reasonably obtainable maximum monetary exposure for all claims. Class Counsel reviewed these records and prepared a damage analysis prior to mediation. Class Counsel also investigated the applicable law regarding the claims and defenses asserted in the litigation. (*Id.*)

1           **C.     Settlement**

2           On July 22, 2026, the Parties mediated before a mediator Kevin T. Barnes, Esq., who is a well-  
3           regarded litigator and mediator for wage and hour class action litigation. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 6.) At the  
4           mediation, the Parties discussed at length the burdens and risks of continuing with the litigation as well  
5           as the merits of the claims and defenses. (*Id.*) The Parties have been able to reach a settlement at the  
6           mediation. The Parties have reached an agreement regarding the substantive terms of a class-wide  
7           settlement, pending the Parties' agreement on a long-form class settlement agreement. The Parties then  
8           signed a long form settlement agreement ("Agreement"). (*Id.*)

9           Plaintiff and Class Counsel are aware of the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability for  
10          the claims asserted in the Action, both generally and in response to Defendants' defenses thereto.  
11          (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 7.) Plaintiff and Class Counsel have also taken into account Defendants' agreement to  
12          enter into a Settlement that confers substantial relief upon the Class.

13          Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff and Class Counsel have determined that the Settlement set forth  
14          in this Agreement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable Settlement and is in the best interests of the Class.  
15          (Tunyan Decl., ¶7.) Solely for the purpose of settling this case, Plaintiff believes that the requirements  
16          for establishing class action certification with respect to this class have been met and are met. (*Id.*) If  
17          this Settlement is not approved by the Court for any reason, Defendants reserve their right to contest  
18          class certification. (*Id.*) This Settlement, if approved by the Court, will result in entering the Judgment  
19          and the release of all Released Claims for all Class Members, including all within the class definition  
20          who have not elected to exclude themselves from the Class and Released PAGA Claims for all PAGA  
21          Employees. (*Id.*)

22       **IV.    CLASS DEFINITION**

23          The Class is defined as follows:

24          All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant Road Warrior Staffing,  
25          Inc. who were placed to work for Defendant Performance Team Logistics LLC in the  
26          State of California at any time during the Class Period. (the "Class Period" is from  
27          September 19, 2021 through the date the Court grants preliminary approval of this  
28          settlement or 60 days from July 22, 2026, whichever is earlier). "Settlement Class  
        Members" are those Class Members who do not submit timely exclusion requests to the  
        Settlement Administrator. (Settlement, ¶¶ 3-4.) (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 36 and Exhibit 1.)

1 The PAGA Employee is defined as follows:

2 All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant Road Warrior Staffing,  
3 Inc. who were placed to work for Defendant Performance Team Logistics LLC in the  
4 State of California at any time during the PAGA Period. (the “PAGA Period” is from  
5 September 19, 2024 through the date the Court grants preliminary approval of this  
6 settlement or 60 days from July 22, 2026, whichever is earlier.) All PAGA Employees  
7 are “aggrieved employees” as defined pursuant to PAGA. PAGA Employees cannot  
8 opt out of the settlement of the PAGA claim. (Settlement, ¶¶ 9-10.)

6 **V. DISCUSSION**

7 **A. The Court Should Conditionally Certify the Class Because It Meets All the**  
8 **Requirements for Certification for Settlement Purposes Under CCP § 382**

9 Under Code of Civil Procedure § 382,<sup>1</sup> class certification is warranted so long as there is a  
10 numerous and ascertainable class with a well-defined community of interest among its members and that  
11 a “class action proceeding is superior to other means for a fair and efficient adjudication of the  
12 litigation.” *See, e.g., Sav-on Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 34 Cal.4th 319, 326, 332 (2004). Any  
13 doubts as to the appropriateness of class treatment must be resolved in favor of certification, subject to  
14 later modification. *Richmond v. Dart Indus. Inc.*, 29 Cal. 3d 462, 473-475 (1981). For purposes of this  
15 Settlement only, Defendants have agreed not to oppose conditional certification of the proposed class  
16 action. (Settlement ¶ 18.)

17 “The certification question is ‘essentially a procedural one that does not ask whether an action is  
18 legally or factually meritorious.’” *Id.*, at 326, quoting *Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.*, 23 Cal. 4th 429, 439-440  
19 (2000). Indeed, the certification question simply asks whether the theory of recovery advanced by the  
20 plaintiff is likely to prove amenable to class treatment. *See, e.g., Jaimez v. Daiohs USA, Inc.*, 181 Cal.  
21 App. 4th 1286, 1298 (2010). In ruling on certification, a trial court’s task is to determine “whether ... the  
22 issues which may be jointly tried, when compared with those requiring separate adjudication, are so  
23 numerous or substantial that the maintenance of a class action would be advantageous to the judicial  
24 process and to the litigants.” *Id.* Thus, “[t]he relevant comparison lies between the costs and benefits of  
25 adjudicating plaintiffs’ claims in a class action and the costs and benefits of proceeding by numerous

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Code Civ. Proc. § 382, which is the statutory basis for the maintenance of class actions under  
28 California law, states in relevant part, “[W]hen the question is one of a common or general interest, of  
many persons, or when the parties are numerous, and it is impracticable to bring them all before the  
court, one or more may sue or defend for the benefit of all.”

