MARALLE MESSRELIAN (SBN 316974)
maralle@mmlawapc.com
MM LAW, APC
500 N. Brand Blvd., Ste 2000
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone (818) 810-7747
Facsimile (818) 230-9018

Attorneys for Plaintiff,
AMAIRANI GOMEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

(*UNLIMITED JURISDICTION*)

AMAIRANI GOMEZ, *Plaintiff*, vs. FOCUS INDUSTRIES, INC., a California corporation; STAN SHIBATA, an individual; and DOES 1 to 25, inclusive, *Defendants*.	Case No.: 30-2023-01336931-CU-OE-CXC **DECLARATION OF MARALLE MESSRELIAN IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT** *Assigned for All Purposes to Hon. Randall J. Sherman, Department CX105* Action filed: 07/17/2023 Hearing Date: 06/13/2025 Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m. Hearing Dept: CX105 **Reservation Number: 74496889**

DECLARATION OF MARALLE MESSRELIAN IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT

I, MARALLE MESSRELIAN, declare and state as follows:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice before all the Courts of the State of California. I am the managing attorney of MM Law, APC and the attorney of record for Amairani Gomez (individually, "Gomez" or "Plaintiff") in her lawsuit against Defendants Focus Industries, Inc. and Stan Shibata (collectively, "Defendants" or "FOCUS").

2. Except as otherwise indicated, I have personal knowledge of all matters set forth herein and, if called as a witness, could and would competently testify thereto under oath.

3. A true and correct copy of the PAGA (Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.)* Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement or "Agreement") is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

4. A true and correct copy of the notice to the below-defined PAGA Members (the "PAGA Notice") is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

Factual and Procedural Background

5. FOCUS began to employ Plaintiff in or around November 2022 as an assembly worker at its facility located at 25301 Commercentre Drive in Lake Forest, California. FOCUS continuously employed Plaintiff in that capacity until on or about March 31, 2023 when her employment ended.

6. Plaintiff complied with the procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 for bringing suit under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq. ("PAGA"). On April 10, 2023, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and FOCUS's other California non-exempt hourly employees (hereafter collectively the "PAGA Members") gave written notice by electronic service to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and via certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. The specific provisions alleged to have been violated in the PAGA notice letter included Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2802,

and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 1. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's letter to the LWDA is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

7. On July 17, 2023, Plaintiff filed a lawsuit in the Orange County Superior Court (the "Lawsuit") against Defendants. The Lawsuit alleged the following causes of action against Defendants: (1) failure to pay all wages earned for all hours worked [*Lab. Code*, §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198]; (2) failure to provide rest breaks [*Lab. Code*, §§ 226.7, 1198]; (3) failure to provide meal periods [*Lab. Code*, §§ 226.7, 512, 1198]; (4) failure to indemnify [*Lab. Code*, § 2802]; (5) failure to provide accurate, itemized wage statements [*Lab. Code*, § 226]; (6) failure to pay wages when employment ends [*Lab. Code*, §§ 201, 202, 203]; (7) failure to pay wages owed every pay period [*Lab. Code*, § 204]; (8) failure to provide personnel records; (9) failure to provide pay records; (10) civil penalties pursuant to California Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") [*Lab. Code*, §§ 2698, *et seq*.]; (11) discrimination on the basis of race and national origin in violation of the FEHA; (12) sexual harassment in violation of the FEHA; (13) retaliation in violation of the FEHA; (14) failure to prevent, investigate, and remedy harassment and retaliation in violation of the FEHA; (15) negligent hiring, retention, supervision, and training; (16) intentional infliction of emotional distress; (17) negligent infliction of emotional distress; (18) wrongful constructive discharge in violation of public policy; and (19) unfair competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code*, §§ 17200, *et seq*.]. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Complaint is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

8. The parties met and conferred and agreed that it may be in their mutual interests to discuss Plaintiff's allegations informally, rather than through litigation, and scheduled private mediation to resolve the representative PAGA claim and Plaintiff's individual claims. Upon mutual agreement of the parties, on June 20, 2024, the parties participated in a full-day mediation session with professional neutral Gig Kyriacou.

