

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Misty M. Lauby, Esq. [CSB No. 243009]
misty@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513
Riverside, CA 92504
Tel: (951) 320-1444 | Fax: (951) 320-1445

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis, and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

BRIANA ARREOLA, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

FLEET SERVICES, INC., a California
Corporation; DICK VAN ECK, an
individual; and DOES 1 through 20,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2023-01316151-CU-OE-CXC
*[Assigned to Hon. Layne Melzer, Dept
CX102, for all purposes]*

**DECLARATION OF BRIAN J. MANKIN,
ESQ., IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Hearing

Date: September 18, 2025
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Dept: CX102

Complaint filed: March 30, 2023

I, Brian J. Mankin, state and declare:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before all of the courts of the State of California. I manage the employment law department and am a partner with the law firm of Lauby Mankin Lauby LLP, which has offices in Orange County and Riverside County. I am thoroughly familiar with and have personal knowledge of all of the facts set forth herein. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of this Class Action Settlement. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto.

///

1 **COUNSEL'S EXPERIENCE**

2 2. I have been a member, in good standing, of the State Bar of California since 2001.
3 I am admitted to practice in the United States District Courts for the Central and Southern
4 District of California and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal and have tried cases in various
5 courts in California.

6 3. I have handled well over 500 employee vs. employer litigation matters during my
7 23 years in practice. Over the last 18 years, my practice has almost entirely consisted of
8 representing employees, the majority of which has included class action and representative
9 action wage and hour matters. In total, I have handled over 300 class action and representative
10 action wage/hour cases, and have been appointed by the court as class counsel and have received
11 final court approval and judgment in close to half of those actions to date, and anticipate
12 receiving final approval in many more of those in the future.

13 4. As part of these settlements and judgments, I have recovered well in excess of
14 \$250 million in damages for my clients and the class members (who often work as nurses,
15 ambulance drivers, technicians, warehouse workers, truck drivers, sales, professional
16 occupations and countless other trades). My team and I once held the record for the largest
17 PAGA-only case in California's history - a \$12.5 million-dollar court approved settlement,
18 which followed extensive litigation, summary adjudication and writs to the CA Supreme Court
19 against a Fortune 50 company (*Garcia v. Macy's*, San Bernardino Superior Court).

20 5. I have tried two major class and PAGA cases against Fortune 100 companies over
21 the last few years. I was lead counsel in a PAGA case that my firm tried in the Orange County
22 Superior Court and received a \$425,000 judgment. I was co-counsel in a class action case
23 against Walmart that was tried to the jury in District Court, wherein the jury awarded Plaintiffs
24 over \$6 million. Both cases were appealed, and ultimately the jury trial verdict was affirmed and
25 the PAGA case was reversed and remanded.

26 6. I was named by the LA Times as one "Southern California Leading Lawyers" in
27 the May 2023 issue of Consumer Attorney's of Southern California (a recognition given to 17
28 employment/labor law attorneys in 2023). Additionally, for the last six consecutive years, I have

1 been selected by my peers as a “Super Lawyer” in Employment Litigation, a distinction that only
2 5% of lawyers receive.

3 **ADEQUACY OF SETTLEMENT**

4 7. The Class, as conditionally certified by this Court, consists of all Class Members,
5 which includes all current and former nonexempt (hourly paid) employees employed by
6 Defendant Fleet Services, Inc., in California during the Class Period of March 30, 2019, through
7 April 20, 2024.

8 8. As set forth in the Declaration of Nathalie Beltran on behalf of the Administrator,
9 ILYM Group, the Net Settlement Amount is \$121,447.11, after the deductions set forth in the
10 chart here:

	Total Amount
<i>Gross Settlement Amount</i>	\$ 275,000.00
Attorneys’ Fees (1/3)	\$ 91,666.67
Litigation Costs	\$ 18,936.23
Administrator Costs	\$ 7,950.00
PAGA Penalties	\$ 27,500.00
Class Representative’s Service Award	\$ 5,000.00
<i>Net Settlement Amount</i>	\$ 123,947.10

16
17 9. The process of mailing the Notice Packets was very successful, as 98% of the
18 Notice Packets were successfully delivered by the Administrator.

