Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
Brian J. St. John (SBN 304112)
LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiff Arlene Parra

David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)
Vedang J. Patel (SBN 328647)
Brandon M. Chang (SBN 316197)
BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
8484 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 500
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 438-5555 / Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff Shaloma Smith

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – TORRANCE COURTHOUSE

ARLENE PARRA and SHALOMA SMITH, individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiff,

vs.

MARKSMAN SECURITY CORPORATION, a Florida corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23TRCV01864

Honorable Alan B. Honeycutt
Department E

PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT (CAL. LABOR CODE § 2698, *ET SEQ.*) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS, GENERAL RELEASE FEES, AND SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Reservation ID:	194841821040
Date:	February 9, 2026
Time:	8:30 a.m.
Department:	E

Complaint Filed:	June 9, 2023
FAC Filed:	November 14, 2025
Trial Date:	None Set

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 9, 2026 at 8:30 a.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard before the Honorable Alan B. Honeycutt in Department E of the Superior Court of the State of California, for the County of Los Angeles, located at 825 Maple Ave., Torrance, California 90503, Plaintiffs Arlene Parra and Shaloma Smith (together, the "Plaintiffs") will and hereby do move for entry of the following orders:

1. Granting approval, pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2), of the settlement between Plaintiffs and Defendant Marksman Security Corporation ("Defendant") of the claims brought pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), as set forth in the Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement"), attached as "**EXHIBIT 1**" to the Declarations of Brian J. St. John including and not limited to, the plan of allocation and distribution of the Total Settlement Amount for payment of the LWDA Payment to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), Individual Settlement Shares to the Aggrieved Employees, Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Plaintiffs' Counsel, Settlement Administration Costs to the PAGA Settlement Administrator, and General Release Fees to Plaintiffs;
2. Approving the Net Settlement Amount, estimated to be no less than $530,450.32 which will be distributed to the LWDA and the Aggrieved Employees, pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), of which 75% will be paid to the LWDA ("LWDA Payment") and 25% will be paid to the PAGA Members ("Employees' Portion");
3. Appointing Simpluris, Inc. ("PAGA Settlement Administrator") as the PAGA Settlement Administrator, to handle the administration of the Settlement;
4. Directing Defendant to fund the Total Settlement Amount, and directing the PAGA Settlement Administrator to distribute payments in accordance with the Settlement Agreement;
5. Directing the mailing of Individual Settlement Share checks to the Aggrieved Employees along with the Cover Letter, which is substantially similar in content and form to that attached as "**EXHIBIT A**" to the [Proposed] Order and Judgment Granting Approval of Private Attorneys General Act (Cal. Labor Code § 2698, *Et Seq*.) Settlement Agreement and Award

of Attorneys' Fees and Costs, General Release Fees, and Settlement Administration Costs ("[Proposed] Order and Judgement") filed concurrently herewith;

6. Awarding $5,000.00 each, to Plaintiffs Arlene Parra and Shaloma Smith (totaling, $10,000.00) as their General Release Fee;

7. Awarding up to $5,500.00 to the PAGA Settlement Administrator as Settlement Administration Costs; and

8. Awarding to Lawyers *for* Justice, PC and Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., (collectively, "Plaintiffs' Counsel") the amount of $306,250.00 as compensation for reasonable attorneys' fees and the amount of $22,799.68 for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses (together, "Attorneys' Fees and Costs"), pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(g)(1).

Unless otherwise specified, all citations and references to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA") are to the version of the statute prior to the recent amendment effective July 1, 2024; the amended statute does not apply to the above-captioned action and the Settlement pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(v)(1), as amended, because the above-captioned action was filed prior to June 19, 2024.

The Settlement Agreement and moving and supporting papers for this motion are being concurrently submitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2).

This motion is made pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2), which provides for review and approval by the Court of the settlement of a civil action filed pursuant to PAGA.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

This motion will be based upon the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Settlement Agreement, the Declarations of Plaintiffs' Counsel (Brian J. St. John and David D. Bibiyan) and Plaintiffs Arlene Parra and Shaloma Smith 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: January 15, 2026

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC

By: ______________________________

Brian J. St. John
Attorney for Plaintiff Arlene Parra

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
David D. Bibiyan
Vedang J. Patel
Brandon M. Chang
Attorneys for Plaintiff Shaloma Smith

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Statutes

Other Authorities

Rules

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION

Plaintiffs Arlene Parra ("Plaintiff Parra") and Shaloma Smith ("Plaintiff Smith") (together, the "Plaintiffs") seek approval of the Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement") entered into between Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of the State of California with respect to Aggrieved Employees, and Defendant Marksman Security Corporation ("Defendant"), pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2).[1] Plaintiffs and Defendant (together, the "Parties") have agreed to resolve the above-captioned action, brought pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"), for a Total Settlement Amount of $875,000.00.[2]

The Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, as it represents a reasoned compromise of a disputed claim that has been reached through arm's-length negotiations, in light of the risks, complexity, and expense of further litigation, and the strengths of the PAGA claim. The Settlement meets the requirements for Court approval based upon the relevant fairness factors. The Court is respectfully requested to approve the Settlement, award the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Settlement Administration Costs, and General Release Fees and approve the LWDA Payment.