9. At the mediation, the parties agreed to settle the Action. Before agreeing to the terms of the Settlement, the parties engaged in informal discovery regarding FOCUS's policies, practices, operations, time and payroll information and other topics. In advance of mediation, Defendants provided Plaintiff's counsel with information and documents relating to other

PAGA Members, including timekeeping and payroll data. The parties also exchanged information pertaining to Plaintiff's individual claims. Through extensive, arm's length negotiations at the mediation, and only after discovery and investigation were performed, the parties agreed to the settlement terms. Now that the parties have finalized the PAGA Settlement, Plaintiff submits it to this Court for approval.

10. Defendants deny any liability or wrongdoing of any kind whatsoever associated with the lawsuit. It is the desire of the parties to fully, finally, and forever compromise, and discharge all claims known or unknown related to those alleged in Plaintiff's lawsuit.

11. Counsel for the parties have further investigated the applicable law as applied to the facts discovered regarding Plaintiff's claims, the defenses thereto, and the Labor Code violations claimed by Plaintiff. I am experienced in prosecuting PAGA lawsuits. Counsel for the Defendants are experienced in defending PAGA cases. Based on the parties' own independent investigations and evaluations, the parties and their respective counsel are of the opinion that the Settlement for the consideration and on the terms set forth in the Agreement are fair, reasonable and adequate and are in the best interests of Plaintiff, the PAGA Employees, the State, and Defendants in light of all known facts and circumstances and the risks inherent in litigation.

12. The Settlement of a PAGA claim requires court approval. Lab. Code §2699(l)(2). The Court necessarily has broad discretion in making the decision to approve or reject a settlement for civil penalties as the statutory scheme authorizes the Court to determine whether, in certain circumstances, penalties should be assessed and, if so assessed, the appropriate amount of penalties based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case. Although the PAGA does not set forth the particular standards against which a PAGA settlement should be evaluated, the LWDA has provided guidance for approval that mirrors the standards for evaluating class action settlements.

13. PAGA imposes two requirements for the settlement of a PAGA claim. Both are met here. First, any civil penalties recovered, whether by judgment or settlement, must be distributed as follows: 75 percent to the LWDA, and the remaining 25 percent to the aggrieved employees. *See Moorer v. Noble L.A. Events, Inc*. (2019) 32 Cal.App.5th 736, 742; Cal. Lab.

Code, § 2699(i). The parties' Settlement so provides (*See* **Exhibit 1**). Second, the LWDA must be given notice of the settlement so that it may be heard before the Court decides whether to grant approval. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(l)(2). Here, notice is being given to the LWDA concurrently with the filing of this motion. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's submission with the LWDA and a confirmation email is attached as **Exhibit 9**. As a result, Plaintiff has met all procedural statutory requirements for settling a PAGA action.

Background of Counsel

14. In 2003, I earned a Bachelor of the Science degree with a major in Accounting from Cal State University, Northridge. In 2017, I earned a Juris Doctor degree from Southwestern University School of Law.

15. In December of 2017, the Supreme Court for the State of California admitted me as an Attorney and Counselor at Law and licensed me to practice law in all the Courts of this State.

16. I am experienced in handling employment law matters and specifically wage and hour cases. I have been practicing law since 2017. My experience has been almost exclusively in the area of employment law representing employees with claims of wrongful termination, harassment, whistleblower retaliation, discrimination, wage and hour, and family and medical leave violations. I am a member of the California Employment Lawyers Association (CELA).

17. In my representation of employees, I have prosecuted several lawsuits on behalf of employees with claims of rest and meal period and overtime violations or other wage claims.