1 separate actions . . . .”*See, e.g., id.*

2 “[I]t is also well established that trial courts should use different standards to determine the  
3 propriety of a settlement class, as opposed to a litigation class certification. Specifically, a lesser standard  
4 of scrutiny is used for settlement cases.” *Global Minerals & Metals Corp. v. Superior Court*, 113 Cal.  
5 App. 4th 836, 859 (2003), citing *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1807 n. 19 (1996). As  
6 the court noted in *Dunk*, although certification requirements are intended “to protect the interests of the  
7 non-representative class members,” that concern is “protected by the trial court’s fairness review of the  
8 settlement.” *Dunk*, 48 Cal. App. 4th at 1807 n.19.

9 Indeed, numerous courts have certified settlement classes. For example, the court in *In re Drexel*  
10 *Burnham Lambert Group, Inc.*, 960 F.2d 285 (2d Cir. 1992), cert. dismissed, 506 U.S. 1088, 122 L. Ed.  
11 497, 113 S. Ct 1070 (1993), addressed settlement before a class was certified. After a hearing, the  
12 “district court issued an order certifying the class and approving the settlement agreement.” *Id.* at 289;  
13 *see also Alaniz v. California Processors, Inc.*, 73 F.R.D. 269, 278 (N.D. Cal. 1976) (“the use of the  
14 tentative settlement class procedure was appropriate in this case”), *aff’d*, 572 F.2d 657 (9th Cir.), cert.  
15 denied, 439 U.S. 837 (1978). Certification of a settlement class is a regular feature of class action  
16 litigation and an approved procedure which ought to be followed in this case. *See Newberg on Class*  
17 *Actions* (3d ed. 1991) § 11.27, pp. 11-40 to 11-56; *Manual for Complex Litigation*, 2d (1993) § 30.45.

18 In view of these standards, and as shown below, the Class should be certified for purposes of  
19 settlement. Code Civ. Proc. § 382; Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(c).

20 **1. The Members of the Class Are Both Objectively Ascertainable and**  
21 **Sufficiently Numerous.**

22 Whether an ascertainable class exists turns on three factors: (1) the class definition, (2) the size of  
23 the class, and (3) the means of identifying class members. *See Miller v. Woods*, 148 Cal. App. 3d 862,  
24 873 (1983). In this case, Plaintiff contends that all three considerations strongly favor class certification.

25 A class is ascertainable when “it is defined ‘in terms of objective characteristics and common  
26 transactional facts’ that make ‘the ultimate identification of class members possible when that  
27 identification becomes necessary.’” *Noel v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.*, 7 Cal. 5th 955, 980 (2019). No set  
28 number of class members is required to maintain a class action. *Hebbard v. Colgrove*, 28 Cal. App. 3d

1 1017, 1030 (1972). In fact, the California Supreme Court has upheld a class of as few as ten members.  
2 *Bowles v. Superior Court*, 44 Cal. 2d 574 (1955).

3 The class definition is sufficiently specific to enable the Parties, Class Members, and the Court to  
4 determine makeup of the class. *See Clothesrigger, Inc. v. GTE Corp.*, 191 Cal. App. 3d 605, 617 (1987)  
5 (proposed class defined as all persons nationwide subscribing to telephone service since January 1, 1981,  
6 who were charged for one or more unanswered long distance calls, deemed “plainly” ascertainable).

7 The question of whether class members are easily identifiable turns on whether a plaintiff can  
8 establish “the existence of an ascertainable class,” not whether the plaintiff can “identify the individual  
9 members of such class as prerequisite to the class suit.” *Daar*, 67 Cal.2d at 706; *see also, Reyes v. San*  
10 *Diego County Bd. of Supervisors*, 196 Cal. App. 3d 1263, 1275 (1987).

11 In this case, there are approximately 54 Class Members, all of whom may be identified by  
12 reference to Defendants’ records. In addition, to facilitate the administration of the Settlement,  
13 Defendants has agreed to share the information from records and has already demonstrated that it can do  
14 so when providing class-wide discovery to Plaintiff to facilitate settlement discussions. Accordingly, the  
15 Class is not only ascertainable, but also sufficiently numerous. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 37.)

16 **2. There Are Common Questions That Predominate Over Any Questions That**  
17 **May Be Unique to Individual Class Members.**

18 The community of interest requirement embodies three factors: (1) predominant questions of law  
19 and fact; (2) class representatives with claims or defenses typical of the class; and (3) class  
20 representatives who can adequately represent the class. *Dunk*, 48 Cal. App. 4th at 1806; *Richmond*, 29  
21 Cal. 3d at 473-75. In this case, Plaintiff’s claims satisfy all three factors.

22 A question of law or fact is common to the members of a class if it may be resolved through  
23 common proof. *See, Jaimez*, 181 Cal.App.4th at 1305. As for predominance, it “is a comparative  
24 concept, and ‘the necessity for class members to individually establish eligibility and damages does not  
25 mean individual fact questions predominate.’” *Sav-on*, 34 Cal. 4th at 334, quoting *Reyes v. Los Angeles*  
26 *County Bd. of Supervisors*, 196 Cal. App. 3d 1263, 1278 (1979). Thus, “[i]ndividual issues do not render  
27 class certification inappropriate so long as such issues may effectively be managed.” *Id.* This is  
28 especially so where the key difference between class members solely concerns their damages. *See id.*

1 In this case, common questions include, but are not limited to: i. Whether or not Defendants paid  
2 proper wages to the Class; ii. Whether or not Defendants provided meal periods to the Class; iii. Whether  
3 or not Defendants provided rest periods to the Class; iv. Whether or not Defendants paid compensation  
4 timely upon separation of employment to former Class Members; v. Whether or not Defendants paid  
5 compensation timely throughout Class Members' employment; vi. Whether or not Defendants provided  
6 accurate itemized wage statements to the Class; vii. Whether or not waiting-time penalties are available  
7 to the Class for violation of California Labor Code § 203; viii. Whether or not Defendants reimbursed for  
8 necessary business expenses pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802; ix. Whether or not Defendants  
9 engaged in unlawful or unfair business practices affecting the Class in violation of California Business  
10 and Professions Code §§ 17200-17208; and x. Whether or not Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to  
11 penalties pursuant to PAGA (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 39.)

