Arrash T. Fattahi (SBN 333676)
arrash.fattahi@wilshirelawfirm.com
Alan A. Wilcox (SBN 287476)
alan.wilcox@wilshirelawfirm.com
Arman A. Salehi (SBN 351112)
arman.salehi@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF BUTTE

ROBERTA JEAN LINOZ and NATALIE YANG, individually, on behalf of all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the State of California and other aggrieved persons, Plaintiffs, v. MAINS'L CALIFORNIA, LLC, a California limited liability company; MAINS'L SERVICES, INC., an unknown entity; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. 23CV01439 *[Assigned for All Purposes to* the *Hon. Stephen E. Benson*, *Dept. 6]* **PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT** <u>FINAL APPROVAL HEARING</u> Date: July 22, 2026 Time: 9:00 a.m. Dept: 6 Complaint filed: June 1, 2023 Trial date: Not set

TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on **July 22, 2026, at 9:00 a.m**., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in Department 6 of the above-entitled Court, located at 1775 Concord Avenue, Chico, CA 95928, Plaintiffs Roberta Jean Linoz and Natalie Yang ("Plaintiffs") will and hereby do move this Court for an Order:

1. Granting final approval of the proposed Class, Collective, and Representative Action Settlement Agreement and Release of Claims (the "Agreement");
2. Finally approving payment of the Gross Settlement Amount of $1,400,000.00.
3. Awarding Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the amount of $490,000.00 and reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of $26,668.54;
4. Awarding Plaintiffs' service awards in the amount of $20,000.00 ($10,000.00 each);
5. Awarding $12,000.00 to Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions ("Phoenix") for settlement administration expenses;
6. Approving allocation of $50,000.00 as civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), 75% of which ($37,500.00) will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and 25% of which ($12,500.00) will be distributed on a pro rata basis to Aggrieved Employees; and
7. Entering a Final Judgment consistent with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the accompanying declarations, and on all records and documents on file, together with such oral and documentary evidence that may be presented at the hearing on this matter.

Dated: June 29, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

By: ______________________________

Arrash T. Fattahi
Alan Wilcox
Arman A. Salehi
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

STATE CASES

FEDERAL CASES

<u>OTHER SOURCES</u>

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs Roberta Jean Linoz and Natalie Yang ("Plaintiffs") seek final approval of a non-reversionary settlement of class claims and representative claims under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq*., for a Gross Settlement Amount of $1,400,000.00 (the "Settlement"). The Class, Collective, and Representative Action Settlement Agreement and Release of Claims ("Agreement") provides that the following deductions will be made from the Gross Settlement Amount:

1. Attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed $490,000.00;
2. Litigation costs in an amount not to exceed $30,000.00[1];
3. A Class Representative Service Award to each Plaintiff in an amount not to exceed $10,000.00 ($20,000 total);
4. Settlement administration expenses in an amount not to exceed $12,000.00; and
5. Civil penalties in the amount of $50,000.00 for claims under PAGA, 75% of which ($37,500.00) will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), and 25% of which ($12,500.00) will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. (*See* Agreement ¶ D.52(i); *see also* Declaration of Taylor Mitzner ("Mitzner Decl.") ¶ 17.)

After all deductions are made, as of the filing of this Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (the "Motion"), the remainder (the "Net Settlement Amount") will be distributed to 903 Class Members ("Participating Class Members") based on the number of weeks worked during the Class Period. (Mitzner Decl. ¶¶ 13-16.)

The proposed Settlement is the product of diligent efforts, litigation, arm's length negotiations, and informal discovery that resulted in the best possible outcome for the Class. By resolving this matter now, Participating Class Members will receive a guaranteed recovery without risk of nonpayment, delay, or an adverse judgment at trial.

An objective evaluation of the Settlement confirms that the relief negotiated on the

[1] Class Counsel's final litigation costs total $26,668.54, inclusive of $300.00 in future legal costs. (*see* Declaration of Arrash T. Fattahi in Support of the Motion ("Fattahi MFA Decl.") ¶ 18, Ex. 4.)

Settlement Class's behalf is fair, reasonable, and valuable. The Settlement was negotiated by the Parties at arm's length with helpful guidance from Mark LeHocky, Esq., an experienced and well-respected mediator of wage and hour actions, and the Settlement confers substantial benefits to Participating Class Members. This relief—averaging approximately $882.74 per Class Member from the Net Settlement Amount—is particularly impressive when viewed against the difficulties typically encountered by plaintiffs pursuing wage and hour cases. Moreover, by settling now rather than proceeding to trial, Participating Class Members will not have to wait (possibly years) for relief, nor will they have to risk the denial of class certification, decertification, Defendants' prevailing at trial, or Plaintiffs' prevailing at trial but losing on appeal.