18. I have been involved in the prosecution of numerous wage and hour class and representative actions at various stages of litigation. A small sampling of the wage and hour class and representative action cases in which I have been counsel of record is as follows:

a) *Joshua Silva v. Payo Laboratories, Inc.*, *et al.*, San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV-0689 (appointed Class Counsel and granted final approval of class action settlement by the court).

b) *Mervin Perkins v. CC Venice, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC703660 (appointed Class Counsel and granted final approval of class action settlement by the court).

c) *Jashar Bryant v. Pinnacle Cabling & Construction, Inc., et al*., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01123094-CU-OE-CXC (appointed Class Counsel and granted final approval of class action settlement by the court).

d) *Collins v. Spa Products Import & Distribution Co., LLC*, et al., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV10586 (granted final approval of class action settlement by the court)

e) *Sabrina Slater v. Avalon Care Center – Sonora, L.L.C., et al*., Tuolumne County Superior Court, Case No. CV62006 (granted final approval of class action settlement by the court)

f) *Violet Avalos v. Smithcare Incorporated, et al*., Tulare County Superior Court, Case No. VCU272975 (granted final approval of class action settlement by the court)

g) *David Contreras v. HTX Services LLC, et al*., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV43405 (granted final approval of class action settlement by the court)

h) *Devin Cherry v. LA Corral Three, Inc., et al.,* Kern County Superior Court, Case No., BCV-18-101817-DRL (granted final approval of class action settlement by the court)

i) *Vikki Curl and Anthony J. Gratton v. Reel Security Corp., et al.,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 18STCV09302 (granted final approval of class action settlement by the court)

j) *Corrine Lashbrook and Joshua Sweat v. Andy's BP, Inc., et al.,* San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 19CIV02344 (granted final approval of class action settlement by the court)

k) *Stephen Aguirre and Christopher Walls v. Anlin Industries*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG04326 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

l) *Rebecca Mallory v. Odyssey Healthcare Operating A, L.P*., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-19-102735 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

m) *Wendy Chavez v. Texas De Brazil (Fresno) Corporation, et al*., Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 19CECG04249 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

n) *Kevin Littleton v. Lincoln Military Property Management LP*., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00061799-CU-OE-NC (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

o) *Krystal Thomas v. Choice Physicians Network, Inc., et al*., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2013964 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

p) *Otina Sengvong v. Probuild Company, LLC, et al*., United States District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:19-cv-02231-MMA (JLB) (granted final approval of class action settlement by the court)

q) *Orland Perez Avalos v. Milagros Restaurant LLC, et al*., San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 22-CIV-01222 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

r) *David Xiqui Vasquez v. The Province LLC, et al*., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 22CV397541 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

s) *Manuel Melendrez v. Clean Auto Inc., et al*., San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 22CIV01967 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

t) *Arturo Vera Lopez v. Green Valley Landscape, et al*., Monterey County Superior Court, Case No, 22CV003751 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

u) *Erasmo Gomez v. A-1 Jay's Machining, Inc., et al*., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 22CV394795 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

v) *Iris Rodriguez v. Facility Masters, Inc*., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV423999 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court)

w) *Mariana Ruelas v. Vista La Mesa Senior Living, Inc., et al*., San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00050755-CU-OE-CTL (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court).

x) *Jose Angel Lopez v. Moreno & Associates, Inc., et al*., Santa Clara Superior Court, Case No. 23CV422622 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court).

y) *Irma Tapia v. Posada Associates, et al*., Santa Cruz Superior Court, Case No. 23CV00355 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court).

z) *Andres Ibarra v. Stadco, et al*. Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV26591 (order and judgment approving PAGA settlement by the court).

Exposure and Risk Analysis

19. The PAGA Settlement warrants a presumption of fairness for several reasons: (1) The parties reached the Settlement through arm's-length bargaining with the aid of a respected mediator; (2) The parties conducted sufficient investigation and discovery to allow Counsel and the Court to act intelligently. Plaintiff requested and Defendant provided the number PAGA Employees, the number of total pay periods during the PAGA Period, all policies in effect during the PAGA Period, and anonymized payroll and time punch data for all of its California non-exempt employees for the relevant period; and (3) Counsel for the parties are experienced with PAGA cases. Moreover, neither Plaintiff nor I have any conflicts of interest with the absent PAGA Employees and there are no issues of ascertainability.

