

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
TALIA LUX (SBN 336074)
HAIG HOGDANIAN (SBN 334699)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

LEONORA STRAUSS, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

v.

HANALEI HOLDINGS LLC d/b/a
BRIDGEVIEW POST ACUTE, a California
limited liability company; and DOES 1
through 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 37-2024-00023715-CU-OE-CTL

Assigned for All Purposes to:
Honorable Matthew C. Braner
Department C-60

CLASS ACTION

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT, CONDITIONAL
CERTIFICATION, APPROVAL OF CLASS
NOTICE, SETTING OF FINAL
APPROVAL HEARING DATE;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

[Declaration of Proposed Class Counsel
(Douglas Han); Declaration of Proposed Class
Representative (Leonora Strauss); and
[Proposed] Order filed concurrently herewith]

Hearing Date: October 9, 2026
Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.
Hearing Place: Department 11

Complaint Filed: May 22, 2024
FAC Filed: March 12, 2026
Trial Date: None Set

1 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on October 9, 2026 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon as the matter
2 may be heard, before the Honorable Matthew C. Braner in Department C-60 of the San Diego
3 County Superior Court located 330 West Broadway San Diego, California 92101, Plaintiff
4 Leonora Strauss (“Plaintiff”) will and hereby does move for an order:

- 5 • Granting Preliminary Approval of the class action settlement described herein and
6 as set forth in the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Settlement
7 Agreement,” “Settlement,” or “Agreement”), attached as **Exhibit 2** to the
8 Declaration of Douglas Han, including, and not limited to, the means of allocation
9 and distribution of funds;
- 10 • Approving the Court Approved Notice of Class Action Settlement and Hearing
11 Date for Final Court Approval (“Class Notice”) attached as **Exhibit A** to the
12 Settlement Agreement;
- 13 • Directing the mailing of the Class Notice with a postage-paid return envelope to
14 the Class Members;
- 15 • Approving Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as the Administrator;
- 16 • Approving the proposed deadlines for the settlement administration process;
- 17 • Conditionally certifying the Class for settlement purposes only;
- 18 • Appointing Justice Law Corporation as Class Counsel;
- 19 • Appointing Plaintiff as the class representative; and
- 20 • Scheduling a hearing to consider whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement
21 Agreement, at which time the Court will also consider whether to grant Final
22 Approval of the requests for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel
23 Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment,
24 Administration Expenses Payment, and approval of the allocation of the Private
25 Attorney General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) Penalties.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 This motion is based upon the following memorandum of points and authorities;
2 Declaration of Proposed Class Counsel (Douglas Han); Declaration of Proposed Class
3 Representative (Leonora Strauss); [Proposed] Order filed concurrently with this motion; pleadings
4 and other records on file with the Court in this matter; and such documentary evidence and oral
5 argument as may be presented at the hearing on this motion.

6
7 Dated: April 13, 2026

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

8 By: 
9 Douglas Han
10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	10
II.	BACKGROUND	10
III.	INVESTIGATION/ LITIGATION HISTORY	10
a.	Discovery, Investigation, and the Parties' Staunchly Conflicting Positions	10
b.	The Parties Were Able to Reach an Agreement	11
i.	The Parties Attended Mediation Which Led to the Settlement	11
ii.	The Settlement Was Reached as a Result of Arm's-Length Negotiations	11
iii.	The Settlement Is the Result of Thorough Investigation and Discovery	12
c.	Terms of the Settlement	12
i.	Deductions from the Settlement	12
ii.	Calculating Settlement Payments	12
iii.	Notice to the Class	13
iv.	Distribution of Funds	13
v.	Release of Claims	13
d.	Counsel for Both Parties Are Experienced in Similar Litigation	14
IV.	ARGUMENT	15
a.	Class Action Settlements Are Subject to Court Review	15
b.	The Settlement Is a Reasonable Compromise of Claims	15
i.	The Settlement Amount of \$400,000 Is Fair and Reasonable	16
ii.	The PAGA Penalties of \$40,000 Are Reasonable	17
c.	Discount Analysis Justifies the Settlement	18
d.	Conditional Certification of the Class Is Appropriate	19
i.	The Proposed Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous	19
ii.	Class Members Share a Well-defined Community of Interest	20
1.	Common Issues Predominate	20