There are three (3) requests for exclusion from the Settlement and no objections from a total of 906 Class Members. (Mitzner Decl. ¶¶ 6, 10, 11.) Participating Class Members will receive an average settlement payment of $887.41, with the highest payout reaching $4,525.55. (*Id*. ¶ 16.) Aggrieved Employees will receive an average settlement payment of $18.33, with the highest payout reaching $51.87. (*Id*. ¶ 17.) In light of the Class's favorable response, and the facts and law set forth below, as well as in the motion for preliminary approval, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court now enter an Order: (1) granting final approval of the Settlement; (2) entering final judgment; (3) requiring distribution of individual settlement shares to Participating Class Members; and (4) approving payments for attorneys' fees, litigation costs, the Class Representative Service Awards, Settlement Administration Expenses, and civil penalties under PAGA.

II. <u>THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL</u>

"Public policy generally favors the compromise of complex class action litigation." (*Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1118, s*ee also 7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp*. (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1151 ("voluntary conciliation and settlement are the preferred means of dispute resolution . . . [t]his is especially true in complex class action litigation . . . .").)

Class action settlement approval occurs in two steps: (1) an early (preliminary) review by the trial court, and (2) a subsequent (final) review after notice has been distributed to Class Members for their comments and/or objections. Cal. R. Ct. 3.769. The Court granted preliminary approval on April 8, 2026. Plaintiffs now seek final approval.

"[T]he trial court has broad powers to determine whether a proposed settlement in a class action is fair." (*Mallick v. Super. Ct.* (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 434, 438.) Fairness is presumed when: (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 low. (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1802; s*ee also Nordstrom Com. Cases* (2010) 186 Cal. App. 4th 576, 581.) "Where the settlement terms are fair and reasonable, the settlement is presumptively valid, subject only to objections that may be raised at a final hearing." (Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 11.26 (4th ed. 2002) (Newberg).)

In deciding whether to grant final approval of a class action settlement, California courts consider whether the settlement is "fair, adequate, and reasonable." (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801.) In evaluating whether a settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, courts evaluate the following factors: (1) the strength of the plaintiff's case; (2) the risk, expense, complexity, and duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class action status through trial; (4) the amount offered in settlement; (5) the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7) the presence of a governmental participant; and (8) the reaction of class members to the proposed settlement. (*Id.*)

A. <u>A Presumption of Fairness Exists</u>

While the burden is on the proponent to demonstrate that a proposed settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, "a presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached through arm's length bargaining; (2) investigation is 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.* at 1802.)

At preliminary approval, Plaintiffs presented evidence that this Settlement is entitled to a presumption of fairness because: (1) it was reached through arm's length bargaining with the assistance of an experienced mediator; (2) Plaintiffs conducted a thorough investigation through formal and informal discovery and an analysis of Settlement Class Members' time and payroll records; and (3) Class Counsel is experienced in similar litigation. (*See* Declaration of Arrash T. Fattahi in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed February 13, 2026 ("Fattahi MPA Decl.") ¶¶ 7-8, 9-15, 40-49. Three (3) Class Members have opted out, and none has objected. (*See* Mitzner Decl. ¶¶ 10, 11.) Therefore, the Court can confidently conclude that a presumption of fairness exists.

B. <u>The Strength of Plaintiffs' Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial</u>

Courts are not required to ensure that a settlement maximizes the value of released claims with mathematical precision. "[T]he test is not the maximum amount plaintiffs might have obtained at trial on the complaint, but rather whether the settlement is reasonable under all of the circumstances." (*Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 250, disapproved of on other grounds by *Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 260, 269-270; *see also 7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1150 ("the merits of the underlying class claims are not a basis for upsetting the settlement of a class action; the operative word is 'settlement.'").) The relevant circumstances include the strengths and weaknesses of plaintiffs' claims and the risks they faced in litigation. (*7-Eleven*, 85 Cal.App.4th at 1146.)