12 In the Action, Plaintiff's claims present sufficient common issues of law and fact that  
13 predominate over individual issues and warrant class certification. From their review of the  
14 documentation provided, Class Counsel determined that for purposes of these claims, Defendants'  
15 policies and practices are either identical, or sufficiently similar, to raise the same questions of liability,  
16 and applied to all Class Members. Because Class Members would have to prove the same issues of law  
17 and fact to prevail, and because their potential legal remedies are identical, it would be preferable to  
18 resolve all Class Members' claims by means of the Settlement than to require each Class Member to  
19 litigate his or her individual claims. Therefore, common questions predominate over any questions that  
20 may be unique to individual Class Members, and class-wide settlement is superior to any other method  
21 of resolution.

### 22 3. Plaintiff's Claims Are Typical of Those of the Class.

23 Typicality "requires a showing that the class representative has claims or defenses typical of the  
24 class." *See, e.g., Ghazaryan v. Diva Limousine, Ltd.*, 169 Cal. App. 4th 1524, 1534 (2008), citing  
25 *Fireside Bank v. Super. Ct.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1069, 1089 (2007), and *Sav-On*, 34 Cal. 4th at 326, approved by  
26 *Jaimez*, 181 Cal. App. 4th at 1298 and *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super. Ct.*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012).

27 To satisfy the typicality requirement, California law does not require that Plaintiff has claims  
28 identical to the other class members. Rather, the test of typicality for a class representative is whether

1 other members have the same or similar injury, whether the action is based on conduct which is not  
2 unique to the named plaintiffs, and whether other class members have been injured by the same course of  
3 conduct. *Seastrom v. Neways, Inc.*, 149 Cal. App. 4th 1496, 1502 (2007). The typicality requirement for  
4 a class representative refers to the nature of the claim or defense of the representative, and not to the  
5 specific facts from which it arose or the relief sought. *Id.*; *Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.*, 976 F.2d 497,  
6 508 (9th Cir. 1992).

7 The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that the representative plaintiff has interests that are  
8 reasonably co-extensive with those of absent class members. *See id.* “The test of typicality ‘is whether  
9 other members have the same or similar injury, whether the action is based on conduct which is not  
10 unique to the named plaintiffs, and whether other class members have been injured by the same course of  
11 conduct.’” *Id.*, quoting *Schwartz v. Harp* 108 F.R.D. 279, 282 (C.D. Cal. 1985). Notably, “it has never  
12 been the law in California that the class representative must have *identical* interest with the class  
13 members.” *Classen v. Weller*, 145 Cal. App. 3d 27, 46 (1983). In light of these standards, Plaintiff is  
14 typical of class members.

15 Here, like other Class Members, Defendants employed Plaintiff in a non-exempt position during  
16 the Class Period, and Plaintiff was subject to the same policies alleged to have impacted the entire class.  
17 (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 38.) Plaintiff and other Class Members share the same claims stemming from  
18 Defendants’ alleged violations of the Labor Code and relevant wage order. In addition, Defendants’  
19 main defense, namely that its policies and practices comply with California law, apply equally to the  
20 claims of all Class Members. Thus, Plaintiff is typical of the Class.

#### 21 **4. Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s Counsel Will Adequately Represent the Class.**

22 The adequacy requirement is met where the plaintiff is represented by counsel qualified to  
23 conduct the litigation and the plaintiff’s interest in the litigation is not antagonistic to class members’  
24 interests. *McGhee v. Bank of America*, 60 Cal.App.3d 442, 451(1976). In other words, where the plaintiff  
25 has adequate counsel, the plaintiff may represent the entire class absent any disabling conflicts of interest  
26 that might hinder the plaintiff’s ability to represent the class. *Id.*

27 In the Action, Plaintiff has no conflicts of interest with other Class Members and has agreed to  
28 place Class interests above Plaintiff’s own. (Hockley Decl., ¶¶ 4-23; Tunyan Decl., ¶ 41.) Moreover,

Plaintiff's counsel are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation and have no conflicts of interest with absent Class Members. (Tunyan Decl., ¶¶ 21-27, 41.) As such, this Court should appoint Plaintiff as Class Representative for the Class and appoint Plaintiff's Counsel as Class Counsel.

## **5. Proceeding as a Class Action is Superior to Individual Actions**

Under the circumstances, proceeding as a class action is a superior means of resolving this dispute, as the Class Members and the Court will derive substantial benefits. Class certification would serve as the only means to deter and redress the alleged Labor Code violations. *See Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* 23 Cal. 4th at 434 (relevant considerations include the probability that each class member will come forward ultimately to prove his or her separate claim to a portion of the total recovery and whether the class approach would actually serve to deter and redress the alleged wrongdoing). Furthermore, individual actions arising out of the same operative facts would unduly burden the courts and could result in inconsistent results, which may be avoided by class certification.