19 10. The response by the Class Members to this settlement was very positive, as 99%
20 of the Class elected to participate in the Settlement.

21 11. As discussed at length in Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary approval, as well as in
22 the Motion for Final Approval, this Settlement is very favorable to the Class and the release is
23 narrowly limited to the claims alleged.

24 12. Sufficient information existed to allow Class Counsel to intelligently value this
25 case. Given the parties’ arms’ length bargaining facilitated by an experienced wage and hour
26 mediator, the extensive exchange of informal discovery, the experience of Class Counsel, the
27 fact that 99% of the Class elected to participate and no objections were submitted, the
28 presumption of fairness is justified.

1 13. I believe that the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best
2 interests of the Class, given the litigation risks and delay inherent in further litigation and
3 possible appeals. As set forth in Plaintiff's motion for preliminary approval and the declarations
4 submitted in support thereof, Defendants vigorously challenged Plaintiff's claims, and Plaintiff
5 faced real challenges in certifying the Class and obtaining a recovery on the claims in this matter.
6 Nonetheless, the Parties concluded that further litigation would be protracted and expensive, and
7 that it is desirable that the action be fully and finally settled in the manner and upon the terms
8 and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement in order to limit further expense,
9 inconvenience and distraction, to dispose of burdensome and protracted litigation, and to permit
10 the operation of Defendants' business without further expensive litigation and the distraction and
11 diversion of its personnel with respect to matters at issue. All parties considered the uncertainty
12 of risks inherent in any litigation, especially in complex cases such as this case. The parties
13 determined that it is desirable and beneficial to both the Class and Defendants that this case be
14 settled. Risks on both sides were considered in reaching the Settlement Agreement. The
15 recoveries contemplated by the Settlement represent a good result for the Class, fairly
16 proportioned to the likely risk-adjusted recovery in litigation.

17 **ADEQUACY OF COUNSEL**

18 **AND REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED FEE AND COST AWARDS**

19 14. As set forth above, I have handled over 300 class and representative actions. I
20 have been appointed as class counsel and have successfully resolved approximately half of those
21 cases (while many are ongoing and will successfully resolve in the future) while recovering
22 hundreds of millions of dollars for my clients and Class Members. This is substantially better
23 than average accordingly to Mayer Brown LLP's study entitled, An Empirical Analysis of Class
24 Actions, cited in *Laguna v. Coverall North America, Inc.*, No. 12-55479 (9th Cir. 2014), which
25 found that only one-third of class actions are successful, compared to two-thirds that are defeated
26 and result in no payment to the class members.¹

27
28

¹ www.mayerbrown.com/files/uploads/Documents/PDFs/2013/December/DoClassActionsBenefitClassMembers.pdf

1 15. When this case was taken on a contingency fee basis, with my firm agreeing to
2 assume responsibility for all litigation costs, the ultimate result was far from certain. In the
3 course of this litigation, Class Counsel paid all costs including filing fees, court costs, research
4 fees, and mediation costs. There was never a guarantee that we would recoup those expenditures.

5 16. It has been my experience that the benchmark for attorney fee awards in
6 California state cases is one-third of a common settlement fund, which the CA Supreme Court
7 upheld in the Robert Half case. Here, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement, Class
8 Counsel is seeking a fee of \$91,666.67, which is one-third of the Settlement Amount.

9 17. There are several additional factors why I believe that the Court should award
10 one-third of the common fund as reasonable attorneys' fees. First, Class Counsel's efforts
11 resulted in a common fund settlement amount, whereby the Class Members will receive
12 \$1,203.37 on average and up to a maximum of \$2,878.20 for those employees that worked the
13 longest during the Class Period. This is a very good result in light of the disputed nature of the
14 claims alleged. This result was achieved by the work and success of my office, who negotiated
15 the settlement after extensive preparation, investigation, mediation, and substantial work
16 thereafter.