The Settlement Agreement and moving and supporting papers for this motion are being concurrently submitted to the LWDA and Plaintiffs now move for an order granting approval of the Settlement, in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(l)(2).[3]

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY

For a discussion of relevant procedural history and facts regarding this matter, please see the Declaration of Brian J. St. John at paragraphs 8 to 13.

///

///

///

[1] The Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement Agreement") is attached as "**EXHIBIT 1**" to the Declaration of Brian J. St. John ("St. John Decl.").

[2] Settlement Agreement, § 3(a). The Total Settlement Amount is subject to possible increase pursuant to Section 3(b) of the Settlement Agreement.

[3] As noted in the concurrently-filed Proof of Service, the settlements papers were submitted to the LWDA.

III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS

A. Scope of the Settlement

If the Court grants approval of the Settlement, Plaintiffs and the State of California with respect to Aggrieved Employees[4] will release the Released Parties[5] from the Released Claims[6].

B. Funding and Distribution of the Total Settlement Amount

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will pay a Total Settlement Amount of $875,000.00[7], including: (1) Attorneys' Fees and Costs to be paid to Lawyers *for* Justice, PC and Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., (collectively, "Plaintiffs' Counsel"), (2) General Release Fees to Plaintiffs, (3) Settlement Administration Costs to be paid to the PAGA Settlement Administrator, and (4) Net Settlement Amount to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Aggrieved Employees. The Net Settlement Amount will be the Total Settlement Amount less the Court-approved Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Settlement Administration Costs, and General Release Fee; the Net Settlement Amount is currently estimated to be no less than $530,450.32.[8] The Net Settlement Amount will be distributed as follows: 75% of the Net Settlement Amount (or approximately $397,837.74) will be distributed to the LWDA ("LWDA Payment") and 25% of the Net Settlement Amount (or approximately $132,612.58) ("Employees' Portion") will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees on a *pro rata* basis, based on their Compensable Pay Periods.[9] The Total Settlement Amount is $875,000.00, however, pursuant to Section 3(b) of the Settlement Agreement, if the actual number of Compensable Pay Periods during the PAGA Period is more than twelve percent (12%) above 15,500 (i.e., 17,360), Defendant shall have the option to either: (a) increase the Total Settlement Amount by the percentage that the actual number exceeds 17,360 Compensable Pay Periods (e.g., if the number of Compensable Pay Periods increases by 13% to 17,515, the Total Settlement

[4] Settlement Agreement, § 3(a)(1)-(5), and St. John Decl., ¶ 15. "Aggrieved Employees are defined as all individuals who are or were employed by Defendant Marksman and worked in California as current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees at any time during the PAGA Period. *Id*., § 3(a)(5) "PAGA Period" is defined as the period of April 5 , 2022, to the earlier of (a) October 31, 2024 or, (b) the Alternate End Date. Ibid.

[5] The definition of the "Released Parties" is set forth in the Settlement Agreement, § 8(a).

[6] The definition of the "Released Claims" is set forth in the Settlement Agreement, § 8(a).

[7] Settlement Agreement, § 3(a), St. John Decl., ¶ 16, and see footnote 2.

[8] Settlement Agreement, § 3(a)(4).

[9] *Id.*, § 7(b)(1).

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Amount will increase by 1%); or (b) end the PAGA Period on the date on which the number of Compensable Pay Periods reaches 17,360 Compensable Pay Periods ("Alternate End Date").[10]

No later than thirty (30) calendar days after the Court's order granting approval of the Settlement, Defendant shall provide the PAGA Settlement Administrator with a list of all Aggrieved Employees ("Aggrieved Employee List"), containing the contact information and other information required to calculate payment for each Aggrieved Employee.[11] No later than fourteen (14) calendar days of the Effective Date, Defendant shall deposit the Total Settlement Amount into a qualified settlement account established, by the PAGA Settlement Administrator for administration of the Settlement in accordance with this Order and Judgment and the Settlement Agreement.[12]

No later than 14 calendar days after the PAGA Settlement Administrator receives the Aggrieved Employees List and Total Settlement Amount, it will calculate payments and mail the Cover Letter[13] and Individual Settlement Share[14] checks (together, the "PAGA Settlement Package") to all Aggrieved Employees by first-class U.S. mail.[15] For each PAGA Settlement Package returned as undeliverable within five (5) calendar days of the initial mailing, the PAGA Settlement Administrator will promptly attempt to locate an alternate, updated address for such Aggrieved Employee by using a skip-trace search and shall attempt one re-mailing of the PAGA Settlement Package.[16]

