Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943)
Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
Matthew Richard Soto (353499)
LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiff Leopoldo Ariola

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

LEOPOLDO ARIOLA, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiff,

vs.

RAYTHEON (CA) TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation; RAYTHEON COMPANY, a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23STCV10195

Honorable David S. Cunningham III
Department 11

<u>CLASS ACTION</u>

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Date:	November 20, 2025
Time:	10:00 a.m.
Department:	11
Complaint Filed:	May 5, 2023
FAC Filed:	February 3, 2025
Trial Date:	None Set

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on November 20, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard before the Honorable David S. Cunningham III in Department 11 of the Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles, located at 312 North Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012, Plaintiff Leopoldo Ariola ("Plaintiff" or "Class Representative") will, and hereby does, move for an order:

- Granting preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement described herein and as set forth in the First Amended Joint Stipulation of Class Action and Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement"), attached as "**EXHIBIT 2**" to the Declaration of Matthew Richard Soto in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement;
- Certifying the proposed Class for settlement purposes;
- Appointing Plaintiff Leopoldo Ariola as Class Representative;
- Appointing Edwin Aiwazian, Arby Aiwazian, Joanna Ghosh, and Matthew Richard Soto of Lawyers *for* Justice, PC as Class Counsel;
- Approving the proposed Court Approved Notice of Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval ("Class Notice"), attached as "**EXHIBIT A**" to the [Proposed] Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, and directing the mailing thereof in accordance with the Settlement Agreement;
- Approving Simpluris, Inc. as the Settlement Administrator; and
- Scheduling a hearing to consider final approval of the Settlement.

This Motion is made pursuant to Rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court, which require approval by the Court of the settlement of a putative class action, and Rule 3.1113(e), which allows the Court to preliminarily certify a class for settlement purposes, and permits the Court to extend the page limit for memoranda.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

This motion is based upon the following memorandum of points and authorities, the Settlement Agreement, the Declaration of Proposed Class Counsel (Matthew Richard Soto) and Proposed Class Representative (Leopoldo Ariola) in support thereof, as well as the pleadings and other records on file with the Court in this matter, and such evidence and oral argument as may be presented at the hearing on this motion.

Dated: June 6, 2025

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC

By: ________________________________

Joanna Ghosh
Matthew Richard Soto
Attorneys for Plaintiff Leopoldo Ariola

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Statutes

Other Authorities

Rules

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION

Plaintiff Leopoldo Ariola ("Plaintiff" or "Class Representative") seeks preliminary approval of the First Amended Joint Stipulation of Class Action and Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement") entered into by and between Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and other aggrieved employees, on the one hand, and Defendants Raytheon (CA) Technologies Corporation and Raytheon Company (together, the "Defendants"), on the other hand. Subject to approval by the Court, Plaintiff and Defendants (collectively, the "Parties") have agreed to settle the lawsuits for a Gross Settlement Amount of $6,500,000.00.[1]

Plaintiff also seeks to provisionally certify the following Class for settlement purposes, which Defendants do not oppose:

> All non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California at any time between May 5, 2019 through November 28, 2024 ("Class" or "Class Members").[2]

Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion from the Class Settlement ("Participating Class Member") will receive a *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount ("Individual Class Share"). The net payment of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Share ("Individual Class Payment") will be distributed to Participating Class Members on a *pro rata* basis based upon the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendants for at least one day during the Class Period ("Workweeks").[3]

The Settlement, upon final approval by the Court and funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, will operate to resolve the Released Class Claims of Plaintiff and Participating Class Members and the Released PAGA Claims of the State of California.[4]

---

[1] Settlement Agreement, attached as "**EXHIBIT 2**" to Declaration of Matthew Richard Soto ("Soto Decl."), § 1.17. Defendants represent and estimate that there are 259,564 total Workweeks between May 5, 2019 and July 17, 2024 (the date of mediation). If the actual number of Workweeks during this timeframe exceeds 259,564 by more than 10% (i.e., at least 285,521 total Workweeks), the Gross Settlement Amount will be increased by the actual percentage above the 10% threshold. For example, if the number is 11% higher, then the Gross Settlement Amount will be increased by 1%. *See id.*, § 6.