17 18. Second, Plaintiff faced significant risks going forward with the litigation. As
18 discussed in the motion for preliminary approval, Defendants raised various defenses throughout
19 this litigation, any one of which, if successful, could have decimated Plaintiff's case. And
20 Defendants vowed to raise all these defenses at trial. Accordingly, Plaintiff faced risky issues
21 going forward with this litigation, and it would have taken several more years to realize any
22 recovery in this action along with the possibility of post-trial appeals.

23 19. Third, Class Counsel are experienced class action litigators. This experience and
24 expertise, combined with the high quality of work performed in this case, resulted in the
25 settlement achieved in this case.

26 20. Fourth, Class Counsel has been representing Plaintiff strictly on a contingency fee
27 basis. To that end, we have incurred the risk of non-recovery after investing a substantial
28 amount of time, money, and resources, and have done so since the inception of this case without

1 any payment or compensation. If Plaintiff had lost this case, we would have recovered nothing,
2 and would have lost our out-of-pocket costs. This is not an easy burden for my office, which is a
3 small firm. While some cases result in a positive lodestar and some in a negative lodestar, if the
4 best Class Counsel could hope for is merely to be paid our hourly rate, then Class Counsel would
5 not be compensated for the hardships and serious risks we face when litigating contingency fee
6 cases, and would not be incentivized to take on similar cases in the future. Indeed, not all
7 class/PAGA cases are successful. Many cases end with no fees or a greatly reduced fee that is
8 far less than lodestar like this one, often due to no fault of counsel (i.e., bankruptcy, change in
9 the law, consolidation- coordination-preemption, being top filed, etc.). As noted in the Mayer
10 Brown LLP's study discussed above, only one-third of class actions are successful, compared to
11 two-thirds that are defeated and result in no payment to the class members.

12 21. As exemplified by the contingent nature of high risk class action litigation, I can
13 further attest to having had many cases result in (a) zero recovery, (b) negative multiplier and (c)
14 an individual settlement in lieu of a class recovery. There are also many situations when my
15 office is forced to convert matters into small individual settlements (and therein lose substantial
16 attorneys fees) for a variety of reasons, including due the financial constraints of a defendant, or
17 because a company may engage in a "Pick-up Stix Campaign" to settle directly with the class
18 members, or because a Defendant engages in a reverse auction and settles a class/PAGA case
19 with another firm that will take less (i.e., cherry picking), thereby cutting off Class Counsel's
20 recovery. There are indeed numerous examples of this occurring that result in an individual
21 settlement, thereby causing my office to bear the burden of a loss in attorneys' fees.

22 22. Fifth, the request for attorney's fees in the amount of one-third of the common
23 fund falls well within the norms accepted by state courts in California in comparable wage and
24 hour actions actually handled by my office. Moreover, the award of a one-third fee recovery
25 under the common fund doctrine was approved by the California Supreme Court in *Laffitte*,
26 *supra*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 503.

27 23. For all of the above reasons, a common fund fee award here in the amount of one-
28 third of the common fund created by Plaintiff and Class Counsel is fair and reasonable.

1 24. At my office, this case was primarily handled by Misty Lauby while I performed
2 the role of the supervising attorney up through mediation, and then largely took over the
3 handling through the settlement and notice process. Ms. Lauby works exclusively with me on
4 employment law matters and has been in practice for 16 years. She bills at the hourly rate of
5 \$650/hour. I have been in practice for 23 years, with most of those years handling complex
6 litigation and for over the last 18 years, my practice has almost entirely consisted of handling
7 class action wage and hour matters. My billing rate is \$950/hour. I believe these rates are
8 consistent with Plaintiff and Defense attorneys who handle complex class action litigation, if not
9 somewhat lower.