Here, Plaintiffs presented sufficient information for preliminary approval regarding the number of Participating Class Members and the estimated maximum value of each claim alleged. (*See* Fattahi MPA Decl. ¶¶ 16-29.) Plaintiffs have also described in detail the risks the Class faced in litigation and the strengths and weaknesses of each of the claims. (*See id.*) Plaintiffs noted potential difficulties in obtaining class certification and succeeding on the merits at trial. (*See id.*) The factual record here is sufficiently developed to allow the Court to independently satisfy itself "that the consideration being received for the release of the class members' claims is reasonable in light of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and the risks of the particular litigation." (*Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 410.)

C. **<u>The Amount Offered in Settlement</u>**

The Settlement provides a $1,400,000.00 Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") to be distributed among the 903 Participating Class Members. (Mitzner Decl. ¶¶ 6, 13-15.) The GSA will be used to pay Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs, Plaintiffs' service awards, and Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions' ("Phoenix") costs for Settlement administration. (*Id*. ¶¶ 15.) The Settlement also allocates $50,000.00 from the GSA to PAGA civil penalties. (*See* Agreement ¶ D.52(i); *see also* Mitzner Decl. ¶ 17.) After all deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount will be $801,331.46, which will be distributed to Participating Class Members according to the number of weeks they worked for Defendants Mains'l California, LLC and Mains'l Services, Inc. ("Defendants") during the Class Period. (*See* Agreement ¶ D.52(d); *see also* Mitzner Decl. ¶ 16.)

The Administrator has calculated a total of 59,884 Workweeks in the Class Period. (Mitzner Decl. ¶ 14.) As a result, the average recovery for Participating Class Members is $887.41, and the highest payout is $4,525.55. (*Id*. ¶ 16.) Weighing the potential value of the class claims against the risk and expense of trial, the Settlement provides relief that is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

D. **<u>The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings</u>**

Class Counsel sufficiently investigated the alleged claims, applicable law, and potential defenses. Specifically, Class Counsel assessed the value of the claims using data and documents provided by Defendants in informal discovery, including policy documents and timekeeping and payroll records. (*See* Fattahi MPA Decl. ¶¶ 7-8, 16-29.) Following a complete analysis of this information, the Parties attended mediation on January 28, 2025, with an experienced mediator, Mark LeHocky, Esq. (*Id*. ¶ 9.) The Parties were able to reach an agreement and spent a considerable amount of time negotiating the terms of the Settlement. (*See id*. ¶ 10.)

The document and data exchanges allowed Class Counsel to assess fully the nature and magnitude of the claims being settled, as well as the impediments to recovery, and ultimately enabled Class Counsel to make an independent assessment of the reasonableness of the Settlement's terms. By engaging in such a thorough investigation and evaluation of Plaintiffs' claims, Class Counsel can opine that the Settlement, for the consideration and on the terms set forth in the Agreement, is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interests of Class Members in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant delay and uncertainty associated with litigation and various defenses asserted by Defendants.

E. The Experience and Views of Counsel

Plaintiffs are represented by Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. (Fattahi MFA Decl. ¶ 2.) Class Counsel regularly prosecute wage and hour cases, including class and representative actions and have successfully resolved cases involving issues similar to those presented in this matter. (*Id*. ¶¶ 3-11.) Class Counsel have negotiated a settlement here that they believe is fair, reasonable, and adequate based on their prior experience litigating these types of cases. (*Id*. ¶ 18.)

F. The Presence of a Government Participant

On June 21, 2023, Plaintiff Linoz provided notice to the LWDA of her intention to file a PAGA claim. (Fattahi MPA Decl. ¶ 4.) The LWDA received the required notice of this Settlement on October 23, 2025. (*Id*. ¶ 11, Ex. 2.) The Settlement provides for the payment of $50,000.00 in civil penalties, 75% of which ($37,500.00) will be paid to the LWDA, and 25% of which ($12,500.00) will be paid to Aggrieved Employees based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. (*See* Mitzner Decl. ¶ 17; *see also* Agreement ¶ D.52(i).) The LWDA has not responded or objected to the Settlement. (Fattahi MPA Decl. ¶¶ 11, Ex. 2.)

G. The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement

Class Members' reaction to the Settlement has been favorable. A court may properly infer that a class action settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate when few class members object to or opt out of it. (*Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 51.)