[2] *Id.*, § 1.3.

[3] Settlement Agreement, §§ 1.47 & 7.1.1. "Class Period" is defined as the period from May 5, 2019 through November 28, 2024. *See id.*, § 1.9.

[4] *Id.*, at §§ 5.3 & 13. *See id.* at § 13.1 for the full scope of the "Released Class Claims" *id.* at § 13.2 for the full scope of the "Released PAGA Claims," and *id.* at § 1.42 for the definition of the "Released Parties."

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants are a multinational aerospace and defense conglomerate with various locations in California. Raytheon (CA) Technologies Corporation is headquartered in Arlington, Virginia and Raytheon Company is headquartered in Waltham, Massachusetts.

On March 1, 2023, Plaintiff provided written notice by certified mail to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that were alleged to be violated ("PAGA Notice").[5]

On May 5, 2023, Plaintiff filed the Class Action Complaint for Damages ("Original Complaint") in the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, thereby commencing the above-captioned lawsuit ("*Ariola* Class Action").[6]

On May 5, 2023, Plaintiff filed his Complaint for Enforcement under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code § 2698, *Et Seq.*, Case No. 23TRCV01456 ("*Ariola* PAGA Action") (the *Ariola* Class Action and *Ariola* PAGA Action are collectively referred to as the "Action"), asserting civil penalties for the same Labor Code violations alleged in the Class Action Complaint in the Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles.[7]

On June 13, 2023, Defendants filed a Notice of Removal of the Class Action to the United States District Court Central District of California in the Action and on June 14, 2023, Defendants filed a Notice of Removal of the PAGA Action to the United States District Court Central District of California in the *Ariola* PAGA Action.[8]

On August 21, 2024, the Parties agreed to stipulate to remand the Actions to state court and on August 22, 2024, the United States District Court Central District of California remanded the *Ariola* Class Action and *Ariola* PAGA Action to the Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles.[9]

---

[5] Soto Decl. ¶ 2, Exh. 1.
[6] *Id.*, ¶ 3.
[7] *Id.*, ¶ 4.
[8] *Id.*, ¶¶ 5-6.
[9] *Id.*, ¶¶ 8-9.

On January 21, 2025, Plaintiff sought leave to file a First Amended Complaint for Damages and Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698, *Et Seq*. ("Operative Complaint"), adding a PAGA cause of action. The Court granted Plaintiff leave to file the proposed First Amended Complaint on January 24, 2025, and Plaintiff filed the First Amended Complaint on February 3, 2025.[10]

Plaintiff's core allegations are that Defendants have violated California wage and hour law, including but not limited to laws set forth in the California Labor Code, by engaging in a uniform practice and procedure, with respect to Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees of, *inter alia*, failing to pay all overtime and minimum wages, at all or at the correct rate of pay, failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium pay, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide compliant wage statements, failing to maintain requisite payroll records, and failing to reimburse necessary business expenses, and thereby engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq*., and conduct giving rise to civil penalties recoverable under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*). Plaintiff contends that he, and the Class Members, are entitled to, *inter alia*, unpaid wages, penalties (including and not limited to, penalties pursuant to PAGA), and attorneys' fees and costs.[11]

The Parties have actively litigated the Action since it was commenced on May 5, 2023. On July 17, 2024, the Parties participated in arm's-length and informed negotiations with Mediator Paul Grossman ("Mediator"), a respected mediator of complex wage and hour actions.[12] The case resolved after Mr. Grossman issued a mediator's proposal that the Parties accepted on July 31, 2024.[13]