10 25. The hourly rates above are comparable to those of other attorneys with equal or
11 similar experience, if not somewhat lower (*i.e.*, the Laffey Matrix at www.laffeymatrix.com
12 indicates that the benchmark rates are: \$777/hour for an 8–10-year attorney, \$878/hour for a 11–
13 19-year attorney, and \$1,057/hour for a 20+ year attorney). Moreover, the Wolters Kluwer 2023
14 Real Rate Report (“Real Rate Report”) provides directly applicable information in this regard.
15 The Real Rate Report is based on an enormous and statistically significant compilation of data,
16 comprising millions of billing entries from a hundred thousand individual timekeepers who
17 worked at thousands of law firms. The Real Rate Report then compiles and analyzes this data to
18 provide the hourly rates for partners and associates in major metropolitan areas. For the southern
19 California area: (a) the rate for partners in Los Angeles is between \$840 and \$1,159 per hour for
20 the middle and upper quartiles, and (b) the rates for associates with seven or more years of
21 experience, the median rate is \$674 per hour, and the upper quartile rate is \$888 per hour. And,
22 perhaps most importantly, the information provided in the Real Rate Report is not based on self-
23 reported numbers, surveys, sampling, or reviews or other publications – instead, the Real Rate
24 Report is based on the actual hours and fees billed by law firms, which makes it “a much better
25 reflection of true market rates than self-reported rates in all practice areas.” *Brown v. CVS*
26 *Pharmacy, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2017) 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182309, at *21; *PLCM Group*,
27 22 Cal.4th at 1085 (holding that rates should be premised upon precisely this form of
28 independent, “objective” rate data that reflects “fair market” rates actually billed to clients “in

the community for similar work.”

26. There are ***no fee splitting agreements*** in this case, as all work was performed by my office. Thus, the table below includes a summary of the hours worked, plus additional hours that I will bill in finalizing and filing the motion, preparing for and attending the approval hearing, and working with the administrator and defense counsel to issue checks, respond to class members and finalize this matter. The detailed billing records for Ms. Lauby is attached to her declaration and my billing records are attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. Our aggregated lodestar is approximately \$156,500, resulting in a negative multiplier, as follows:

Attorney/Timekeeper	Rate	Hours	Fee
Brian J. Mankin <i>Trial Counsel / Partner</i> (23 Years)	\$950	86.6²	\$82,270
Misty Lauby <i>Handling Attorney</i> (16 Years)	\$650	114.2	\$74,230
Grand Total for All Attorneys			\$156,500

27. With regard to the 30 hours of estimated future work, this includes an estimated 15 hours from preparing this declaration through the final approval hearing (inclusive of finalizing and filing the motion, appearing at the hearing, addressing the Court’s questions/concerns, submitting revised documents, responding to class members who are anxious to receive their check, and so on).” It also includes an estimated 15 hours from the Court’s granting of final approval through the completion of the case which includes up to 1.5 years of case management relating to ensuring timely payment from Defendants, reviewing the calculations, checks are timely mailed, responding to class members questions about the timing

² Includes an estimated 15 hours of additional work preparing for and attending the hearing (inclusive of finalizing and filing the motion, appearing at the hearing, addressing the Court’s questions/concerns, submitting revised documents, responding to class members who are anxious to receive their check, and so on), as well as 15 hours in anticipated work to be performed after the final approval, working with counsel, administrator, and Class Members (which includes up to 1.5 years of case management relating to ensuring timely payment from Defendants, reviewing the calculations, checks are timely mailed, responding to class members questions about the timing of checks/missing checks/lost checks and remailings, working with the administrator regarding uncashed checks and remailings, assisting with the Administrator’s declarations regarding payments and uncashed checks, potentially filing an amended judgment, appearing at the final disbursement hearing and/or submitting paperwork related thereto).