### **B. The Court Should Preliminarily Approve the Settlement Because It Is a Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable Compromise of Disputed Wage Claims in View of Defendantss' Potential Liability Exposure and the Risks of Continued Litigation**

California courts favor settlement. *See, e.g., Stambaugh v. Superior Court*, 62 Cal. App. 3d 231, 236 (1976). Unlike most settlements, class action settlements involve a court approval process that exists to prevent fraud, collusion, and unfairness to class members. *Malibu Outrigger Bd. of Governors v. Superior Court*, 103 Cal.App.3d 573, 578-579 (1980). This approval process consists of preliminary settlement approval, notice being given to class members, and a final fairness and approval hearing being held at which class members may be heard with respect to the settlement. *Id.* For the reasons discussed below, this Court should preliminarily approve the Settlement, allow the Parties to give notice to the Class as proposed, and schedule a final fairness and final approval hearing.

### **1. Class Action Settlements Are Subject to Review and Approval.**

Any settlement of class litigation must be reviewed and approved by the presiding court. Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(a). Approval occurs in two steps: (1) an early (preliminary) review by the trial court and (2) a subsequent (final) review after notice has been distributed to the class members. The Preliminary Approval Hearing and Final Approval Hearing coincide with these two steps. The present

1 motion seeks *preliminary approval* and the setting of a Final Approval Hearing.

2 To evaluate a settlement, the trial court must receive “basic information about the nature and  
3 magnitude of the claims in question and the basis for concluding that the consideration being paid for the  
4 release of those claims represents a reasonable compromise.” *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal.  
5 App. 4th 116, 133 (2008). However, the record need *not* contain an explicit statement of the maximum  
6 theoretical amount that the class could recover:

7 Greenwell misunderstands *Kullar*, apparently interpreting it to require the record in all  
8 cases to contain evidence in the form of an explicit statement of the maximum amount  
9 the plaintiff class could recover if it prevailed on all its claims—a number which  
10 appears nowhere in the record of this case. But *Kullar* does not, as Greenwell claims,  
require any such explicit statement of value; it requires a record which allows “an  
understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes  
of the litigation.”

11 *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 399, 409 (2010).

12 **2. The Parties Reached the Settlement Through Arms’ Length Negotiations**  
13 **Between Experienced Counsel with the Assistance of a Highly Qualified**  
14 **Mediator After Sufficient Data Was Exchanged to Evaluate Settlement.**

15 A settlement is presumptively fair where it is reached through arms’ length bargaining, based on  
16 sufficient discovery and investigation to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently, counsel is  
17 experienced in similar litigation, and the percentage of objectors is small.<sup>2</sup> *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1802;  
18 *In re Microsoft I-V Cases*, 135 Cal. App. 4th 706, 723 (2006); *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v.*  
19 *Southland Corp.*, 85 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1146 (2000). In deciding whether to approve a settlement, a  
20 trial court has broad powers to determine whether it is fair under the circumstances of the case. *See, e.g.,*  
21 *Mallick v. Superior Court*, 89 Cal. App. 3d 434, 438 (1979). In exercising these powers, the overriding  
22 concern is to ensure that a proposed settlement is “fair, adequate, and reasonable.” *Dunk*, at 1801,  
23 quoting *Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n of San Francisco*, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982).

24 Relevant factors in making this determination, include, but are not limited to:

25 [T]he complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class  
26 action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery

27 <sup>2</sup> Because the fourth prerequisite for the presumption to arise cannot be addressed until the final  
28 approval hearing, only the first three prerequisites are relevant at this preliminary stage of the settlement  
approval process.

completed and the state of the proceedings, the experience and views of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement.

*Id.* These factors require balancing, are non-exhaustive, and, as such, trial courts should tailor the factors considered to each case and give due regard to “what is otherwise a private consensual agreement between the parties.” *Id.*

Here, the Settlement resulted from thorough, arms’ length negotiations between experienced counsel with the assistance of highly regarded mediator. (Tunyan Decl., ¶¶ 6-7, 16.) With respect to the claims at issue in this case, Plaintiff obtained data from Defendants and then carefully reviewed that information. Counsel for Plaintiff also examined relevant policies in detail about their work experiences and Defendants’ practices.

Based on the totality of that review, Plaintiff estimated the potential exposure and then estimated risk factors to adjust the reasonable expected outcome. The investigation and discovery that Plaintiff’s counsel conducted were sufficient to provide them with enough information to intelligently evaluate the estimated exposure in this action for purposes of negotiating the Settlement in view of the risks discussed below and are also sufficient to allow this Court to do the same. *See, e.g., Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 224, 245 (2001).

**3. The Settlement Represents a Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable Compromise of Class Members’ Claims Based on Defendants’ Estimated Liability Exposure Given the Risks Continued Litigation Would Entail.**

A settlement is not judged against what might have been recovered had a plaintiff prevailed at trial and does not have to provide 100% of damages sought to be fair and reasonable. “In the context of a settlement agreement, the test is not the maximum amount plaintiffs might have obtained at trial on the complaint, but rather whether the settlement is reasonable under all of the circumstances.” *Wershba*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 250. Accordingly, because settlements involve compromise, even one that provides for substantially narrower relief than would likely be obtained if the suit were successfully litigated can be reasonable given that “the public interest may indeed be served by a voluntary settlement in which each side gives ground in the interest of avoiding litigation.” *Id.*, quoting *Air Line Stewards & Stewardesses Ass’n, Local 550 v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 455 F.2d 101, 109 (7th Cir. 1972).