///

///

---

[10] Soto Decl., ¶ 10.
[11] *Id.*, ¶¶ 19 & 32.
[12] *Id.*, ¶ 7.
[13] *Ibid.*

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS

Under the terms of the Settlement, Defendants will pay a Gross Settlement Amount of $6,500,000.00 to resolve the Action.[14] Subject to approval by the Court, the Net Settlement Amount will be calculated by deducting the following amounts from the Gross Settlement Amount: (1) attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 38% of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $2,470,000.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount remains $6,500,000.00) and litigation costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed $45,000.00 ("Class Counsel Fees and Cost Award") to Class Counsel; (2) Settlement Administration Costs, which are currently estimated not to exceed $24,500.00 to the Settlement Administrator ("Settlement Administration Costs"); (3) PAGA Amount of $950,000.00 ("PAGA Payment"); and (4) payment in the amount of up to $22,000.00 to Plaintiff ("Class Representative Service Award").[15] The Parties have agreed to retain Simpluris, Inc. ("Simpluris" or "Settlement Administrator") to handle the notice and settlement administration process.[16]

The Parties have agreed that the Settlement Administrator will determine each Participating Class Member's share of the available Net Settlement Amount ("Individual Class Share"), in accordance with the Settlement Agreement on a *pro rata* per Workweeks basis, which will be adjusted after Final Approval to reflect the total Workweeks worked by Participating Class Member.[17] The Parties have agreed that the Settlement Administrator will determine each Aggrieved Employee's *pro rata* share of the 25% share of the PAGA Payment, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement on a *pro rata* per PAGA Pay Periods basis.[18]

The Parties agree, for purposes of this Settlement, that Individual Class Shares will be allocated 20% to wages subject to withholdings and 80% to penalties and interest.[19] The Settlement Administrator will withhold the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Class Share, and issue checks to Participating

---

[14] Settlement Agreement, § 5.1.
[15] Settlement Agreement, §§ 7.21, 8, 9, and 10.
[16] *Id.*, §§ 1.46 & 10.
[17] *Id.*, § 7.1.1.
[18] *Id.*, § 7.2.2.
[19] *Id.*, § 12.1.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

Class Members for their Individual Class Payments. Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as 100% penalties and will not be subjected to withholdings.[20] Defendants will provide the funds for any employer-side taxes related to the Individual Class Shares.[21]

Individual Class Payment and Individual PAGA Payment checks will be negotiable for 180 calendar days from the date of their issuance, and thereafter, shall be canceled.[22] Thereafter, funds from uncashed Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment checks shall be transmitted to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of each Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee to whom the checks were issued.[23]

Any Class Member may request to be excluded from the Class Settlement by mailing a Request for Exclusion postmarked on or before the date that is 50 calendar days from the date of the initial mailing of the Class Notice by the Settlement Administrator ("Response Deadline").[24] Aggrieved Employees shall be bound to the PAGA Settlement irrespective of whether they exercise their option to opt out of the Class Settlement.[25]

Only Class Members who have not submitted a Request for Exclusion (i.e., Participating Class Member) may object to the Class Settlement by submitting a Notice of Objection, to the Settlement Administrator prior to the Response Deadline.[26]

In order to dispute the number of Workweeks attributable to an individual Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee, that Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee must submit a written letter to the Settlement Administrator, and include copies of any supporting evidence they may have.[27]

///

///

///

---

[20] *Ibid.*
[21] *Id.*, §§ 5.1 & 12.1.
[22] Settlement Agreement, § 11.4.
[23] *Id.*, § 11.5.
[24] *Id.*, § 1.44.
[25] *Id.*, § 1.34 & Settlement Agreement, Exhibit A.
[26] *Id.*, §§ 1.26 & 1.44.
[27] *Id.*, § 14.3.1.1

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

IV. LEGAL STANDARD FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS

The settlement of a class action requires approval by the court. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1800; Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781(f). Courts review class action settlements in a two-step process: (1) an earlier conditional review by the court; and (2) a later detailed review after the period during which notice is distributed to class members for their comments or objections. Conte & Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* § 11.24 (4th Ed. 2002). Preliminary approval of a settlement does not require a court to make a final determination that the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Rather, that decision is made only at the final approval stage. Cal. R. Ct. 3.769(g).