1 of checks/missing checks/lost checks and remailings, working with the administrator regarding
2 uncashed checks and remailings, assisting with the Administrator's declarations regarding
3 payments and uncashed checks, potentially filing an amended judgment, appearing at the final
4 disbursement hearing and/or submitting paperwork related thereto. Of course, 15 hours of future
5 work is an estimate, but from going through this process approximately 150 times, I can
6 represent that this process varies significantly from case to case, and typically takes between 10
7 and 50 hours.

8 28. The fee is warranted because of the results achieved for the Class Members, both
9 in terms of the immediate cash settlement, as well as the fact that the Class Members
10 resoundingly supported the Settlement. Defendant does not oppose this fee request.

11 29. In the course of prosecuting this action, Class counsel have incurred expenses that
12 were incidental and necessary to the effective representation of the Class. These expenses
13 included but were not limited to: court filings, copying and management of documents, on-line
14 Lexis research, messenger services, postage, mediation fees, and other incidental expenses
15 directly related to this action. My firm's expenses through the final approval hearing are
16 estimated to be \$18,936.23, which includes filing this motion, process/server costs, overnight
17 service and travel/parking expenses to the hearing (see the itemized statement of these costs
18 attached hereto as **Exhibit B**). Since these actual costs are lower than the \$20,000 allowed under
19 the settlement, the savings will be placed in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to the
20 Class Members. Defendants do not oppose this request for costs.

21 **REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED SERVICE AWARD**

22 30. I also believe that the service award of \$5,000 to the Plaintiff and Class
23 Representative is fair and warranted. Plaintiff came forward and worked directly with my office
24 in analyzing the claims and documents, providing valuable information and insights that
25 benefitted the class (see his declaration for supporting information). Then, during the settlement
26 process, she agreed to a much broader release than any class member, as she released all claims
27 and gave a 1542 waiver while foregoing her right to bring individual claims against Defendant.
28 Indeed, Plaintiff's participation was an essential element of Defendant's desire to mediate and of

1 the pre- and post-mediation analysis that allowed Class Counsel to settle the case. Of course,
2 Plaintiff also took on various risks, including the risk that she could have been ordered to pay
3 Defendants' costs if she lost and the risk of retaliation and being black-balled in the industry.
4 Defendant does not oppose the requested service award.

5 **SUBMISSION TO THE LWDA**

6 31. The entire Motion for Final Approval, supporting declarations and exhibits have
7 concurrently been submitted to the LWDA. (See **Exhibit C** for a true and correct copy of the
8 LWDA's confirmation of receipt).

9 **EXHIBITS AND CONCLUSION**

10 32. The Settlement Agreement is Exhibit 1 to ROA #82.

11 33. Attached hereto as Exhibit A are my itemized billing records.

12 34. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of an itemized statement
13 of my firm's litigation costs.

14 35. The LWDA's confirmation of receipt of the entire Motion for Final Approval,
15 including declarations and exhibits is attached hereto as Exhibit C. (Note that the confirmation
16 email from the LWDA does not provide an itemized list of all documents submitted, but I
17 directed my office to submit the entire motion to the LWDA).

18 36. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Court grant final
19 approval of the settlement as being fair, reasonable, and in the best interest of the class, and
20 approve the requested attorneys' fees, costs, and enhancements.

21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
22 foregoing is true and correct. Executed on August 26, 2025, at Riverside, California.