The Individual Settlement Share checks issued to Aggrieved Employees shall remain valid and negotiable for ninety (90) calendar days, and thereafter, shall be canceled.[17] Funds associated with canceled checks shall be transmitted to the State Controller's Office Unclaimed

---

[10] Settlement Agreement, § 3(b).
[11] *Id.*, § 7(c)(1).
[12] *Id.*, § 7(a).
[13] The Parties have prepared a simple Cover Letter for transmission to the Aggrieved Employees along with their Individual Settlement Share checks, substantially in the form attached as "EXHIBIT A" to the [Proposed] Order and Judgment and as "EXHIBIT A" to the Settlement Agreement. The Cover Letter informs the Aggrieved Employees about the Actions and the Settlement.
[14] Each Aggrieved Employees' share of the Employees' Portion ("Individual Settlement Share"), will be calculated by the PAGA Settlement Administrator based on their Compensable Pay Periods. *Id.*, § 8(b). The payments to Aggrieved Employees for their Individual Settlement Share are considered 100% penalties to be reported on IRS Form 1099, if required. *Id.*, §§ 3(c) & 7(b)(1).
[15] *Id.*, § 7(c)(3).
[16] Ibid.
[17] *Id.*, § 7(c)(4).

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Property Division in the name of each Aggrieved Employee at issue and in the amount(s) of their respective Individual Settlement Share(s).[18]

C. Standards for Approval of PAGA Settlement

PAGA allows an "aggrieved employee" to bring a civil action on behalf of the State of California to recover civil penalties that normally the LWDA can pursue on behalf of employees against an employer without employees' involvement or approval. Unnamed employees need not be given notice of the PAGA claim, nor do they have the ability to opt-out of the representative PAGA claim.[19] Before bringing a civil action under PAGA, an employee must comply with California Labor Code section 2699.3. *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a). Plaintiffs have complied.[20]

Settlement of a PAGA action requires court approval. *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(l)(2). However, a PAGA claim is asserted on a non-class basis, and is a law enforcement action rather than a class action.[21] A court's review of a PAGA settlement involves consideration of unique factors that render the approval process distinct from, and simpler than the two-step court approval process for a class action settlement. A court reviewing a PAGA settlement need only "ensur[e] that a negotiated resolution is fair to those affected." *Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 549 (citing Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(l)(2)). Although California Labor Code section 2699(l) does not set forth the criteria on which a PAGA settlement is to be judged, courts have approved settlements of PAGA claims.[22]

---

[18] Settlement Agreement, § 7(c)(4).

[19] *Robinson v. Southern Counties Oil Co.* (2020) 53 Cal.App.5th 476 (aggrieved employee cannot opt out of a PAGA settlement); *Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 546-548 ("[A] PAGA action is a statutory action for penalties brought as a proxy for the State," "whatever personal claims the absent employees might have for relief are not at stake[,]" as such, "there is no need to protect absent employees' due process rights" and they "will be bound by the outcome of any PAGA action[.]"); *Ochoa-Hernandez v. CJADERS Foods, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2010), 2010 WL 1340777, at *5 (Unnamed employees need not be given notice); *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, 984-86 (Same).

[20] St. John Decl. ¶ 9; Declaration of David D. Bibiyan ("Bibiyan Decl."), ¶ 28.

[21] *Casida v. Sears Holdings Corp.* (E.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2012) 2012 WL 253217, at *3; *Thomas v. Aetna Health of Cal., Inc.* (E.D. Cal. June 2, 2011) 2011 WL 2173715, at *11; *Arias, supra,* 46 Cal.4th at 980-88 (affirming lower court's holding that "plaintiff need not satisfy class action requirements" to assert a PAGA claim); *Pedroza v. PetSmart, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2013) 2013 WL 1490667, at *15; *Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, Afl-Cio v. Superior Court* (2009)*,* 46 Cal.4th 993, 1003; see also *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 58 Cal.4th 348, 381.

[22] See, e.g., *Resendez v. Bridgestone Retail Operations, LLC*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC596892 (June 2016), *DCH Auto Wage and Hour Cases*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4833 (May 2017); *Garcia v. Gordon Trucking* (E.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2012) 2012 WL 5364575, at *3; *Schiller v. David's Bridal, Inc.* (E.D. Cal. June 11, 2012) 2012 WL 2117001, at *14; *Chu v. Wells Fargo Invs., LLC* (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2011) 2011 WL 672645, at *1; *Franco v. Ruiz Food Prods.* (E.D. Cal Nov. 27, 2012) 2012 WL 5941801, at *14; *Nordstrom Commissions Case* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576, 589.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

In a PAGA case, the court's focus is not on the monetary amounts but on whether the total settlement amount achieves PAGA's objectives. The purpose of PAGA is "to incentivize private parties to recover civil penalties for the government that otherwise may not have been assessed and collected by overburdened state enforcement agencies." *See Ochoa-Hernandez*, *supra*, 2010 WL 1340777, at *4 (citing *Arias, supra,* 46 Cal.4th at 986). Penalties recovered under PAGA are, in part, to "be distributed to the [LWDA] for enforcement of labor laws . . . and for education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities under this code, to be continuously appropriated to supplement and not supplant the funding to the agency for those purposes." See Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(j).