In considering a potential class settlement, a court need not reach any ultimate conclusions on the issues of fact and law which underlie the merits of the dispute and need not engage in a trial on the merits. See *City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corporation* (2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448, 456; *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission of City and County of San Francisco* (9th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 615, 625. Neither formal notice nor a hearing is required for the trial court to grant provisional class certification and preliminary approval; the court may grant such relief upon an informal application by the settling parties and may conduct any necessary hearing in court or in chambers, at the court's discretion. *Newberg*, § 11.25.

V. THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT

The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether a proposed settlement is fair under the circumstances of the case. *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1800. To make this fairness determination, courts must consider several relevant factors, including "the strength of the Plaintiff's case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and view of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement." *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801. "The list of factors is not exclusive and the court is free to engage in a balancing and weighing of the factors depending on the circumstances of

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

each case." *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245. Furthermore, courts give "proper deference to the private consensual decision of the parties." *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1027 (citation omitted).

The proponent of the settlement has the burden to show that it is fair and reasonable. *Wershba*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 245. "A presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached through arm's-length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small." *Id.*; *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1802; *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1151.

A. **The Settlement Resulted from Arm's-Length Negotiations Based Upon Extensive Investigation and Discovery.**

The Parties have actively litigated the Action since it commenced on May 5, 2023. Both sides investigated the veracity, strength, and scope of the claims throughout the case, and Class Counsel was actively preparing the matter for class certification and trial.[28]

Class Counsel conducted significant investigation and informal discovery regarding the facts of the case, including and not limited to, the exchange, review, and analysis of a large volume of documents and data from Plaintiff, Defendants, and other sources.[29] The volume of data and documents that Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed included and was not limited to: Plaintiff's and other Class Members' employment records, a detailed sampling of Class Members' time and pay data, multiple collective bargaining agreements between Defendants and several unions, company policy documents, Defendants' operations, among other information and documents.[30] Class Counsel had the opportunity to interview Plaintiff to gather facts and to identify potential witnesses.[31] In addition, Class Counsel has extensive experience in California wage-and-hour class actions.[32]

---

[28] Soto Decl., ¶¶ 26-31.
[29] *Id.*, ¶ 28.
[30] *Ibid.*
[31] *Ibid.*
[32] *Id.*, ¶¶ 21-25.

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

The Parties engaged in extensive settlement negotiations and participated in a full-day mediation conducted by Paul Grossman, Esq., a well-respected mediator experienced in mediating complex labor and employment matters.[33] Prior to and during the mediation and settlement negotiations, the Parties exchanged extensive information and engaged in discussions regarding their evaluations of the case and various aspects of the case, including but not limited to, the risks and delays of further litigation, including the risks of proceeding with class certification, the law relating to off-the-clock theory, collective bargaining agreements, regular rate of pay, rounding, meal and rest periods, PAGA representative claims, and wage-and-hour enforcement; the evidence produced and analyzed; and the possibility of appeals.[34] During all settlement discussions, the Parties conducted their negotiations at arm's length in an adversarial position.[35] Arriving at a settlement that was acceptable to both Parties was not easy. Both sides felt strongly about their ability to prevail at certification and at trial.[36] After conducting investigations, informal discovery, extensive settlement negotiations, and with the aid of the mediator's proposal, the Parties have agreed that the matter is well-suited for settlement given the legal issues relating to Plaintiff's principal claims, as well as the costs and risks to both sides that would attend further litigation.[37]

B. <u>The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.</u>

The Settlement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the matter.[38] The Settlement was calculated using the information and data uncovered during litigation, case investigation, and the informal exchange of information.[39] The Settlement takes into account the potential risks and rewards inherent in any case and, in particular, in the matter at issue.[40] Moreover, considering all of the facts and circumstances of the lawsuit, the Settlement represents a fair, reasonable, and adequate recovery for the Class.[41]