When it granted preliminary approval, the Court also approved the method of providing notice to Class Members. Following a search of the National Change of Address database, Phoenix mailed the Class Notice to all Class Members on May 13, 2026. (Mitzner Decl. ¶¶ 4, 5.) The Class Notice informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, the amounts of their individual payments and how those amounts were calculated, their right to participate in the Settlement, opt out of it, object to it, or dispute the amount of their individual payments, the procedures and deadlines to submit an opt out, objection, or dispute, and the date, time, and place of the hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval and instructions to be heard at the hearing. (*Id.* ¶ 5, Ex. A.) Here, in response to the Class Notice, three (3) Class Members opted out, and none objected, as of the date of the filing of the Motion. (*Id*. ¶¶ 10, 11.) Class Members' favorable response to the Settlement further supports final approval.

III. THE REQUESTED FEE AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

There are two primary methods of determining a reasonable attorney fee in the context of class action litigation. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 489.) The percentage-of-recovery method calculates the fee as a percentage of a common fund recovered on behalf of the class. (*Id*.) The lodestar method calculates the fee by multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by counsel by a reasonable hourly rate, which amount then may be adjusted based on other factors. (*Id*.) In *Laffitte*, the California Supreme Court held that trial courts have the discretion to choose between the two methods. (*Id*. at 504.) Trial courts also have discretion to blend the two methods to calculate fees, using one method to "cross-check" the reasonableness of the other's result, but a cross-check is not required. (*Id*. at 506.)

A. The Requested Fee Award is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Percentage-of-Recovery Method

The ultimate purpose of the percentage-of-recovery method is to "spread the attorney fee among all the beneficiaries of the fund." (*Id*. at 503.) The California Supreme Court recognized that the percentage-of-recovery method has many advantages, "including relative ease of calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better approximation of market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement it provides counsel to seek an early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging the litigation. . ." (*Id*.)

The requested fee award, thirty-five percent (35%) of the GSA, is consistent with the average fee award in class actions. (*See*, *e.g.*, *Roos v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.* (2015) 241

Cal.App.4th 1472 (fee award of 37.5% was not an abuse of discretion), disapproved of on other grounds by *Hernandez, supra,* 4 Cal.5th at 287; *Wren v. RGIS Inventory Specialists* (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011) No. C–06–05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826, at *29 (approving fee award of 42%); *Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.* (S.D. Cal. June 1, 2010) No. 08–CV–821–IEG, 2010 WL 2196104, at *8 (approving fee award of one-third and noting that the typical fees awarded in wage and hour class action cases ranges from 33.33% to 40%).) Therefore, the percentage-of-recovery method should be utilized to approve the requested fee.

B. A Lodestar Cross-Check Confirms the Reasonableness of the Requested Fee

Although *Laffitte* makes clear that a lodestar cross-check is not required, Class Counsel's lodestar supports the reasonableness of the requested fee. The lodestar is determined by multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by the reasonable hourly rate. (*PLCM Group, Inc. v. Drexler* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 1084, 1095.) The lodestar figure may then be adjusted, based on consideration of factors specific to the case, in order to fix the fee at the fair market value for the legal services provided." (*Id.*) The factors that can be considered include "the nature of the litigation, its difficulty, the amount involved, the skill required in its handling, the skill employed, the attention given, the success or failure, and other circumstances in the case." (*Melnyk v. Robledo* (1976) 64 Cal.App.3d 618, 623-24 (citations omitted).) Additionally, Courts utilize "multipliers" to account for the risk of taking on cases where there is no guarantee of recovery, uncertainties as to the amount that will be recovered, uncertainty as to the cost of litigating the case (both in effort and expenses), and uncertainty about how much time will pass before the recovery is obtained. (*Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-33; *see also Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 48-49 (approving the adjustment of the lodestar figure based on factors specific to the case to ensure fair market value for legal services provided on a contingency basis).) Application of that rule is particularly appropriate where the case is brought to redress important rights of vulnerable persons. (*Ketchum*, 24 Cal.4th at 1133.)

Generally, "[m]ultipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even higher." (*Wershba, supra,* 91 Cal.App.4th at 255; *see also Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 495, 512 (applying a 2.52 multiplier on a cross-check in an antitrust class action); *Chavez v.*

Netflix, Inc. (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 60 (applying a 2.5 multiplier on a lodestar cross-check); *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.* (9th Cir. 2002) 290 F.3d 1043, 1051 n.6 ("most" common fund cases apply a multiplier of 1.0-4.0); *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 860, 881-82 (affirming a 2.13 multiplier after finding that "2 to 4" is a reasonable range for multipliers on a cross-check).) Here, the application of a modest 2.79 multiplier supports Class Counsel's fee request of $490,000.00. (Fattahi MFA Decl. ¶¶ 16, 17.)