23
24 By: 
25 Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
26
27
28

EXHIBIT “A”

Arreola v. Fleet Services

Time Records for Brian Mankin

Date	Attorney	Description	Hours	Rate	Amount
8/22/2023	Brian J. Mankin	Initial file review; review client documents, LWDA letter and complaint; online research of employer	2.60	\$950	\$ 2,470.00
8/30/2023	Brian J. Mankin	Review multiple correspondence between ML & OC re scheduling mediation	0.20	\$950	\$ 190.00
9/7/2023	Brian J. Mankin	Review and revise first amended complaint and stipulation to file same	0.60	\$950	\$ 570.00
10/18/2023	Brian J. Mankin	Review informal requests for mediation	0.20	\$950	\$ 190.00
1/15/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Case development review re status of mediation and informal discovery	0.20	\$950	\$ 190.00
2/9/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Analysis of statistical expert's report for mediation	0.50	\$950	\$ 475.00
2/19/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Review mediation brief, damages analysis and prepare for mediation	4.60	\$950	\$ 4,370.00
2/20/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Attend mediation	8.50	\$950	\$ 8,075.00
2/29/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Review Def's changes to the MOU, and further draft same	0.70	\$950	\$ 665.00
3/4/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Review changes and further draft MOU re Escalator	0.30	\$950	\$ 285.00
3/12/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Obtain and review multiple bids from settlement administrators	0.50	\$950	\$ 475.00
3/13/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Draft long form settlement agreement and notice packet	8.40	\$950	\$ 7,980.00
3/26/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Multiple correspondences with OC re their request to change Admins and use ILYM; email ILYM re notice process	0.30	\$950	\$ 285.00
5/28/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Case development review re status of finalizing settlement agreement and responses from OC re same.	0.30	\$950	\$ 285.00
6/3/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Review Def's changes to the settlement docs and further draft same	1.10	\$950	\$ 1,045.00
7/2/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Prepare initial draft of MPA, Order and my declaration	8.80	\$950	\$ 8,360.00
9/13/2024	Brian J. Mankin	Review OC's comments and finalize MPA documents for filing	0.60	\$950	\$ 570.00
1/31/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Review court's tentative ruling re MPA and evaluate changes needed	0.30	\$950	\$ 285.00
3/3/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Draft supplemental declaration, order, amended settlement agreement and revised class notice	6.90	\$950	\$ 6,555.00
3/20/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Review OC's changes to the amended MPA documents and further draft same	1.40	\$950	\$ 1,330.00
4/10/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Review tentative ruling, assignment to new department, and draft revised order and notice packet	1.10	\$950	\$ 1,045.00
4/16/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Draft correspondence to Admin re MPA granted and beginning notice process	0.20	\$950	\$ 190.00
5/13/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Review Admin's calculations	0.20	\$950	\$ 190.00
6/17/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Review correspondences from Admin re weekly report; review objection	0.20	\$950	\$ 190.00
8/6/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Review Admin's final weekly report	0.20	\$950	\$ 190.00
8/19/2025	Brian J. Mankin	Draft MFA, final order and my declaration	7.70	\$950	\$ 7,315.00
	Brian J. Mankin	<i>Estimated (8/20/23 through Final Approval):</i> Finalize Motion and Related Documents; Respond to questions/comments from the Court and prepare any necessary supplemental briefing; Attending Approval Hearing	15.00	\$950	\$ 14,250.00
	Brian J. Mankin	<i>Estimated (after Final Approval):</i> Work with OC and administrator to complete Settlement and mailing of checks/letter; responding to employees questions; ensuring timely payment; reviewing final calculations and disbursement instructions; preparing final declaration and report of disbursement; attending final disbursement hearing	15.00	\$950	\$ 14,250.00
Billable Totals for Brian Mankin			86.60		\$ 82,270.00

EXHIBIT “B”

All Expenses
Lauby, Mankin & Lauby LLP

Staff Member = All (Inactive Included)
Group By Staff Member Group
Client - Project = 14000-00531 Arreola v Fleet
Services (Active Only)
Activity Code = All
Expense Code = All
View = Original
Approval Status = All
Selected Expenses = All
From Earliest To Latest