2.	Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical of the Class Claims.....	20
3.	Plaintiff Is Adequate to Represent the Class.....	21
4.	Class Action is Superior for the Fair and Efficient Adjudication of this Controversy	21
e.	The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate	21
f.	Notice to the Class Complies with Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(f).....	22
V.	CONCLUSION.....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Acosta v. TransUnion, LLC</i>	
(C.D. Cal. 2007) 240 F.R.D. 564	18
<i>Aguiar v. Cintas Corp. No. 2</i>	
(2006) 144 Cal.App.4th 121	17
<i>Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Management, LLC</i>	
(2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 521	14
<i>Bartold v. Glendale Federal Bank</i>	
(2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 816	19
<i>In re Beef Industry Antitrust Litigation</i>	
(5th Cir. 1979) 607 F.2d 167	15
<i>Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.</i>	
(N.D.Cal. 1979) 485 F.Supp.610	12
<i>Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court</i>	
(2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004	20
<i>Capitol People First v. Department of Developmental Services</i>	
(2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 676	20
<i>Classen v. Weller</i>	
(1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 27	20
<i>Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.</i>	
(2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448.....	18
<i>Dunbar v. Albertson's Inc.</i>	
(2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 1422	17
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	
(1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794	14, 21, 22
<i>Espinoza v. Galardi South Enters.</i>	
(S.D.Fla. Jan. 11, 2016, No. 14-21244-CIV-GOODMAN) 2016 U.S.Dist.LEXIS.....	20

Cases	Page(s)
<i>In re General Motors Corp. Engine Interchange Litigation</i>	
(7th Cir. 1979) 594 F.2d 1106	18
<i>Ghazaryan v. Diva Limousine, Ltd.</i>	
(2008) 169 Cal.App.4th 1524	19
<i>Green v. Obledo</i>	
(1981) 29 Cal.3d 126	15
<i>Harris v. Superior Court</i>	
(2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 164	16
<i>Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp.</i>	
(2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 908	19
<i>Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.</i>	
(N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2009) No. 08-00844, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900	17
<i>Iowa Beef Processors, Inc. v. Meat Price Investigators Ass’n</i>	
(1981) 452 U.S. 905	15
<i>Jones v. JGC Dallas LLC</i>	
(N.D.Tex. Nov. 29, 2012, Civil Action No. 3:11-CV-2743-O) 2012 U.S.Dist.LEXIS	
185042	20
<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i>	
(2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116	15, 16
<i>Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.</i>	
(2000) 23 Cal.4th 429	19
<i>Linney v. Cellular Alaska P’ship</i>	
(9th Cir. 1998) 151 F.3d 1234	18
<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i>	
(2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399	15, 16
<i>Nordstrom Com. Cases</i>	
(2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576	17

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court</i>	
(2004) 34 Cal.4th 319	16, 19, 20
<i>Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Mgmt.</i>	
(2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 1112	17
<i>Vasquez v. Superior Court</i>	
(1971) 4 Cal.3d 800	15
<i>Walsh v. IKON Office Solutions, Inc.</i>	
(2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1440	17
Rules	
Federal Rule 23	15
Rules of Court, Rule 3.769	15
Rules of Court, Rule 3.769 (f)	22
Rules of Court, Rule 3.769 (g).....	15
Statutes	
Business & Professions Code § 17200	16
Code of Civil Procedure § 382.....	19, 21
Code of Civil Procedure § 877.6.....	16
Code of Civil Procedure § 1542.....	14
Labor Code § 201.....	17
Labor Code § 202.....	17
Labor Code § 203.....	17
Labor Code § 204.....	17
Labor Code § 218.5.....	17
Labor Code § 221.....	17
Labor Code § 226.3.....	17
Labor Code § 226.7.....	17
Labor Code § 226 (a)	17

	Statutes	Page(s)
1		
2	Labor Code § 246.....	17
3	Labor Code § 510.....	17
4	Labor Code § 512 (a)	17
5	Labor Code § 551.....	17
6	Labor Code § 552.....	17
7	Labor Code § 558.....	17
8	Labor Code § 1174 (d).....	17
9	Labor Code § 1174.5.....	17
10	Labor Code § 1194.....	17
11	Labor Code § 1197.....	17
12	Labor Code § 1197.1.....	17
13	Labor Code § 1198.....	17
14	Labor Code § 2698.....	10
15	Labor Code § 2800.....	17
16	Labor Code § 2802.....	17

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 This motion seeks preliminary approval of a non-reversionary proposed wage-and-hour
3 class action settlement for all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of
4 Defendant Hanalei Holdings LLC d/b/a Bridgeview Post Acute (“Defendant”) within the State of
5 California at any time during the period from May 22, 2020, through March 20, 2026 (“Class,”
6 “Class Members,” and “Class Period”). At the time of mediation (January 20, 2026), the number
7 of Class Members is estimated to be three hundred seventy-six (376), which was confirmed by
8 Defendant. (Declaration of Douglas Han In Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class
9 Action Settlement (“Han Decl.”), ¶¶ 8, 9.)