---

[33] *Id.*, ¶ 27.
[34] Soto Decl., ¶ 27.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *Ibid.*
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] *Id.*, ¶ 29.
[39] *Id.*, ¶ 27.
[40] *Ibid.*
[41] *Ibid.*

Assuming that the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Class Representative Service Award, PAGA Payment, and Settlement Administration Costs are approved by the Court and paid in the full amounts provided for by the Settlement, the Settlement provides for a Net Settlement Amount that is currently estimated to be $2,988,500.00.[42] Additionally, 25% of the PAGA Payment (i.e., PAGA Penalties), which is $237,500.00 out of $950,000.00, will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees. The entire Net Settlement Amount will be fully paid out to the Participating Class Members, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

The amount of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Share and each Aggrieved Employee's Individual PAGA Payment will be calculated based on their Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods during the Class Period and PAGA Period, respectively.[43] "An allocation formula need only have a reasonable, rational basis [to warrant approval], particularly if recommended by experienced and competent class counsel." *In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc., Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 127 F.Supp.2d 418, 429-30. Here, the allocation is reasonably related to the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods actually worked for Defendants during the relevant period and should be approved.

In light of the foregoing considerations, Class Counsel believes that the Settlement as a whole is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interest of the Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California.[44] Although the recommendations of Class Counsel are not conclusive, the Court can properly take the recommendations into account, particularly if Class Counsel appears to be competent, and has experience with this type of litigation, and investigations have been completed, as is the case here.[45] *Newberg*, §11.47. Accordingly, the Court should grant preliminary approval of the Settlement.

C. <u>The Settlement Is of Significant Value.</u>

Pursuant to *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, the Parties conducted extensive informal discovery and exchanged a large volume of documents, data, and

---

[42] *Id.*, ¶ 12.
[43] Settlement Agreement, §§ 7.1.1 and 7.2.2.
[44] Soto Decl., ¶¶ 27 & 38.
[45] *Id.*, ¶ 21-25.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

information prior to mediation.[46] The information that Class Counsel obtained from Plaintiff, Defendants, and other sources allowed Class Counsel to develop valuation models in order to evaluate the potential value and merit of the claims, and perform a complete evaluation of Defendants' defenses thereto.[47] As outlined in the Declaration of Matthew Richard Soto, Class Counsel performed an extensive analysis of each and every claim pursuant to *Kullar* prior to entering into the Settlement.[48]

VI. CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE

The requisites for establishing class certification are met, and the Parties have stipulated to conditional certification of the Class for settlement purposes only.[49] California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 "authorizes class actions when 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." *Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319, 326. California courts certify class actions where the Plaintiff identifies "both [1] an ascertainable class and [2] a well-defined community of interest among class members." *Id.*

A. The Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous.

"Ascertainability is required in order to give notice to putative class members as to whom the judgment in the action will be *res judicata*." *Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 908, 914. "A class is ascertainable if it identifies a group of unnamed Plaintiffs by describing a set of common characteristics sufficient to allow a member of that group to identify himself or herself as having a right to recover based on the description." *Bartold v. Glendale Federal Bank* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 816, 828. The proposed Class must also be sufficiently numerous. *Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429, 435; *see also Rose v. City of Hayward* (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 926, 934-35 (indicating that a class of 30 to 40 individuals satisfies the numerosity requirement as joinder is not practical at that point). The Class here is estimated to be approximately 2,619 individuals, which is sufficiently numerous.[50]

---

[46] *Id.*, ¶ 28.
[47] *Ibid.*
[48] Soto Decl., ¶¶ 32-36.a-j.
[49] Settlement Agreement, § 4.1.
[50] Soto Decl., ¶ 18 & 33.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

Further, all Class Members can and will be identified by Defendants to the Settlement Administrator through a review of Defendants' employment records regarding non-exempt employees in the State of California at any time during the Class Period. As such, the Class is ascertainable and sufficiently numerous.