1 With respect to the claims asserted on behalf of the Class in this case, there are serious risks that  
2 support the reduced compromise amount. These risks include, but are not limited to: (i) the risk that  
3 Plaintiff would be unable to establish liability for unpaid straight time or overtime wages, *see Duran v.*  
4 *US Bank Nat'l Ass'n*, 59 Cal. 4th 1, 39 & n. 33 (2014) ("*Duran*"), *citing Dilts v. Penske Logistics, LLC*  
5 2014 WL 205039 (S.D. Cal. 2014); (ii) the risk that Plaintiff would be unable to establish liability for  
6 meal and rest period violations; (iii) the risk that uncertainties pertaining to the ultimate legality of  
7 Defendants' policies and practices could preclude class-wide awards of statutory penalties under Labor  
8 Code §§ 203 and 226(e); (iv) the risk that individual differences between Class Members could be  
9 construed as pertaining to liability and not solely to damages, *see Duran*, 59 Cal. 4th at 19; (iv) the risk  
10 that any civil penalties award under the PAGA could be reduced by the Court in its discretion, *see Labor*  
11 *Code § 2699(e)(1)*; (vi) the risk that class treatment could be deemed improper as to one or more claims,  
12 except for settlement purposes; and, (vii) the risk that lengthy appellate litigation could ensue. (Tunyan  
13 Decl., ¶ 15.) These risks are non-exhaustive.

14 In light of the uncertainties of protracted litigation, the settlement amount reflects a fair and  
15 reasonable recovery for the Class Members. (Tunyan Decl. ¶¶ 10-15.) The settlement amount is, of  
16 course, a compromise figure. (Tunyan Decl. ¶ 16.) By necessity it took into account risks related to  
17 liability, damages, and the defenses asserted by Defendants. (*Id.*) Moreover, each Class Member will be  
18 given the opportunity to opt-out of the Settlement, allowing those who feel they have claims that are  
19 greater than the benefits they can receive under this Settlement to pursue their own claims. (*Id.*) For the  
20 approximately **54** members of the Class, the average **gross** recovery at least **\$1,203.70** per class member,  
21 and the estimated average **net** recovery for each Class Member is approximately **\$265.43**. (*Id.*) Given  
22 that Defendants could challenge certification and liability, this is a significant sum to have achieved in  
23 settlement. Moreover, a Class Member who worked a greater number of weeks for Defendants will  
24 receive a larger share of the Settlement than a Class Member who worked for a shorter amount of time  
25 during the class period. (*Id.*)

26 After analyzing the claims in this matter, Plaintiff has concluded that the value of this Settlement  
27 is fair, adequate, and reasonable. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 17.) The Gross Settlement Amount of **\$65,000.00** is  
28 about **82%** of the **\$79,373.29** estimate of *risk-adjusted* recovery (excluding interest) at this stage in the

litigation. On that basis, it would be unwise to pass up this settlement opportunity. This assessment is based on a carefully constructed model of the current fair value of the case, using estimated risks, average wage rates, numbers of employees, and the amount of time covered by the class period. (*Id.*) The maximum calculated reasonable exposure is **\$682,857.16**, including PAGA penalties. (*Id.*)

- A reasonably estimated exposure for unpaid wages for unlawful rounding and regular rate violation was calculated, with the assistance of an expert, to be approximately **\$26,444.46**. However, with the risk factor discounts for certification and liability proof, the value of that claim is estimated by Plaintiff's counsel to be approximately **\$7,933.34**, assuming certification probability of 60% and merits success at 50%.
- A reasonably estimated exposure for unpaid wages for the off-the clock work was calculated, with the assistance of an expert, to be approximately **\$32,763.58**. However, with the risk factor discounts for certification and liability proof, the value of that claim is estimated by Plaintiff's counsel to be approximately **\$3,931.63**, assuming certification probability of 40% and merits success at 30%.
- A reasonably estimated exposure for rest break violations over the class period was calculated at **\$65,527.16**, but with chances of certification and proof of liability (30% and 20% respectively) for a risk-adjusted exposure of **\$3,931.63**.
- A reasonably estimated exposure for meal break violations over the class period was calculated at **\$65,527.16**, with chances of certification and liability risks (50% and 20% respectively) resulting in a risk-adjusted exposure of **\$6,552.72**.
- Risk-adjusted penalty recoveries for wage statement and Labor Code § 203 penalties with chances of certification and liability risks (50% and 20% respectively) were estimated to be approximately **\$5,410.00** and **\$35,520.48**, respectively, on maximum exposures of **\$54,100.00** and **\$355,204.80**.
- A reasonably estimated exposure for unreimbursed expenses over the class period was calculated at **\$11,290.00**, with chances of certification and liability risks (50% and 30% respectively) resulting in a risk-adjusted exposure of **\$1,693.50**.
- Performing risk-adjusted valuations for all claims yields a total value in the range of

1           **\$64,973.29**, excluding PAGA.<sup>3</sup> (*Id.*)

- 2           • PAGA penalties were calculated as having a maximum realistic exposure of **\$72,000.00**  
3           (36 aggrieved employees estimated to have worked during one-year statutory period x  
4           \$2,000.00 civil penalties), but a risk adjusted value of **\$14,400.00**, after factoring in risks  
5           of reduction in penalties pursuant to Court discretion and the high risk of the inability to  
6           prove violations for all aggrieved employees.

7           The concurrently filed Declaration of Lilit Tunyan sets forth claim valuation in additional detail.  
8           (*See*, Tunyan Decl., ¶ 17.)