IV. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

The Settlement resulted from hard-fought negotiations, fulfills PAGA's objectives, is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and meets all of the criteria for approval for the reasons discussed below.

A. The Factors Giving Rise to a Presumption of Fairness Exist

The Parties reached the Settlement after conducting extensive, arm's-length settlement negotiations and the involvement of a neutral mediator Eve Wagner, Esq.[23] A settlement that is "the product of extensive and hard-fought adversarial negotiations between the parties" is entitled to a presumption of fairness. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245.

As discussed in the Declarations of Brian J. St. John and David D. Bibiyan the Settlement is presumptively fair because: (1) it is the product of adversarial non-collusive, and arm's-length negotiations; (2) it was negotiated by counsel with significant experience in similar complex labor and employment matters; and (3) it occurred after counsel for the Parties engaged in significant investigation to evaluate the strength and potential value of the PAGA claim, and risks and expenses of litigating this claim through trial.[24]

Based on all of the information available to the Parties, the Parties agree that this matter is well-suited for settlement given the strengths and weaknesses of the PAGA claim and the facts and circumstances of the case.[25] Plaintiffs' Counsel have extensive experience handling representative and class action wage-and-hour litigation and used that experience to achieve a settlement recovery for

---

[23] St. John Decl., ¶ 18.
[24] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 2-6, 17-32; Bibiyan Decl., ¶¶ 2, 4-16, 28.
[25] St. John Decl., ¶ 38.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Plaintiffs, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees.[26] Therefore, the Court should give considerable weight to the competency, experience, and opinion of counsel and the involvement of a neutral mediator in assuring that the settlement is a product of arm's length bargaining.[27]

B. <u>The Relative Strengths and Weaknesses of the PAGA Claim and the Range of Possible Outcomes Strongly Favor Approval of the Settlement</u>

For a discussion of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the PAGA claim and the range of possible outcomes in the litigation, see the Declaration of Brian J. St. John at paragraphs 22-32.

C. <u>The Settlement Avoids Risky, Complex, and Lengthy Further Litigation</u>

Courts favor voluntary conciliation and settlement of complex litigation. *Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle* (9th Cir. 1992) 955 F.2d 1268, 1276. Generally, unless the settlement is clearly inadequate, its acceptance and approval are preferable to lengthy and expensive litigation with uncertain results. *Nat'l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2004) 221 F.R.D. 523, 526.

Prior to reaching the Settlement, the Parties investigated the veracity, strength, and scope of the PAGA claim and allegations and considered thousands of pages of information, documents, and data relevant to Plaintiffs' claims and Defendant's defenses thereto.[28] The Parties thoroughly and sufficiently evaluated the PAGA claim and related allegations, including, and not limited to, calculating the potential monetary recovery under PAGA.[29] Plaintiffs' Counsel performed other work as well, which is discussed in the Declaration of Brian J. St. John and David D. Bibiyan.[30]

Had the case not settled, the Parties would have conducted extensive additional formal discovery, including propounding additional written discovery requests as well as multiple depositions of party and percipient witnesses all over the State of California, to prepare the cases for trial. From the inception of this litigation, Defendant indicated that it would aggressively litigate the cases.[31] Even if Defendant failed on its defenses, litigating a complex PAGA action comes with inherent risks and costs,

---

[26] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 2-6; Bibiyan Decl., ¶¶ 4-16.
[27] See *Kirkorian v. Borelli* (N.D. Cal. 1988) 695 F.Supp. 446, 451 (opinion of experienced counsel entitled to considerable weight); *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.* (N.D. Cal. 1979) 485 F.Supp. 610, 616-17, 622 (recommendations of plaintiffs' counsel given presumption of reasonableness); *Satchell v. Fed. Express Corp.* (N.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2007) 2007 WL 1114010, at *4 (assistance of experienced mediator confirms settlement is non-collusive).
[28] St. John Decl., ¶ 19.
[29] Ibid.
[30] St. John Decl., ¶ 19; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ 28.
[31] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 23-27.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

and the litigation could continue beyond entry of judgment if either party were to appeal adverse rulings.[32] Additionally, there is a real possibility that Plaintiffs could recover nothing, either for themselves or on behalf of the State of California or other Aggrieved Employees after years of costly and labor-intensive litigation. Avoiding these risks and the likelihood of future contentious litigation, which would involve significant costs, favors settlement.

D. The Settlement Is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable

The Settlement provides significant benefits to the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees and falls well-within the range of acceptable settlements under the circumstances. "[T]he very essence of a settlement is compromise, 'a yielding of absolutes and an abandoning of highest hopes.'" *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Comm'n* (9th Cir. 1981) 688 F.2d 615, 624. "The proposed settlement is not to be judged against a hypothetical or speculative measure of what might have been achieved by the negotiators." *Id*. at 625.