20. I considered various sources of information in the lead-up to the mediation of June 20, 2024 that enabled Plaintiff to achieve the Settlement at issue. Among other things, Plaintiff considered the following:

- Defendants produced and Plaintiff's counsel reviewed Plaintiff's personnel file.
- Plaintiff's counsel requested that Defendants provide any and all policies regarding overtime and double-time wages, off the clock work, expense reimbursement, meal periods, rest breaks, meal period waivers and agreements, compensation plans, and complaints about working conditions in effect during the relevant time period beginning in April of 2022. Defendants produced those policies as part of their employee handbook.
- Plaintiff's counsel requested that Defendants provide the total number of employees,

paychecks, and the pay cycles during the relevant period. Defendants provided the answers to each of these questions.

- Plaintiff requested a 20% sampling of time and payroll records. Defendants provided Plaintiff's counsel with anonymized payroll and time punch data for approximately 55 of its non-exempt employees during the relevant time period.

- Plaintiff's counsel then retained a professional data analyst, James Toney, to examine the records and determine the meal period violation rates, if there was any pay discrepancy in timesheet hours versus paid hours, and if there was any rounding/time shaving issues. Plaintiff is prepared to provide the Court with the data analysis for *in camera* inspection upon its request.

- Plaintiff's counsel analyzed the state of caselaw on PAGA claims, meal and rest break violations, claims for "off the clock" work and business expense reimbursement, especially as it relates to "manageability" arguments brought up by the defense.

21. Defendant estimated for purposes of mediation that, through June 20, 2024, there were approximately 77 PAGA Members[1] who incurred 1,987 pay periods during the relevant period. Based on this information and with the help of the data analyst, I prepared an estimate of the maximum possible civil penalties under the PAGA. The maximum possible civil penalties under the PAGA is the total number of pay periods with one or more violations multiplied by the maximum possible civil penalty amount per pay period.

22. Plaintiff's analysis, which Defendant strongly disputes, revealed that 60% of the sample shifts showed unfavorable rounding and that 55.6 % of pay periods with shifts greater than 5 hours had at least one meal violation (late, short, or no meal). Under the civil penalty formulas applicable under PAGA, I calculated Defendant's potential exposure as follows: $100 penalty per pay period, assuming 60% violation, based on Labor Code § 1197.1 for violation of Labor Code § 1194 (failure to pay wages)(1,987 x $100 x 60%= $119,220); $250 penalty per pay period, assuming 60% violation rate, based on Labor Code § 226.3 for violation of Labor Code § 226 (failure to provide compliant wage statements) (1,987 x $250 x 60% = $298,050); $50 penalty per pay period, assuming 55.6% violation, based on Labor Code § 558 for violation of Labor Code § 512 (failure to provide meal periods)(1,987x $50 x 55.6% =$55,238); $100

[1] The number of PAGA Members was inadvertently stated as 76 instead of 77 in the Settlement Agreement.

penalty per pay period under Labor Code sec. 2699(f)(2), assuming the same 55.6% violation rate for rest break violations (1,987x $100 x 55.6% =$110,477). Stacking each of these maximum recoverable civil penalty estimates yields a total amount of $582,985. Assuming that Plaintiff's calculations and analysis are accurate, the maximum exposure also presumes that the Court will not reduce the penalty award as unjust, arbitrary, oppressive, or confiscatory. For the rest period violations, it also presumes that the meal and rest period violation rates were identical. The potential for recovery of approximately $582,985 in civil penalties depends on circumstances that are extremely unlikely independently and in combination. It would depend on the Court stacking the maximum recoverable civil penalties for unpaid wage violations, meal period violations, rest break violations, and faulty wage statement violations per pay period for all 1,987 pay periods for all 77 PAGA Members during the PAGA Period. I am not aware of any California State court decision awarding a plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees she represents multiple civil penalties for the same pay period under different Labor Code provisions. At best, Plaintiff could hope to recover one penalty for each pay period (regardless of the different Labor Code violations that potentially occurred for the same employee, during the same pay periods). I had to substantially discount the value of these claims in the settlement negotiations for this and a variety of other reasons (outlined below).