9           This result here is fully supportable as reasonable. First, it is important to recognize the  
10          wilfulness finding required for Labor Code §§ 203 and 226 is challenging to establish. (Tunyan Decl., ¶  
11          18.) Second, rest break and meal period claims have been challenging to certify for many years, even  
12          after *Brinker*. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 18.) Third, the certification rates in California are lower than  
13          conventional wisdom holds. *See*, H. Scott Leviant, *Second Interim Report on class actions in California*  
14          *sheds new light on certification* (February 19, 2010), [www.thecomplexlitigator.com](http://www.thecomplexlitigator.com), available at  
15          [http://www.thecomplexlitigator.com/post-data/2010/2/19/second-interim-report-on-class-actions-in-](http://www.thecomplexlitigator.com/post-data/2010/2/19/second-interim-report-on-class-actions-in-california-sheds-n.html)  
16          [california-sheds-n.html](http://www.thecomplexlitigator.com/post-data/2010/2/19/second-interim-report-on-class-actions-in-california-sheds-n.html); *see also*, *Findings of the Study of California Class Action Litigation, 2000-2006*,  
17          available at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/class-action-lit-study.pdf> (finding, at page  
18          5, and in Table 9, at page 15, that only 21.4% of all class actions were certified either as part of a  
19          settlement **or** as part of a contested certification motion).

20          Here, the estimated certification probabilities are **above** the average rate at which cases were  
21          certified in California over the study years, based upon data available through the California Courts  
22          websites. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 18.) In sum, well *under* 20% of all cases filed as proposed class actions are  
23          ultimately certified by way of a *contested* motion. (*Id.*) The recovery is roughly **10.5%** of the maximum  
24          theoretical recovery (estimated to be approximately \$682,857.16, including PAGA), which falls within  
25

---

26          <sup>3</sup> In a sense, it is nonsensical to assign specific percentages to future events, but it does provide a  
27          specific method for attempting to reduce the concept of “very high risk” or “high risk” to a quantifiable  
28          amount. Certification of a claim is typically a binary event. One does not obtain a 20% certification; a  
claim is either certified or it is not. But the current expected value is best quantified by applying a risk  
reduction, based on the total experience of counsel.

1 the expected outcome under the likelihood of success metric. (*Id.*) This Settlement achieves the goals of  
2 the litigation.

3 **4. The Proposed Method for Allocating Settlement Funds Is Fair, Adequate,**  
4 **and Reasonable.**

5 The proposed method of allocating the Settlement Fund to Class Members also is fair and  
6 reasonable. As noted, the parties agreed to allocate the Settlement Fund between all Class Members  
7 based on time worked by the Class Member during the Class Period, in relation to the total amount of  
8 time worked by all participating Class Members collectively during the class period. This proposed  
9 method is fair and reasonable because each Class Member's actual potential damages vary based on the  
10 number of workweeks he or she actually worked (e.g., Lab. Code § 226.7 provides for an extra hour of  
11 pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each violation, resulting in a higher potential damage when  
12 a higher number of incidents occur). A Class Member who worked a greater number of weeks for  
13 Defendants will receive a larger payment under the Settlement than a Class Member who worked for a  
14 shorter amount of time during the relevant period. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 16.)

15 **5. The Proposed Service Payment to Plaintiff Is Fair, Adequate, and**  
16 **Reasonable and Warrants Preliminary Approval.**

17 The proposed service payment to Plaintiff is intended to recognize the substantial initiative and  
18 significant efforts on behalf of the Class. Courts routinely approve incentive awards to compensate  
19 named plaintiffs for the services they provide and the risks they incur during class action litigation, often  
20 in much higher amounts than that sought here. *See, e.g., Bell v. Farmers Ins. Exchange*, 115 Cal. App.  
21 4th 715, 726 (2004) (upholding "service payments" to named plaintiffs for their efforts in bringing the  
22 case); *Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*, 901 F. Supp. 294 (N.D.Cal. 1995) (approving a \$50,000  
23 enhancement award). Plaintiff contributed time to the prosecution of this matter, including assistance  
24 prior to the mediation with discovery, information and substantial time conferring with counsel over the  
25 course of this litigation and before it was filed. (Hockley Decl., ¶¶ 4-23; Tunyan Decl., ¶ 33.) The  
26 enhancement also recognizes the considerable risks Plaintiff undertook on behalf of the Class to be  
27 personally liable for all costs incurred regardless of the success of the litigation or class certification, as  
28 well as the personal risk of facing intrusive discovery and potential disclosure to future employers that

1 Plaintiff sued a former employer, making future employment prospects uncertain.

2                   **6.       The Proposed Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Is Also Fair, Adequate,**  
3                   **and Reasonable and Merits Preliminary Approval.**

4           The California Supreme Court removed any lingering doubt about the use of the percentage of  
5 the fund method to award attorney’s fees in California Courts:

6           We join the overwhelming majority of federal and state courts in holding that when  
7 class action litigation establishes a monetary fund for the benefit of the class members,  
8 and the trial court in its equitable powers awards class counsel a fee out of that fund, the  
9 court may determine the amount of a reasonable fee by choosing an appropriate  
10 percentage of the fund created. The recognized advantages of the percentage method—  
11 including relative ease of calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the  
12 class, a better approximation of market conditions in a contingency case, and the  
13 encouragement it provides counsel to seek an early settlement and avoid unnecessarily  
14 prolonging the litigation (See pt. I, *ante*; *Lealao, supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at pp. 48–49, 97  
15 Cal.Rptr.2d 797; *Rawlings v. Prudential–Bache Properties, Inc., supra*, 9 F.3d at p.  
16 516)—convince us the percentage method is a valuable tool that should not be denied  
17 our trial courts.

18           *Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.*, 1 Cal. 5th 480, 503 (2016).<sup>4</sup> Thus, this Court may and, as strongly  
19 encouraged by the California Supreme Court, *should* award attorney’s fees to Plaintiff’s counsel based  
20 upon the percentage of the fund methodology.