10 **II. BACKGROUND**

11 On May 22, 2024, Plaintiff filed a wage-and-hour class action lawsuit in the Superior Court
12 of California, County of San Diego, alleging eight (8) causes of action. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 10.)

13 After engaging in discovery, investigations, and negotiation, on January 20, 2026, the
14 Parties attended mediation with the mediator Gig Kyriacou, resulting in a tentative settlement
15 pursuant to a mediator’s proposal. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 11.)

16 In line with the settlement, on January 23, 2026, Plaintiff provided written notice to the
17 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency and Defendant. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 12;
18 Exhibit 3.)

19 Plaintiff then filed a First Amended Complaint that adjusted the “class” definition and
20 added cause of action for violation of Labor Code section 2698 (PAGA). (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶
21 13; Exhibit 4.)

22 **III. INVESTIGATION/ LITIGATION HISTORY**

23 **a. Discovery, Investigation, and the Parties’ Staunchly Conflicting Positions**

24 After initiating this lawsuit, the Parties engaged in discovery. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 15.)
25 Plaintiff drafted and propounded special interrogatories and requests for production of documents,
26 and Defendant responded to the formal discovery requests. (*Ibid.*) The Parties met and conferred
27 and agreed to engage in the informal exchange of information and then eventually attended
28 mediation. (*Ibid.*)

1 Prior to the mediation, Defendant produced documents relating to its policies, practices,
2 and procedures. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 16.) As part of Defendant’s production, Class Counsel
3 reviewed time records, pay records, and information relating to the size and scope of the Class.
4 (*Ibid.*) Putative class members were also located and interviewed to attain a better understanding
5 of the extent and frequency of the alleged day-to-day violations. (*Ibid.*)

6 Based on the information provided by Defendant and interviews with putative class
7 members, Plaintiff contends – and Defendant denies – Defendant: (1) failed to provide employees
8 with legally mandated meal and rest breaks; (2) failed to pay employees for all hours worked; (3)
9 failed to include non-discretionary bonuses in employees’ regular rate of pay; (4) failed to
10 reimburse employees for necessary business expenses; (5) issued noncompliant wage statements;
11 and (6) is liable for waiting time penalties. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 18-25.)

12 **b. The Parties Were Able to Reach an Agreement**

13 **i. The Parties Attended Mediation Which Led to the Settlement**

14 The Parties attended mediation with an experienced mediator. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26.)
15 Under the auspices of the mediator, the Parties reached a settlement via a mediator’s proposal, the
16 terms of which were memorialized in the Settlement Agreement. (*Id.* at ¶ 26; Exhibits 2, 5.)

17 **ii. The Settlement Was Reached as a Result of Arm’s-Length Negotiations**

18 The Settlement Agreement was reached because of arm’s-length negotiations. (Han Decl.,
19 *supra*, at ¶ 29.) Though cordial and professional, the settlement negotiations have always been
20 adversarial and non-collusive in nature. (*Ibid.*) At the mediation, the Parties’ counsel conducted
21 extensive arm’s-length settlement negotiations until an agreement was ultimately reached. (*Ibid.*)

22 Plaintiff and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of additional proceedings
23 necessary to continue the litigation through trial and any possible appeals. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶
24 30.) Plaintiff and Class Counsel also considered the uncertainty and risk of further litigation,
25 potential outcome, and difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation. (*Ibid.*) Based on the
26 foregoing, Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe that the Settlement Agreement is a fair, adequate,
27 and reasonable settlement and is in the best interests of the Class Members. (*Ibid.*)

28 ///

1 **iii. The Settlement Is the Result of Thorough Investigation and Discovery**

2 The Parties investigated and evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and
3 defenses before reaching the Settlement Agreement and engaged in research and discovery to
4 support the Settlement Agreement. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 31.) The Settlement Agreement was
5 only possible following an investigation and evaluation of the relevant policies and practices,
6 permitting Class Counsel to engage in an analysis of liability and potential damages. (*Ibid.*) This
7 case has reached the stage where the Parties understand “the strength of the case; the
8 reasonableness of the settlement in light of the attendant risks of litigation, and in light of the best
9 possible recovery” sufficient to support the reasonableness, adequacy, and fairness of the
10 Settlement Agreement. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 31; *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.* (N.D.Cal. 1979) 485
11 F.Supp. 610, 617.)