23. There are risks to Plaintiff's meal and rest period claims. Defendants contend that, to establish a violation for missed meal periods, a plaintiff must do more than show that a meal break was not taken. *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. So long as an employer provides employees with a "reasonable opportunity" to take a duty-free meal period, it has no further duty to "police meal breaks and ensure no work thereafter is performed." *Id*. at 1040-41. Instead, a plaintiff must show the employer impeded, discouraged, or prohibited the employee from taking a proper break, or otherwise failed to release the employee of all control. Id. "Thus, the crucial issue with regard to the meal break claim is the reason that a particular employee may have failed to take a meal break." *Washington v. Joe's Crab Shack* (N.D. Cal. 2010) 271 F.R.D. 629, 641. Determining by a review of FOCUS's time records the exact reasons why a meal period appears to be short or late would be difficult and

pinpointing those days in which Plaintiff and the PAGA Members worked during their meal periods will be a challenge. Additionally, FOCUS's Employee Handbook contains legally compliant meal period and rest break policies.

24. Defendants contend they provided non-exempt employees with the opportunity to take rest breaks in accordance with California law, and, accordingly, that Plaintiff's rest break claim has no support. Additionally, there are other risks to Plaintiff's rest period claim. Employers are not required to record rest periods and such periods are paid. Unlike meal periods, where there are often records showing whether an employee clocked out or not, there is no such evidence to prove a missed rest period or that the employer refused to authorize and permit one.

25. There are risks to Plaintiff's claim for unreimbursed expenses. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants did not reimburse her or the other PAGA Members for their mobile phone expenses. Moreover, there is a risk that the Court may consider Plaintiff's claims as to Defendants' alleged failure to indemnify for business expenses to be individual in nature. As such, I had to significantly discount the value of this claim during settlement negotiations.

26. Additionally, PAGA states a court has discretion to award a lesser amount than the maximum penalty. *See Lab. Code*, § 2699, subd. (e)(2) ("…a court may award a lesser amount than the maximum civil penalty amount specified by this part if, based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory."); *see also Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Management, Inc.* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1135 (reducing PAGA award). There is a substantial risk that the Court could reduce civil penalties to an insignificant amount if it is unpersuaded by Plaintiff's evidence of willful and intentional conduct. *Carrington v. Starbucks* (2018) 30 Cal.App.5th 504 ("*Carrington*") illustrates this. In that case, the Court of Appeal affirmed a trial court's heavily discounted award of only $5 per violation because it was within the Court's discretion to significantly reduce PAGA penalties even when there is a finding that a violation of the California Labor Code occurred. The plaintiff in *Carrington* had requested penalties in excess of $70 million and was successful in proving the PAGA claim during a bench trial. However, the trial court reduced the total award after trial to only $150,000 (30,000 violations x $5) and stated

that this reduction was warranted because imposing the maximum penalty would be "unjust, arbitrary, and oppressive", based on Starbucks's "good faith attempts" to comply with meal break obligations and because the Court found the violations were minimal. Applying the same formula here and assuming there was one violation during each pay period, the award of civil penalties could not exceed $9,935 in PAGA penalties (1,987 violations x $5). As such, this Settlement is a great result based solely on the risk the Court chooses to apply the *Carrington* formula. Defendants have also posed formidable defenses to the Labor Code claims underlying Plaintiff's allegations. Thus, the chance of Plaintiff recovering a higher amount than the Gross Settlement Amount is uncertain.

27. All in all, considering all of the risks detailed above, as well as potential manageability issues, the risk of not prevailing at trial, the risk that, even if Plaintiff prevailed, the damages would be limited due to the largely discretionary nature of the damages, and taking into account Defendant's defenses on the merits, Plaintiff applied a 75% discount to the maximum PAGA exposure of $582,985, resulting in a risk-discounted realistic potential exposure of $145,746. Therefore, the Gross Settlement Amount of $50,000 is a great result, amounts to relief consistent with the underlying purpose of PAGA, and represents approximately 34% of the risk-discounted realistic potential recovery. *See In re Cendant Corp., Derivative Action Litig*., 232 F. Supp. 2d 327 (D. N.J. 2002) (approving settlement that only provided a 2% recovery based on the estimated liability exposure).