21           Setting *Laffitte* aside, whether the once-again-confirmed percentage of the fund method or the  
22 lodestar method is used, the outcome is roughly the same: “Empirical studies show that, regardless  
23 whether the percentage method or the lodestar method is used, fee awards in class actions average  
24 around one-third of the recovery.” *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal. App. 4th 43, 47 n. 11 (2008), quoting  
25 *Shaw v. Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc.*, 91 F.Supp.2d 942, 972 (E.D. Tex. 2000). This is  
26 also consistent with Plaintiff’s counsel’s experience in these types of cases. Here, Plaintiff’s attorneys  
27 intend to request attorneys’ fees of up to \$21,666.67 (one-third of the GSA), and costs capped at \$14,000  
28 (which includes payment for mediation, filing fees, and other standard expenses). (Tunyan Decl., ¶¶ 28-  
32.) Given the efforts and risks involved in this case, as well as the results achieved, these amounts are  
within the range of reasonableness and warrant *preliminary approval*.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Supreme Court also corrected the misconception that *Dunk* should be viewed as expressing doubt about the use of the percentage method: “The *Dunk* court, while finding the percentage method inapplicable to the settlement before it due to the lack of a readily valued common fund, did not purport to bar its usage generally in common fund cases.” *Laffitte*, 1 Cal. 5th at 501.

1                   **7.       The Proposed Payment to the Administrator Is Fair and Reasonable**

2           In deciding whether to approve a proposed settlement, a trial court must determine if the  
3   proposed settlement is fair under the circumstances of the case. *Mallick*, 89 Cal.App.3d at 438. In  
4   exercising this power, the overriding concern is to ensure that a proposed settlement is “fair, adequate,  
5   and reasonable.” *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801 (internal quotations omitted). Phoenix Class Action  
6   Administration Solutions, which has been selected due to its competitive bid, estimates that  
7   administration can be performed for **\$5,000.00**. In counsel’s experience, based on similar wage-and-  
8   hour actions, an estimated cost of \$5,000.00 is a fair and reasonable amount for administration fees and  
9   should be preliminarily approved. (Tunyan Decl., ¶ 34.)

10                   **8.       The Proposed Class Notice Complies with Rule 3.766(d) and (e)**

11           Notice requirements are set forth in Rules of Court, Rule 3.766. In determining the manner of  
12   the notice, the court must consider the interests of the class, the type of relief requested, the stake of the  
13   individual class members, the cost of notifying class members, the resources of the parties, the possible  
14   prejudice to class members who do not receive notice, and the *res judicata* effect on class members.  
15   Rules of Court, Rule 3.766(e).

16                   a)       *The Notice Procedure Satisfies Due Process*

17           Plaintiff requests that the Court approve the proposed plan for giving notice to the Class and  
18   administering the Settlement. The notice process is set forth in the Settlement. The standard for  
19   determining the adequacy of notice is whether the notice has “a reasonable chance of reaching a  
20   substantial percentage of the class members.” *Cartt v. Sup. Ct.*, 50 Cal.App.3d 960, 974 (1975).  
21   California law vests the Court with broad discretion in fashioning an appropriate notice program. *Cartt*,  
22   50 Cal. App. 3d at 973-74. There is no statutory or due process requirement that all class members  
23   receive actual notice, but in this matter, the Class Members will receive direct mailed notice. Direct mail  
24   notice to Class Members’ last known address is the best possible notice under the circumstances.  
25   *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306 (1950).

26           As the Court of Appeal has explained, “[t]he notice given should have a reasonable chance of  
27   reaching a substantial percentage of the Class Members . . .” *Cartt*, 50 Cal. App. 3d at 974. For class  
28   claims “for money damages or similar relief at law, notice sent by first class mail to the last known

1 address of each member of the plaintiff class is sufficient.” *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*, 472 U.S.  
2 797, 811 (1985). Here, the proposed procedure includes safeguards, including, but not limited to,  
3 searches for address changes and the re-mailing of returned notices after skip traces. As such, the  
4 proposed procedure provides a reasonable chance that Class members will receive notice.

5 *b) The Notice is Accurate and Informative*

6 The proposed Notice of Class Action Settlement should be approved for dissemination to the  
7 Class Members. It will be disseminated through direct mail to the last known address for each Class  
8 Member. It informs the Class Members of the terms of the settlement and their right to be excluded from  
9 the Settlement. If there are Class Members who wish to object to this proposed class action settlement,  
10 they will have the opportunity to file their objections and be heard at the Final Approval Hearing.

11 Rule 3.769(f) of the Rules of Court provides as follows:

12 If the court has certified the action as a class action, notice of the final approval hearing  
13 must be given to the class members in the manner specified by the court. The notice  
14 must contain an explanation of the proposed settlement and procedures for class  
members to follow in filing written objections to it and in arranging to appear at the  
settlement hearing and state any objections to the proposed settlement.

15 Rules of Court, rule 3.769(f).

16 The Notice also fulfills the requirement of neutrality in class notices. 3 NEWBERG § 8.39. It  
17 summarizes the proceedings and the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement, in an informative  
18 and coherent manner, in compliance with the Manual for Complex Litigation (“MANUAL”), (2d Ed.  
19 1993), which states that “the notice should be accurate, objective, and understandable to Class Members .  
20 ..” MANUAL, § 30.211. It makes clear that the Settlement does not constitute an admission of liability  
21 by the Defendants and recognizes that this Court has not ruled on the merits. It also states that the final  
22 settlement approval decision has yet to be made. Accordingly, the Notice complies with the standards of  
23 fairness, completeness, and neutrality required of a combined settlement-certification class notice.