B. The Share a Well-Defined Community of Interest.

The community of interest requirement "embodies three factors: (1) predominant common questions of law or fact; (2) Class Representative with claims or defenses typical of the class; and (3) Class Representative who can adequately represent the class." *Sav-On, supra*, 34 Cal.4th at 326. "[T]he community of interest requirement for certification *does not mandate that class members have uniform or identical claims*." *Capitol People First v. Dep't of Developmental Services* (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 676, 692 (emphasis in original). Rather, courts focus on the Defendants' internal policies and "pattern and practice . . . in order to assess whether that common behavior toward similarly situated Plaintiff renders class certification appropriate." *Id.* (citing *Sav-On*, 34 Cal.4th at 333).

Here, common issues of law and fact predominate as to each of the claims alleged and asserted in the Action. Based on the documents and information obtained through informal discovery and exchange of information in the case, Plaintiff contends that Class Members performed similar job duties and were subject to uniform operations and employment policies, practices, and procedures during the Class Period, including payroll and recordkeeping practices.[51] As a result, Plaintiff claims that all of the Class Members were uniformly not paid all compensation due to them from Defendants during the time period at issue. Plaintiff maintains that the outcome of this litigation would be determined by Defendants' alleged uniform operations and employment policies and procedures that applied across its non-exempt employees who worked in the State of California at any time during the Class Period.

As a member of the Class who was subject to these same policies, practices, and procedures, Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class. Moreover, Plaintiff has no interests adverse to the Class. Plaintiff has taken steps to initiate and maintain this action and to ensure

[51] Soto Decl., ¶¶ 19-20.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

that it comes to a fair and reasonable resolution.[52] Importantly, Plaintiff has retained a law firm well-versed in wage and hour class actions, which has at all times represented the best interests of Plaintiff and the Class.[53]

Accordingly, the proposed Class shares a community of interest, and the Court should certify the Class for settlement purposes only.

VII. <u>APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND ALLOCATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS</u>

Prior to the mediation, Class Counsel had litigated the Action for over 1 year and was actively preparing the matter for class certification and trial.[54] The ongoing work has been extensive, demanding, and ultimately successful in achieving a substantial settlement resolution. Class Counsel reviewed a large volume of documents and data[55] and also interviewed and obtained information from Plaintiff, researched applicable law, undertook damages/valuation calculations, and met and conferred with Defendants' counsel regarding the pleadings and the production of documents and data prior to mediation.[56] Counsel for the Parties also undertook extensive settlement discussions, which included participating in mediation.[57]

Class Counsel is well-experienced in wage-and-hour class action litigation and used that experience to obtain a great result for the Class.[58]

The Settlement establishes a Gross Settlement Amount of $6,500,000.00, and provides for Class Counsel to apply to the Court consisting of attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 38% of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $2,470,000.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount remains $6,500,000.00) and reimbursement of actual costs and expenses in an amount up to $45,000.00.[59] The attorneys' fees provided for by the Settlement are commensurate with: (1) the risk that Class Counsel took in bringing and litigating the case, (2) the extensive time, effort and

---

[52] Declaration of Leopoldo Ariola in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Ariola Decl."), ¶¶ 3-4.
[53] Soto Decl., ¶¶ 21-25 & 38.
[54] Soto Decl., ¶ 27.
[55] *Ibid.*, ¶ 28
[56] *Ibid.*
[57] *Id.*
[58] *Id.*, ¶¶ 21-25.
[59] Settlement Agreement, § 5.1 & 8.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

expense that Class Counsel dedicated to the case, (3) the skill and determination that Class Counsel has shown, (4) the results that Class Counsel has achieved throughout the litigation, (5) the value of the Settlement that Class Counsel has achieved for the Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, and (6) the other cases that Class Counsel had to turn down in order to devote its time and efforts to this matter. The proposed Class Notice provides Class Members that an award of the Attorneys' Fees and Costs will be sought, and the amount allocated toward the Attorneys' Fees and Costs by the Settlement.[60]

Trial courts have "wide latitude" in assessing the value of attorneys' fees and their decisions will "not be disturbed on appeal absent a manifest abuse of discretion." *Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 41. Indeed, it is long settled that the "experienced trial judge is the best judge of the value of professional services rendered in his court." *Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132. California law provides that attorney fee awards should be equivalent to fees paid in the legal marketplace to compensate for the result achieved and risk incurred. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503 (citing *Lealao*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 48-49). In *Lealao*, the court held that when an action leads to a recovery that can be "monetized" with a reasonable degree of certainty, the trial court should "ensure that the fee awarded is within the range of fees freely negotiated in the legal marketplace in comparable litigation." *Id.* at 50.