28. The parties further recognize that the issues presented in the representative PAGA claim are likely only to be resolved with extensive and costly pretrial and trial proceedings, and that further litigation will cause inconvenience, distraction, disruption, delay, and expense disproportionate to the maximum potential benefits to the PAGA Members and Plaintiff from continued litigation, especially in the post pandemic era where further and extensive litigation may cause businesses to shut down, resulting in no monetary compensation to Plaintiff, Plaintiff's attorneys, other PAGA Employees, and the State of California.

29. The settlement of the representative PAGA claim involves monetary relief to all PAGA Members, Plaintiff, her attorneys, and the State of California. The Settlement is

reasonable given the uncertainties this lawsuit entails. It is also reasonable given the structure and purpose of the PAGA, since the PAGA is not a restitution statute. Rather, it is essentially a punishment statute. It provides for civil penalties only. Within the PAGA framework she is bound by, Plaintiff, considering the evidence she faced, achieved a great result for the employees concerned. Furthermore, any employees who are dissatisfied with the amount they received in civil penalties can pursue any damages they believe they are owed by the Defendants. The Settlement does not require them to opt out to do so.

30. Furthermore, Plaintiff recognizes that continued litigation presents significant risks that support a significant downward departure from Plaintiff's estimated civil penalties amount. In view of the risks, the Settlement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable compromise amount for these claims and is in the best interest of Plaintiff and PAGA Employees and thus, warrants approval. *See Laguna v. Coverall N. Am., Inc.*, Case No. 12-55479 (9th Cir. June 3, 2014) 2014 WL 2465049, * 3. The PAGA settlement and its terms are fair, just, reasonable, adequate, and equitable to Defendants, Plaintiff, and the State, especially in light of the current economic climate, and are the product of good faith, and informed arms-length negotiations between the parties consistent with public policy and fully comply with applicable provisions of law.

31. As such, the settlement of PAGA penalties in the gross sum of $50,000.00, of which 75% of the net amount after attorney's fees, litigation costs, and settlement administration costs ($18,725.41) will be paid to the LWDA and 25% ($6,241.80) will be distributed to the PAGA Members, is reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances.

Individual PAGA Payments

32. Defendants represent that at the time of mediation there were approximately 76 PAGA Members during the PAGA Period. After deducting the requested Court-approved PAGA Counsel's Fees Payment ($16,666.66) and PAGA Counsel's Litigation Expenses Payment ($5,366.13), and the Administration Costs ($3,000.00), the Net Settlement Amount will be approximately $24,967.21 allocated as PAGA Penalties. Seventy five percent (75%) of the PAGA Penalties will be paid to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA")

($18,725.41), and twenty five percent (25%) ($6,241.80) of the PAGA Penalties will be paid to the PAGA Members on a pro-rata basis based upon their respective number of pay periods during the PAGA Period. Agreement, ¶ 3.2. Based on the data provided to the Settlement Administrator, with a total of 77 PAGA Members, the highest PAGA settlement share to be paid is approximately $267.99, the average PAGA settlement share to be paid is approximately $121.23, and the lowest PAGA settlement share to be paid is approximately $4.70. *See* Declaration of Michael Moore ¶ 22. This is a great result given the uncertainties this lawsuit entails.

Plaintiff's Individual Settlement

33. In the Lawsuit, Plaintiff also alleged individual causes of action. At the mediation, Plaintiff negotiated an individual settlement agreement separate from the PAGA Settlement. The parties agreed that the consideration Plaintiff received pursuant to the individual settlement agreement was to settle her individual wage and hour claims, race discrimination, sexual harassment, retaliation, failure to prevent harassment and retaliation, negligent retention and supervision, intentional infliction of emotional distress, negligent infliction of emotional distress, and wrongful constructive discharge claims. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's individual settlement is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