24 Upon the Court’s approval, the Notice of Class Action Settlement will be mailed by the  
25 Administrator to each Class Member, in Spanish as well.

26 **9. The PAGA Allocation is Reasonable**

27 The PAGA allocation is reasonable because the settlement of the underlying wage and hour  
28 claims is robust and serves the deterrent purpose of the PAGA statute. *O’Connor v. Uber Technologies*,

1 *Inc.*, 201 F.Supp.3d 1110, 1135 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (“By providing fair compensation to the class members  
2 as employees and substantial monetary relief, a settlement not only vindicates the rights of class  
3 members as employees, but may have a deterrent effect upon the Defendants employer and other  
4 employers, an objective of PAGA.”); *see also Viceria v. Mistras Group*, 2016 WL 5907869 \*9 (N.D.  
5 Cal. 2016) (“Applying O’Connor’s sliding scale approach, settlement of the PAGA claim may be  
6 substantially reduced below its standalone settlement value without sacrificing its statutory purposes  
7 because the non PAGA settlement is relatively substantial.”)

8 In addition, there is no evidence that a court or a commissioner had informed Defendants that its  
9 conduct violated the Labor Code. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp.*, 163 Cal. App. 4th 1157, 1209 (2008); *Willis v.*  
10 *Xerox Bus. Servs., LLC*, 2013 WL 6053831, \*7-8 (E.D. Cal. 2013) (“Under California law, courts have  
11 held that employers are not subject to heightened penalties for subsequent violations until and unless a  
12 court or commissioner notified the employer that it is in violation of the Labor Code.”).

13 Finally, the PAGA allocation is fair. The LWDA is receiving **\$3,250.00**. The Class is receiving,  
14 net, an estimated **\$14,333.33** for the releases for eight theories of recovery (excluding the \$1,750.00 as  
15 the PAGA Employees’ share of the PAGA Allocation). An allocation to the LWDA equal to **22.6%** of  
16 the Net Class Settlement Amount is not unfair and satisfies the policies underlying California’s wage and  
17 hour laws.

## 18 **VI. THE COURT SHOULD SCHEDULE A FINAL FAIRNESS HEARING**

19 The last step in the settlement approval process is the fairness hearing, where the Court makes a  
20 final determination about the propriety of settlement. Plaintiff requests that the fairness hearing in this  
21 case be scheduled for about 120 days after issuance of the Court’s Order granting preliminary approval  
22 of the Settlement. Under the Settlement, Defendants will have 15 days to provide the mailing data to the  
23 Settlement Administrator, which will then have 14 days to mail out class notice. Class Members have 45  
24 days after mailing of the notice to submit exclusions or objections (with a 14-day extension available for  
25 late-returned and re-mailed notices). Therefore, Plaintiff proposes a final approval hearing scheduled for  
26 the first available hearing date that is about 120 days after preliminary approval is granted.

## 27 **VII. CONCLUSION**

28 For all the foregoing reasons, because the Class meets the requirements for certification, because

1 the Settlement bears all requisite indicia of fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy, and because the  
2 proposed notice procedure and forms comport with Rule 3.766 and due process, this Court should grant  
3 this Motion for Preliminary Approval, adopt the [Proposed] Order Granting Preliminary Approval of  
4 Class Action Settlement submitted herewith, and schedule a Final Fairness Hearing.

5  
6 Respectfully submitted,

7 Dated: September 22, 2026

**TUNYAN LAW, APC**

8  
9 By:  \_\_\_\_\_

10 Lilit Tunyan  
11 Artur Tunyan

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTOWINE HOCKLEY  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
3 ) ss  
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )

5 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18  
6 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 535 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 285,  
7 Glendale, CA 91203.

8 On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF**  
9 **MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND PAGA**  
10 **REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND**  
11 **AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF** on the interested parties in this action by sending a true  
12 copy thereof to interested parties as follows and as stated on the attached service list:

13 Ronald Gomez

14 [rgomez@koreylaw.com](mailto:rgomez@koreylaw.com)

15 Victor Russame

16 [vrussame@koreylaw.com](mailto:vrussame@koreylaw.com)

17 Nicole Oates

18 [noates@koreylaw.com](mailto:noates@koreylaw.com)

19 **KOREY LAW LLP**

20 835 Wilshire Blvd., 5th Floor

21 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5689

22 Telephone: 213-271-2717

23 Facsimile: 213-221-4739

24 **Attorneys for Defendants ROAD WARRIOR STAFFING, INC.**

25 Michael Wertheim

26 [Michael.Wertheim@gtlaw.com](mailto:Michael.Wertheim@gtlaw.com)

27 Mark D. Kemple

28 [kemplem@gtlaw.com](mailto:kemplem@gtlaw.com)

Elias Tapia

[Elias.Tapia@gtlaw.com](mailto:Elias.Tapia@gtlaw.com)

**GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP**

400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2400

Sacramento, CA 95814

Telephone: (916) 868-0600

Facsimile: (916) 448-1709

**Attorneys for Defendants PERFORMANCE TEAM LOGISTICS LLC**

[✓] **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Glendale,  
California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-  
mail address or e-mail of record in this action.

[✓] **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** Based on an agreement of the parties to accept  
electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic  
service addresses listed above via electronic mail. I did not receive an error message.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
above is true and correct.

Executed on September 22, 2026 at Glendale, California.

Roxana Carranza

Name

Signature