The Settlement is a compromise of highly disputed claims. Plaintiffs and their counsel recognize the expense and length of continued proceedings necessary to pursue the matter through trial and any possible appeals.[33] Plaintiffs and their counsel have also taken into account the uncertainty and risk of the outcome of further litigation, and the difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation.[34] Plaintiffs and their counsel are also aware of the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability, both generally and in response to Defendant's defenses thereto, and the difficulties in establishing Defendant's liability for, and the right to recover, penalties on behalf of Plaintiffs, the State of California, and other Aggrieved Employees.[35] Plaintiffs and their counsel have also taken into account Defendant's agreement to enter into a settlement that confers significant relief upon the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California.[36]

Considering all of the facts in this case, Plaintiffs and their counsel have determined that the Settlement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the PAGA claim, and that it is in the best interests of the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California.[37]

---

[32] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 20-21, 31-32, & 38.
[33] *Id*., ¶¶ 20-21 & 31-32.
[34] Ibid.
[35] *Id*., ¶¶ 22-32.
[36] *Id*., ¶ 16.
[37] *Id*., ¶ 38.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

The result achieved in this case, and the monetary recovery provided by this settlement, are well-within the range of an acceptable settlement under the circumstances, especially when compared to trial court penalties assessments in contested cases and the settlement of PAGA claims in other cases. Here, the value obtained for settlement of the PAGA claim is significant, and it will be distributed in accordance with and in fulfillment of the objectives of the PAGA statute.

E. **<u>The Experience and Views of Plaintiffs' Counsel Favor Approval of the Settlement</u>**

Plaintiffs' Counsel is highly experienced in complex representative and class action wage-and-hour litigation.[38] In the view of Plaintiffs' Counsel, the benefits conferred by the settlement are eminently fair and reasonable, and in the best interests of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees in light of the risk, delay, and uncertainty of continued litigation and the substantial monetary benefits provided for by the Settlement.[39] Furthermore, courts have acknowledged that "the interests of plaintiff, counsel and other potentially aggrieved employees are largely aligned. All stand to gain from proving as convincingly as possible as many Labor Code violations as the evidence will sustain[.]" *Williams, supra,* 548 (citing Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(g)(1)(i)).

V. **<u>THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS' FEES AWARD SHOULD BE APPROVED</u>**

A. **<u>A Fee Award of a Percentage of the Entire Fund Is Appropriate</u>**

The Settlement provides for attorneys' fees in an amount of up to 35% of the Total Settlement Amount, which is $306,250.00 (assuming the Total Settlement Amount remains $875,000.00)[40], subject to approval and award by the Court.[41] The requested attorneys' fees award is commensurate with: (1) the risk that Plaintiffs' Counsel took in bringing and litigating the case, (2) the time, effort, and expense dedicated to the case, (3) the skill and determination that Plaintiffs' Counsel have shown, (4) the results that Plaintiffs' Counsel have achieved in the case, (5) the value that Plaintiffs' Counsel have achieved in the case, and (6) the other cases that Plaintiffs' Counsel have turned down in order to work on this matter.

Plaintiffs' Counsel are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as a matter of right under PAGA. *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(g)(1) ("Any employee who prevails in any [PAGA] action

[38] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 2-6; Bibiyan Decl., ¶¶ 4-16.
[39] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 22-32 & 38.
[40] *See* footnote 2.
[41] Settlement Agreement, § 3(a)(1).

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."). Plaintiffs' Counsel are also entitled to fees and costs under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, as the instant PAGA action is by definition "for the benefit" of others and secures monetary recovery for a large number of aggrieved employees, as well as the State of California.[42] The settlement will also provide funds to the state labor agency, to enhance enforcement of labor laws and education of "employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities under [the California Labor Code]." Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(i).

Courts may calculate and award attorneys' fees as a percentage of a monetary fund that has, by litigation, been preserved or recovered for the benefit of others. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480 at 486 & 506. Trial courts "retain the discretion to forgo a lodestar cross-check and [may] use other means to evaluate the reasonableness of a requested percentage fee." *Id*. (internal quotes omitted); *see also Wershba*, *supra*, 91 Cal.App. 4th at 253.

Courts award fees as an economic incentive for lawyers to pursue litigation that will enhance and facilitate access to the judicial system for meritorious claims, deter wrongdoing, and address multiple similar alleged wrongs that would not be economically feasible to pursue individually, such as here. See A. Conte, *Attorney Fee Awards* (2d ed. 1993) 104, at 6.

The percentage method is particularly appropriate where a monetary settlement has been recovered and "the benefit [recovered can be] easily quantified." *In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.* (9th Cir. 2011) 654 F.3d 935, 942. Where the amount of a settlement is a "certain easily calculable sum of money," California courts may calculate attorneys' fees as a reasonable percentage of the settlement created. Weil and Brown, California Practice Guide, *Civil Procedure Before Trial*, Chapter 14, section 14:145; *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*(1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1808.