The risk factors present in this case favor the application of a 2.79 multiplier. (*Id*. ¶ 17.) To begin, Class Counsel has singularly assumed the risk and costs of litigation purely on a contingency basis. And, while Plaintiffs are confident in the merits of their claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each cause of action, posing an actual risk that Plaintiffs may not succeed at class certification and/or trial. (*Id*.) Any of these obstacles could have prevented recovery, meaning Class Counsel would have been left with no compensation for all the time and money invested in this case. (*Id*.) Despite these risks, Class Counsel took this case on a contingency basis so that Class Members (a particularly vulnerable group of hourly paid workers) could be compensated for Labor Code violations and unpaid wages. Consequently, Class Counsel was precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases that could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain. (*Id*.) Moreover, Class Counsel's hourly rates are comparable to those charged by other class action counsel. (*Id*. ¶ 13, Ex. 1.) Class Counsel spent **239.4** hours prosecuting this action, which was divided among the attorneys working on this case according to skill level. (*Id*. ¶ 16, Ex. 3.) Multiplying the total hours expended by Class Counsel by their reasonable hourly rates yields a lodestar of **$175,440.00**. (*Id*.) The hours expended by each attorney were reasonable and not duplicative and reflect the extensive investigation and analysis that was required to achieve this Settlement. (*Id*.)

Considered against the risks of continued litigation, and the importance of advocating for employment rights and a speedy recovery, the relief provided under the Settlement represents a very strong result for the Class. Accordingly, Class Counsel's fee request of $490,000.00 is fair and reasonable and should be approved.

///

IV. THE REQUESTED COST AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

The Settlement permits Class Counsel to seek reimbursement of litigation costs in an amount up to $30,000.00. The actual costs incurred are $26,368.54 and future costs are estimated at $300.00, for a total of $26,668.54, which does not exceed the maximum amount allocated for litigation costs in the Settlement, and the remaining $3,331.46 will revert to and increase the Net Settlement Amount. (Fattahi MFA Decl. ¶ 18, Ex. 4.) These costs were reasonable and necessary to prosecute this case and obtain the results achieved. (*Id.*)

V. THE REQUESTED CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE PAYMENTS ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

Plaintiffs also request approval of service awards of $10,000.00 each ($20,000.00 total) for their efforts in obtaining the Settlement. In evaluating a service award, the Court may consider: "(1) the risk, both financial and otherwise, the class representative faced in bringing the suit; (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 received by the class representative as a result of the litigation." (*Golba v. Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1251, 1272; *Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804.)

Here, both Plaintiffs provided declarations in support of the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement detailing the risks they faced in bringing the suit, the notoriety and personal difficulties they encountered, the amount of time and effort they spent on this litigation, the duration of the litigation, and the personal benefit they will receive as a result of the litigation. (*See generally,* Declarations of Roberta Jean Linoz and Natalie Yang in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, filed on February 13, 2026.) Plaintiffs should be adequately compensated for their role in obtaining this Settlement.

Additionally, no Class Members objected to the amount of additional compensation sought by Plaintiffs. Accordingly, the awards are reasonable in light of the substantial benefits

Plaintiffs conferred upon the Settlement Class.

VI. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

The Parties agreed to hire Phoenix as the Settlement Administrator in this case and the Court approved this choice at preliminary approval. The Settlement Administrator was responsible for updating Class Members' mailing addresses, mailing the Class Notice to each Class Member, responding to Class Member questions, providing weekly status reports, and providing a declaration as to the results of the mailing. (*See* Mitzner Decl. ¶ 2.) Following final approval, Phoenix's duties will continue in order to calculate and mail the settlement payments to Participating Class Members, disburse other payments as ordered by the Court, and perform such other duties described in the Settlement. (*Id.*) The requested amount of $12,000.00 for services rendered and to be rendered is therefore fair and reasonable. (*Id*. ¶ 19.)

VII. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Class Counsel respectfully request that the Court grant final approval of the Settlement and the Agreement, approve Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the amount of $490,000.00 and reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of $26,668.54, the service awards in the amount of $10,000.00 each ($20,000.00 total) to Plaintiffs, PAGA civil penalties in the amount of $50,000.00, and settlement administration expenses to Phoenix in the amount of $12,000.00.

Dated: June 29, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

By: ______________________________
Arrash T. Fattahi
Alan Wilcox
Arman A. Salehi
Attorneys for Plaintiffs