The California Supreme Court has confirmed the propriety of calculating and awarding attorneys' fees as a percentage of a settlement that has, by litigation, been preserved or recovered for the benefit of others. *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal.5th 480 at 486 & 506. The Court has taken the position that while "[t]rial courts have discretion to conduct a lodestar cross-check on a percentage fee," "they also retain the discretion to forgo a lodestar cross-check and use other means to evaluate the reasonableness of a requested percentage fee[,]" and "[t]he percentage of fund method survives in California." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

Historically, courts have awarded fees as high as 50% of the settlement, depending on the circumstances of the case. *Newberg,* § 14.03; *see also In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.*

---

[60] Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

(D.D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp. 494 (awarding attorneys' fees in the amount of 45% of the $7.3 million settlement); *Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.* (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195 (awarding approximately 53% of the settlement as attorneys' fees). California courts routinely approve class action attorneys' fee awards "averag[ing] around one-third of the recovery." *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 n.11 (lower court found 20 to 40 percent range of contingency fee in marketplace was appropriate in class actions); see also *Estrada v. Dr. Pepper/Seven-Up*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC262247 (May 2005) (wage and hour); *Moore v. IKEA*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC263646 (Sept. 2006) (wage and hour).

Class Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.[61]

Class Counsel will provide extensive evidence as to the time worked, litigation efforts, and further argument at the time of filing Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement and application for the Attorneys' Fees and Costs at the Final Approval Hearing. Considering the work performed and the risks incurred, the attorneys' fees provided for by the Settlement are well within the range of reasonableness for preliminary approval.

VIII. THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS ADEQUATE

California statutory authority and case law vests the Court with broad discretion in fashioning appropriate class notice. See Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781; *Cartt v. Superior Court* (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 960, 973-74. A class notice is adequate if it "present[s] a fair recital of the subject matter and proposed terms" of the Settlement. *Mendoza v. United States* (9th Cir. 1980) 623 F.2d 1338, 1351 (quoting *Marshall v. Holiday Magic* (9th Cir. 1977) 550 F.2d 1173, 1177).

"Sufficient information about the case should be provided to enable class members to make an informed decision about their participation." *Manual for Complex Litigation* § 21.311 at 413 (4th ed. 2004). The proposed Class Notice describes the Settlement, the deadlines and procedures to submit an objection to the Class Settlement, submit a Request for Exclusion from

[61] Soto Decl., ¶ 13.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

the Class Settlement, and/or dispute regarding Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods, and the date and time set for the Final Approval Hearing.[62] The proposed Class Notice summarizes the proceedings to date and the terms and conditions of the Settlement in an informative and coherent manner.[63] The proposed Class Notice recognizes that the Court has not yet granted final approval of the settlement.[64] The proposed Class Notice also apprises the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees of, *inter alia*, how their Individual Class Share and if applicable, their Individual PAGA Payment is calculated and the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods credited to them.[65] The proposed Class Notice fulfills the requirement of neutrality in notice procedure. *Newberg*, at § 8.39.

Thus, the proposed Class Notice satisfies all due process requirements and complies with the standards of fairness, completeness, and neutrality. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2) and 23(e); *Newberg*, §§ 8.21, 8.39; *Manual*, §§ 21.311, 21.312; see also *Cartt*, *supra*, 50 Cal.App.3d at 960. Accordingly, the Court should approve the proposed Class Notice.