The percentage fee method is preferred in representative actions because "it better approximates the workings of the marketplace than the lodestar approach." *Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 49. California law provides that fee awards should be equivalent to fees freely negotiated in the marketplace and paid in comparable litigation based on the result achieved and risk incurred. *See Lealao*, *supra*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 47-50; *Laffitte*, *supra*, 1 Cal.5th 480 at 503. Where a settlement

[42] *See Estrada v. FedEx Ground Package Sys. Inc.* (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 1, 16-17 (recognizing that recovery obtained on behalf of 209 individuals satisfies the "significant benefit," "public interest," and "large class of persons" requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, regardless of plaintiff's personal motivation).

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

agreement provides that defendant will pay a percentage of the fund created by the settlement as fees, use of that percentage method is appropriate. *Lealao*, 82 Cal.App.4th at 32. Fee awards that are too small will "chill the private enforcement essential to the vindication of many legal rights and obstruct the representative actions that often relieve the courts of the need to separately adjudicate numerous claims." *Id.* at 53. Therefore, fees in representative actions should approximate the probable terms of a contingent fee contract negotiated by a sophisticated attorney and client in comparable litigation. *Id*. at 48. "The ultimate goal . . . is the award of a 'reasonable' fee to compensate counsel for their efforts, irrespective of the method of calculation." *Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 557-58 (quoting *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2005) 126 Cal.App.4th, 1253, 1270).

Plaintiffs' Counsels' application for attorneys' fees in light of the facts and circumstances surrounding the case is well-within the range of reasonableness. Courts have awarded fees as high as 50% of the settlement in complex actions, depending on the circumstances of the case.[43]

Plaintiffs' Counsel have performed significant work in this matter, as discussed in the Declaration of Brian J. St. John and David D. Bibiyan, with the very real possibility of an unsuccessful outcome and no fee recovery of any kind.[44] In the present matter, Plaintiffs' Counsel have borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.[45] Plaintiffs' Counsel are experienced in complex wage-and-hour litigation and used that experience to obtain a significant settlement recovery for Plaintiffs, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California.[46] Considering the amount of fees requested, work performed, risks incurred, results obtained, and experience of Plaintiffs' Counsel in handling similar matters, Plaintiffs maintain that the requested attorneys' fees are reasonable and should be awarded.

///

///

---

[43] *See In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.* (D.D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp. 494 (awarding attorneys' fees in the amount of 45% of the $7.3 million total settlement amount); *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 attorneys' fees awards "average[ing] around one-third of the recovery." *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 n.11 (lower court found the range of contingency fees in marketplace to be 20%-40% and determined such a percentage fee was appropriate).

[44] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 18 & 33-34; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ 28.

[45] *Id*., ¶ 36.

[46] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 2-6; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ ¶ 4-16.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

B. <u>The Requested Fee Award is Reasonable Based on the Factors Considered in Determination of Fee Awards</u>

The factors which courts consider in determining whether fee awards are reasonable, all of which support the fee award requested by Plaintiffs' Counsel, are: the time and labor required; the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved; the skill requisite to perform the legal services properly; the preclusion of other employment by the attorney due to the acceptance of the case; the customary fee; whether the fee is fixed or contingent; the time limitation imposed by the client or the circumstances; the amount involved and results obtained; the experience, reputation, and ability of the attorney; the undesirability of the case; the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client; and awards in similar cases. *Camden I Condominium Association, Inc. v. Dunkel* (11th Cir. 1991) 946 F.2d 768, 772. Some of the most relevant factors to this Court's fee determination will be addressed below.

It should be highlighted that the percentage award sought is commensurate with the time, effort, and expense dedicated to the case, the contingent nature of Plaintiffs' Counsels' representation and the risks taken in commencing the case, the skill and determination required, the results that Plaintiffs' Counsel have achieved, and the value of the settlement that Plaintiffs' Counsel have obtained on behalf of Plaintiffs, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California. For the reasons discussed herein, an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of 35% of the Total Settlement Amount is reasonable.