34. As part of this confidential agreement, Plaintiff also provided Defendants with a general release of all claims, whether known or unknown, including unknown claims covered by Civil Code Section 1542. Although Plaintiff has executed an individual settlement agreement, Plaintiff's general release has not yet occurred. Plaintiff's general release will become effective upon the Court's approval of the PAGA Settlement. (*See* Exhibit 5, section 1.2). Plaintiff's individual claims have been part of the Action and the settlement negotiations between the parties from the very start. The settlement of Plaintiff's separate individual claims does not and would not render Plaintiff inadequate to represent the PAGA Members. Plaintiff has no conflict of interest with the absent PAGA Members and is adequate to represent the PAGA Members. Plaintiff has maintained contact with my office and helped me gather information and evidence to prove the alleged claims and has agreed to remain involved as a

PAGA representative even if the Court does not approve the Settlement. While Plaintiff and I believe that Plaintiff's individual settlement has no bearing on her adequacy as a PAGA Representative, Plaintiff has included a copy of her individual settlement to the Court for review *(See* **Exhibit 5**). It represents a fair resolution for Plaintiff's individual wage and hour claims, race discrimination, sexual harassment, retaliation, failure to prevent harassment and retaliation, negligent retention and supervision, intentional infliction of emotional distress, negligent infliction of emotional distress, and wrongful constructive discharge claims. *See generally* Declaration of Amairani Gomez.

35. The PAGA statute does not forbid service awards. Courts frequently award them in PAGA-only cases as well. *See Mancini v. W. & S. Life Ins. Co*. (S.D. Cal. Sept.18, 2018), 2018 WL 4489590, at *2 (approving an incentive award of $5,000 to named plaintiff in a PAGA-only settlement); *see also Kinney v. Harvest Al Mgmt. Sub LLC*, (E.D. Cal. Sept. 6, 2013) 2013 WL 12415482, at *2 (awarding an incentive award of $3,000 to a named plaintiff in a PAGA-only settlement). The work Plaintiff has done on this case includes hiring my firm, speaking with our office on many occasions by phone, explaining what her employment at FOCUS was like, explaining what her employment at FOCUS had in common with other employees who worked for FOCUS, explaining her claims to me and my staff, participating in mediation, and communicating with me and my staff about the settlement agreement and related documents. Despite this, Plaintiff is **not** asking for a service award for her involvement and the time she spent assisting my firm with the PAGA action. *See generally* Declaration of Amairani Gomez.

Attorneys' Fees and Costs

36. I represent Plaintiff on a straight contingency basis. My firm's request for $16,666.66 in attorney fees and $5,366.13 in litigation costs related to the PAGA Settlement is fair and reasonable. "[R]egardless whether the percentage method or the lodestar method is used, fee awards in class actions average around one-third of the recovery." (See *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66, fn.11 ("*Chavez*")); *In re Pacific Enter. Sec. Litig.* (9th Cir. 1995) 47 F.3d 373, 379 ("*Pacific*") [affirming 33% fee award]; *Williams v. MGM-Pathe Communications Co.* (9th Cir. 1997) 129 F.3d 1026, 1027 ("*MGM*") (awarding 33% of total fund

amount).) This is also consistent with my experience in wage and hour class and PAGA settlements.

37. Should the Court elect to use Plaintiff's Counsel's lodestar as the method for awarding fees, notwithstanding courts' clear preference for the percentage method, my request for attorneys' fees of $16,666.66 (33.3% of the Gross Settlement Amount) is fair and reasonable based on my firm's lodestar as cross-checked against the percentage of the recovery. To date, I have investigated and prosecuted this matter for over 55.10 hours, including drafting the initial PAGA notice and Lawsuit; drafting informal discovery questions, reviewing Defendants' informal document production, including wage and hour policies; sending and receiving emails on the case with defense counsel, including substantive discussions; sending the PAGA data to Plaintiff's expert for review/analysis and reviewing the expert's findings/conclusions; drafting a mediation brief and engaging in a full day private mediation; and drafting this PAGA approval motion. I also expect to perform additional work on this case if the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, including supervision of the Administrator's disbursement of the settlement funds to the PAGA Members.

38. In this case, my firm has a total lodestar of approximately $26,540.00 without the use of any multiplier, which results in a negative multiplier of 0.628 when compared against the $16,666.66 request for attorneys' fees.[2] A general summary showing of the pre-multiplier lodestar and the total number of hours of work performed by my firm is set forth below with a total lodestar of approximately $26,540.00.