IX. <u>APPOINTMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR</u>

The Parties have selected Simpluris, Inc. as the Settlement Administrator. Within 14 calendar days of receipt of the Class Data, the Settlement Administrator will perform an NCOA check and will mail the Class Notice to each Class Member and Aggrieved Employee.[66] The Settlement Administrator will skip-trace returned Class Notice and re-mail the Class Notice to the new addresses within three calendar days.[67] In the case of a re-mailed Class Notice, the Response Deadline will be the later of 50 calendar days after initial mailing or 14 calendar days from re-mailing.[68] The Administrator will receive and process Request for Exclusion, Notice of Objection, and any challenges to Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods.[69] In addition, the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for printing, distributing, and tracking Class

[62] Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.
[63] Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.
[64] *Ibid.*
[65] *Ibid.*
[66] Settlement Agreement, § 14.3.3.
[67] *Id.*, § 14.3.4.
[68] *Id.*, § 14.3.5.
[69] *Id.*, § Exh. A.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale. California 91203

Notices and other documents for the Settlement; calculating and distributing payments due under the Settlement; issuing of 1099 and W-2 IRS Forms and all required tax reporting, filings, withholdings, and remittances; providing necessary reports and declarations; and other duties and responsibilities to process the Settlement and as requested by the Parties.[70] The Settlement Administration Costs is currently estimated to be $24,500.00 and will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court.[71] Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court appoint Simpluris, Inc. as the Settlement Administrator and direct the mailing of the Class Notice to the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees in the manner outlined and based on the proposed deadlines as described herein and set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

XI. CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE AWARD

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court appoint him as the Class Representative and preliminarily approve the Class Representative Service Award in an amount up to $22,000.00.[72] It is within the Court's discretion to award payment to a Class Representative for his efforts and work. *Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294, 299. The factors that courts may consider in determining whether to make a Class Representative Service Award include: (1) the risk to the Class Representative in commencing suit, both financial and otherwise; (2) the notoriety and personal difficulties encountered by the Class Representative; (3) the amount of time and effort spent by the Class Representative; (4) the duration of the litigation; and (5) the personal benefit (or lack thereof) enjoyed by the Class Representative as a result of the litigation. *Id.*

The Class Representative Service Award is fair and appropriate. Plaintiff spent a substantial amount of time and effort in producing relevant documents and past employment records and providing the facts and evidence necessary to attempt to prove the allegations filed in both of his lawsuits.[73] Plaintiff was available whenever Class Counsel needed him and

---

[70] Settlement Agreement, § 10.
[71] *Ibid.*
[72] *Id.*, § 9.
[73] Soto Decl., ¶ 14; Ariola Decl., ¶¶ 3-4.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

actively tried to obtain and provide information that would facilitate the pursuit of the class and PAGA claims.[74] In addition, Plaintiff has agreed, in exchange for the Service Award, to a broad general release of all claims (with a waiver of Civil Code Section 1542) which includes all claims both before and after the Class Period. Accordingly, it is appropriate and just for Plaintiff to receive $22,000.00 for his services on behalf of the Class, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, and for agreeing to provide a broad general release of claims, which no other employee is providing as part of the Settlement.

XII. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant Preliminary Approval of the Settlement; conditionally certify the Class for settlement purposes; preliminary appoint and designate Lawyers *for* Justice, PC as Class Counsel; appoint Plaintiff Leopoldo Ariola as Class Representative; appoint Simpluris, Inc. as Settlement Administrator; preliminarily approve the allocations for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Class Representative Service Award, PAGA Payment, and Settlement Administration Costs; approve the proposed Class Notice; direct the Settlement Administrator to undertake the notice and settlement administration process in conformity with the deadlines and procedures provided by the Settlement Agreement; and to schedule a Final Approval Hearing to take place in approximately 6 months.

Dated: June 6, 2025

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC

By: ______________________________

Joanna Ghosh
Matthew Richard Soto
Attorneys for Plaintiff Leopoldo Ariola

[74] Soto Decl., ¶ 14; Ariola Decl., ¶¶ 3-6.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203