1. Time & Labor

Plaintiffs' Counsel have used their experience and skills in litigating complex wage-and-hour actions to bring this matter to a successful conclusion. Prior to commencing this lawsuit, Plaintiffs' Counsel conducted a significant amount of investigation into the factual and legal issues, Defendant's business, and its operations and employment policies, practices, and procedures.[47] During the litigation of the case, Plaintiffs' Counsel interviewed and obtained information from Plaintiffs, Defendant, and other sources, conducted legal research, reviewed and analyzed thousands of pages of documents and data, prepared for and participated in mediation and robust settlement discussions, evaluated the PAGA claim, and calculated the potential monetary recovery under PAGA.[48] Plaintiffs' Counsel also met and conferred with Defendant's counsel regarding the pleadings, case management, discovery, motion

[47] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 18-19; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ 28.
[48] St. John Decl., ¶ 19; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ 28.

practice, arbitration, mediation, and settlement negotiations, among other issues.[49] Plaintiff's Counsel performed other work including, *inter alia*, meeting and conferring with Defendant's counsel regarding the pleadings, case management, discovery, motion practice, arbitration, mediation, and settlement negotiations, among other issues; case strategy and analysis; researching, drafting, reviewing, and revising pleadings, court filings, motion-related papers (e.g., with respect to Plaintiff Parra's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Compel Arbitration, and settlement approval motion papers), briefs for settlement negotiations and mediation, and the settlement agreement; propounding written discovery requests and notices of depositions of Defendant's persons most knowledgeable designees; claims evaluation and analysis; preparing for and participating in settlement negotiations and the mediation; and appearing for court proceedings.[50] Counsel for the parties have further invested time to research the applicable law, which is evolving as it relates to representative PAGA actions, off-the-clock theory, meal and rest periods, , business expense reimbursements, Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, arbitration agreements, wage-and-hour enforcement, Plaintiffs' claims, and Defendant's defenses, as well as facts discovered.[51]

Plaintiffs' Counsel dedicated the full extent of staffing and monetary resources necessary to prosecute the case with maximum efficiency and has fully and actively participated in the litigation process. Plaintiffs' Counsel have spent a combined **509.20 hours** to obtain a recovery on behalf of Plaintiffs, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California.[52] These hours were required to bring the case to its successful conclusion.

In light of the value of time expended and the carrying of costs involved in this litigation, the requested attorneys' fees award is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

2. The Skill Required to Perform Legal Services Properly

The skill required to properly litigate this case is evident not only in the results achieved, but in the steps necessary to reach the same. Defendant retained highly-respected counsel to represent its defenses. Plaintiffs' Counsels' effort and skill were used to, among other things, investigate the

[49] St. John Decl., ¶ 19; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ 28.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.
[52] St. John Decl., ¶ 34 & Exh. 3; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ 26.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

allegations and gather facts, research the legal issues, analyze data, documents, and information obtained from multiple sources, to evaluate the PAGA claim and negotiate the settlement. Despite all of the obstacles that had to be overcome, Plaintiffs' Counsel used its extensive experience and skill in the handling of complex wage-and-hour matters to advocate for and obtain a recovery now, with maximum efficiency, as opposed to the possibility of recovery in the future, after significant expense and time.[53]

3. Whether the Fee Is Fixed or Contingent

Plaintiffs' Counsel have provided representation on a contingency basis, have borne all of the risks and costs of litigation, and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.[54] If Plaintiffs' Counsel had not been successful, the time that they have devoted to litigating the case would have been for naught and would not have produced any fee or any reimbursement of costs or expenses. Plaintiffs' Counsel is well-experienced in complex wage-and-hour litigation and used that experience to obtain a great result in this matter.[55] The skill and determination that Plaintiffs' Counsel have shown throughout the prosecution of the case justifies the requested attorneys' fees and costs. Considering the amounts requested, work performed, and risks incurred, the requested fees and costs are reasonable and should be awarded.

4. The Amount Involved and the Results Achieved

The Settlement is an excellent resolution given the uncertainty and risks of further litigation.[56] Had the case not settled, Defendant would continue to vigorously defend the case, and would have challenged liability, merits, and sought a reduction in the amount of any civil penalties. Defendant, however, faced risks too, including and not limited to, the risk of trial and the risk of having the Court assess civil penalties. Additionally, preparing for trial would have been extraordinarily expensive for the Parties. At this stage, the settlement is preferred over continued litigation because such resolution saves time and money that would otherwise go to litigation. The risks and expenses of further litigation outweighed any benefit that might have been gained otherwise. The Settlement provides an immediate recovery and avoids an uncertain result in the future and additional risk, expense, and delay (e.g., prolonged expert discovery, trial preparation, and appellate review of those proceedings).

---

[53] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 18-32.
[54] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 32 & 36; Bibiyan Decl., ¶¶ 2, 17, & 29.
[55] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 2-6; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ ¶ 4-16.
[56] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 16, 19, 20, 32 & 36; Bibiyan Decl., ¶¶ 2, 17, & 29.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

The results achieved, in light of the difficulties inherent in similar cases and the specific difficulties faced in this case, are considerable. Plaintiffs' Counsel obtained a settlement that provides for a Total Settlement Amount of $875,000.00, and it is currently estimated that the Net Settlement Amount available for distribution, is approximately $530,450.32.[57]

5. The Reputation and Ability of the Attorneys

Plaintiffs' Counsel are recognized class action and complex litigation law firms, and its attorneys employed their knowledge, skill, and experience to bring the case to a successful conclusion. Plaintiffs' Counsel have years of wage-and-hour class action and complex litigation experience, have recovered millions of dollars on behalf of thousands of individuals in California, and have successfully handled numerous significant wage-and-hour class action and representative action cases.[58]