<u>Name</u>	**<u>Hours</u>**	**<u>Rate</u>**	**<u>Pre-Multiplier Lodestar</u>**

[2]The negative multiplier of 0.628 is supported by California case law. Under California law, lodestar multipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even higher. *See Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 49; *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc*., 91 Cal.App.4th at p. 255; *Natural Gas Anti-Trust Cases I, II, III & IV* (Cal. Sup. Ct. 2006) 2006 WL 5377849, *4 ("This Court and numerous cases have applied multipliers of between 4 and 12 to counsel's lodestar in awarding fees."); *In re California Indirect Purchases* (Cal. Sup. Ct. 1998) 1998 WL 1031494, *10 (citing *Wilson v. Bank of America Nat'l Trust & Sav. Ass'n*., (Cal Sup. Ct. 1982) No. 643872 (multiplier of 10 times the hourly rate awarded) (cited in 3 Newberg & Conte, Newberg on Class Actions, section 1403, at 14-5 n. 21), and *Glendora Community Redevelopment Agency v. Demeter* (Cal. App. 2 Dist., 1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 465, 479 (approving fee award 12 times estimated lodestar multiplier).

Maralle Messrelian (8th Year Attorney)	55.10	$550.00	$26,540.00
Totals	**55.10**		**$26,540.00**

True and correct copies of the time records of my firm are collectively attached as **Exhibit 6** to this declaration. I will have waited for over two years to be awarded attorneys' fees for work performed since March of 2023, when Plaintiff first contacted my office, compared to Defendants' counsel who have been paid as they performed work during this case.

39. My previous experience in litigating wage and hour actions also supports the reasonableness of the fee request. Based on past experience with similar matter, I was able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this case and the reasonableness of the Settlement. Because it is reasonable to compensate me commensurate with my skill, reputation, and experience, attorney's fees of approximately one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount is reasonable. Likewise, the caliber and experience of opposing counsel in labor and employment litigation, Matthew Theriault and Neo Chen of Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, also supports the fairness and reasonableness of the requested fee award. The award of attorneys' fees sought is justified here by the contingency nature of the attorney-client relationship, the risks of non-payment and non-reimbursement, the delay in payment and cost reimbursement, and the great results Plaintiff's Counsel has achieved for the PAGA Members while bearing the substantial burdens of contingency representation.

40. In addition, my firm incurred substantial costs to date, $5,366.13 of which I calculated as part of the PAGA Settlement. This amount consists of the LWDA filing fee and certified mailing postage fees, the court's complex designation fee, the data analysis fees, 31% of the mediator fees and 31% all court filing fees and attorney service fees in the Action (based on a pro-rata calculation with the remaining 69% of the attorney service and filing costs being attributed to Plaintiff's individual settlement). A true and correct summary of my firm's costs and expenses incurred to date along with invoices is attached as **Exhibit 7** to this declaration. As the evidence submitted herewith shows, all of these costs are documented and reasonably incurred. Accordingly, they warrant the Court's approval.

///

Settlement Administration Costs

41. With regard to the settlement administration costs provision, it is reasonable. Before agreeing to Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions ("Phoenix"), the parties sought and reviewed bids from other reputable third-party administrator and Phoenix's bid was comparable. A true and correct copy of the bid from Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions is attached hereto as **Exhibit 8**. Furthermore, the Declaration of Michael Moore with attached exhibits, filed under separate cover, sets forth Phoenix's qualifications and costs to administer the settlement. *See generally* Declaration of Michael Moore. Thus, the settlement administration costs provision should be given approval.

Notice of Settlement to the LWDA

42. Pursuant to Lab. Code § 2699(l)(2), Plaintiff submitted a copy of the Settlement with the LWDA at the same time the Settlement is being filed with the Court. True and correct copies of Plaintiff's submission with the LWDA and the confirmation email are collectively attached as **Exhibit 9** to this declaration.

I declare under the penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed February 25, 2025 , at Glendale, California.

Maralle Messrelian

MARALLE MESSRELIAN,
Declarant