Entered	Status	Expense	Staff Member	Price	Mark Up %	Qty	Amount
<u>Briana Arreola</u> <u>14000-00531 Arreola v Fleet Services</u>							
03-30-2023	Approved	E112 Court fees	Charito, Tracie	75.00	0.00	1.00	75.00
	Fees to LWDA to submit PAGA letter						
03-30-2023	Approved	E101 Copying	Charito, Tracie	0.20	0.00	56.00	11.20
	56 copies @ .20 each - letters to company						
03-30-2023	Approved	E108 Postage	Charito, Tracie	19.32	0.00	1.00	19.32
	Postage for March 2023						
04-03-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	1,492.98	0.00	1.00	1,492.98
	Onelgal Order #20120259 - file complaint						
04-11-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	140.73	0.00	1.00	140.73
	Bosco Inv #8658619 Serve: Fleet Services, Inc., a California Corporation Summons: Complaint; Civil Case Cover Sheet; ADR Court: County of Orange - Central Justice Center Completed on: 04/06/2023						
04-17-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	101.85	0.00	1.00	101.85
	Bosco Inv #8658600 Serve: Dick Van Eck, an individual Summons: Complaint; Civil Case Cover Sheet; ADR Court: County of Orange - Central Justice Center Completed on: 04/12/2023						
04-21-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	15.65	0.00	1.00	15.65
	Onelgal Order #20269575 - file (2) Proofs of Service						
08-02-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	13.33	0.00	1.00	13.33
	Onelgal Order #20925760 - file PLA CMC Statement						
08-31-2023	Approved	E125 Mediation fees	Charito, Tracie	8,375.00	0.00	1.00	8,375.00
	JudicateWest Inv #606542 for 2/20/24 mediation with Kelly Knight, Esq.						
09-20-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	15.65	0.00	1.00	15.65
	Onelgal Order #21254320 - file Stip and Order re FAC						
10-10-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	20.59	0.00	1.00	20.59
	Onelgal Order #21254321 - Stipulation fee						
10-19-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	15.65	0.00	1.00	15.65
	Onelgal Order #21390079- file FAC						
10-25-2023	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	15.65	0.00	1.00	15.65
	Onelgal Order #21499741 - file Joint Statement						
02-28-2024	Approved	E119 Experts	Charito, Tracie	8,240.00	0.00	1.00	8,240.00

All Expenses
Lauby, Mankin & Lauby LLP

Staff Member = All (Inactive Included)
Group By Staff Member Group
Client - Project = 14000-00531 Arreola v Fleet
Services (Active Only)
Activity Code = All
Expense Code = All
View = Original
Approval Status = All
Selected Expenses = All
From Earliest To Latest

Entered	Status	Expense	Staff Member	Price	Mark Up %	Qty	Amount
<u>Briana Arreola</u> <u>14000-00531 Arreola v Fleet Services</u>							
Berger Consulting Inv #9963							
04-10-2024	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	17.71	0.00	1.00	17.71
Onelgal Order #22645420 - file Joint Statement							
08-07-2024	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	17.71	0.00	1.00	17.71
Onelgal Order #23482995 - file Joint Statement							
09-16-2024	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	79.48	0.00	1.00	79.48
Onelgal Order #23731305 - file MPA							
10-23-2024	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	17.76	0.00	1.00	17.76
Onelgal Order #239898704 - file Joint Statement							
02-10-2025	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	19.82	0.00	1.00	19.82
Onelgal Order #24678707 - file Notice of Ruling							
03-27-2025	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	19.82	0.00	1.00	19.82
Onelgal Order #25021026 - file Supplemental PA docs							
05-05-2025	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	19.82	0.00	1.00	19.82
Onelgal Order #25140015 - file Notice of Ruling							
05-13-2025	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	41.51	0.00	1.00	41.51
Onelgal Order #25275920 - file Stip and Order to Cont FA							
08-26-2025	Approved	Attorney Service	Charito, Tracie	150.00	0.00	1.00	150.00
File MFA and supporting documents							

Project Total 18,936.23
Client Total 18,936.23
Grand Total 18,936.23

EXHIBIT “C”