VI. REIMBURSEMENT OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSELS' LITIGATION COSTS AND EXPENSES SHOULD BE APPROVED

The Settlement provides for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses of up to $35,000.00. As set forth in the Declarations of Brian J. St. John and David D. Bibiyan, Plaintiffs' Counsel seeks reimbursement of $22,799.68 in litigation costs and expenses.[59] These expenses were reasonable and necessary in the prosecution of this matter and to obtain the Settlement, and is less than the maximum amount allocated under the Settlement Agreement.[60] The cost savings of $12,200.32 will be part of the Net Settlement Amount.[61] Accordingly, the Court is requested to award reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses to Plaintiffs' Counsel in the amount of $22,799.68.

VII. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS SHOULD BE APPROVED

As set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Parties have agreed to retain, subject to approval by the Court, Simpluris, Inc. to handle the administration of the Settlement. The fees and expenses of the PAGA Settlement Administrator are estimated not to exceed $5,500.00. These costs include, but are not limited to, expenses for preparing, translating, printing, and mailing the Cover Letter and Individual Settlement Shares checks to the Aggrieved Employees (i.e., PAGA Settlement Packages); performing

[57] Settlement Agreement, § 3(a) and see footnote 2.
[58] St. John Decl., ¶¶ 2-6; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ ¶ 4-16.
[59] St. John Decl., ¶ 36 & Exh. 4; Bibiyan Decl., ¶ 35 & Exh. 1.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

skip-trace searches; re-mailing the returned PAGA Settlement Packages; and handling inquiries from Aggrieved Employees regarding the Settlement, among other things. Accordingly, the Court should grant approval of the Settlement Administration Costs in the amount of up to $5,500.00 a necessary third-party for handling the settlement process.

VIII. THE GENERAL RELEASE FEE SHOULD BE APPROVED

The Settlement provides for a General Release Fee to be paid to each Plaintiff in the amount of $5,000.00 for their broader individual waiver and release of claims with a California Civil Code Section 1542 waiver (set forth in Section 8(c) of the Settlement Agreement).[62] It is reasonable and just for Plaintiffs to each receive this payment. Plaintiffs contributed considerable time and effort to the litigation of the cases in order to enforce the California Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and for the benefit of other Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiffs discussed their employment with their counsel, gathered and produced relevant documents and information, and provided the facts and evidence necessary to attempt to prove the allegations.[63] Plaintiffs were available whenever their counsel needed them and tried to obtain and provide documents and information that would aid in the litigation of the PAGA claim and pursuit of recovery on behalf of the State of California and Aggrieved Employees.[64]

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

[62] Settlement Agreement, §§ 3(a)(2) & 8(c). The PAGA statute recognizes that a plaintiff employee may pursue or recover other remedies and relief available to the plaintiff employee under state or federal law through an action under PAGA. See, Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(k)(1) (formerly Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(g)(1). As such, it is appropriate for Plaintiff to receive a payment for her broader individual release of claims.

[63] St. John Decl., ¶ 37; Declaration of Plaintiff Shaloma Smith, ¶¶ 8-15.

[64] Ibid.

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

IX. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above and in the accompanying declarations, the Court is respectfully requested to approve the Settlement, including the plan of allocation and distribution of the Total Settlement Amount.

Dated: January 15, 2026

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC

By: ______________________________
Brian J. St. John
Attorney for Plaintiff Arlene Parra

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
David D. Bibiyan
Vedang J. Patel
Brandon M. Chang
Attorneys for Plaintiff Shaloma Smith

LAWYERS *for* JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203

Make a Reservation

ARLENE PARRA, et al. vs MARKSMAN SECURITY CORPORATION, A FLORIDA CORPORATION, et al.

Case Number: 23TRCV01864 Case Type: Civil Unlimited Category: Other Employment Complaint Case
Date Filed: 2023-06-09 Location: Torrance Courthouse - Department E

Reservation

Case Name:
ARLENE PARRA, et al. vs MARKSMAN SECURITY CORPORATION, A FLORIDA CORPORATION, et al.

Case Number:
23TRCV01864

Type:
Motion re: (Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement)

Status:
RESERVED

Filing Party:
Arlene Parra (Plaintiff)

Location:
Torrance Courthouse - Department E

Date/Time:
02/09/2026 8:30 AM

Number of Motions:
1

Reservation ID:
194841821040

Confirmation Code:
CR-BTOPBQP2SJQYGRVBH

Fees

Description	Fee	Qty	Amount
Motion re: (name extension)	0.00	1	0.00
TOTAL			**$0.00**

Payment

Amount:
$0.00

Type:
NOFEE

Account Number:
n/a

Authorization:
n/a

Payment Date:
n/a

Print Receipt | Reserve Another Hearing | View My Reservations

Chat