12 **c. Terms of the Settlement**

13 **i. Deductions from the Settlement**

14 The Parties agreed that (subject to the Court’s approval) this matter be settled and
15 compromised for the non-reversionary sum of \$400,000 (“Gross Settlement Amount”) which
16 includes: (1) Class Counsel Fees Payment up to \$140,000 (35% of the Gross Settlement Amount);
17 (2) Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment up to \$25,000; (3) Class Representative Service
18 Payment up to \$10,000; (4) Administration Expenses Payment up to \$15,000; and (5) PAGA
19 Penalties up to \$40,000. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 27.)

20 **ii. Calculating Settlement Payments**

21 After all the Court-approved deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount, it is estimated
22 that \$170,000 (“Net Settlement Amount”) will be paid to the Participating Class Members – with
23 a gross *average* Individual Class Payment estimated at \$452.13. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 28.)

24 The Participating Class Members will receive a proportionate share of the Net Settlement
25 Amount as their Individual Class Payments using the formula set forth in the Settlement
26 Agreement. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § C(2)(e).) The Individual Class
27 Payments will be allocated twenty percent (20%) to the settlement of wage claims and eighty
28 percent (80%) to the settlement of claims for interests and penalties. (*Ibid.*)

1 The portion of the PAGA Penalties that is to be paid to each Aggrieved Employee as their
2 Individual PAGA Payments shall be determined using the formula set forth in the Settlement
3 Agreement. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § C(2)(d).) The Individual PAGA
4 Payments will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties. (*Ibid.*)

5 **iii. Notice to the Class**

6 No later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval,
7 Defendant will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2,
8 *supra*, at § G(4)(a).) No later than fourteen (14) calendar days after receiving the Class Data, the
9 Administrator will send the Class Notice with a translation to all the Class Members identified in
10 the Class Data via first-class United States Postal Service mail. (*Id.* at § G(4)(c).)

11 **iv. Distribution of Funds**

12 The Gross Settlement Amount will be funded and distributed pursuant to the timeline and
13 manner set forth in the Settlement. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at §§ D(2), D(3).)
14 The uncashed settlement checks will be canceled and transmitted to the California Controller's
15 Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member. (*Id.* at §§ D(3)(a), D(3)(c).)

16 **v. Release of Claims**

17 Effective on the date when Defendant funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds
18 all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all the
19 Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their former and present representatives,
20 agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns release the Released Parties from
21 the Released Class Claims. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § E(2).)

22 Effective on the date when Defendant funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds
23 all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all the
24 Participating and Non-Participating Class Members, who are Aggrieved Employees, are deemed
25 to release, on behalf of themselves and their former and present representatives, agents, attorneys,
26 heirs, administrators, successors, assigns, and LWDA, the Released Parties from the Released
27 PAGA Claims. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § E(3).)

28 ///

1 Effective on the date when Defendant funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds
2 all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, in addition
3 to the Released Class Claims and Released PAGA Claims, Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's individual
4 capacity, fully and finally releases the Released Parties from the Plaintiff's Release. (Han Decl.,
5 *supra*, at ¶ 26; Exhibit 2, *supra*, at § E(1).) Plaintiff expressly waives and relinquishes the
6 provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the Civil Code. (*Ibid.*)

7 With regards to class action releases, “[A] court may release not only those claims alleged
8 in the complaint and before the court, but also claims which ‘could have been alleged by reason of
9 or in connection with any matter or fact set forth or referred to in’ the complaint.” (Amaro v.
10 Anaheim Arena Management, LLC (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 521, 537.) The scope of the releases in
11 this case is acceptable because it is limited to the scope of the allegations in the operative
12 complaints. Moreover, the released claims are “‘based on the identical factual predicate as that
13 underlying the claims in the settled class action.’” (*Ibid.*) In other words, the released claims do
14 not “‘go beyond the scope of the allegations in the operative complaint’” (*Ibid.*)

15 **d. Counsel for Both Parties Are Experienced in Similar Litigation**

16 The Parties' counsel are experienced in wage-and-hour employment law and class actions.
17 (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 2-7; Exhibit 1.) Class Counsel have prosecuted numerous cases on behalf
18 of employees for Labor Code violations and are experienced and qualified to evaluate the class
19 claims, settlement versus trial on a fully informed basis, and viability of the defenses. (*Ibid.*) This
20 experience instructed Class Counsel on the risks and uncertainties of further litigation and guided
21 their determination to endorse the Settlement Agreement.¹ (*Ibid.*)

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

26 ¹ The final factor mentioned in *Dunk* – the number of objectors – is not determinable until
27 the Class Notice has been mailed to the Class Members, and the Class Members have had an
28 opportunity to respond. This information will be provided to the Court in conjunction with the
Motion for Final Approval.

1 **IV. ARGUMENT**

2 **a. Class Action Settlements Are Subject to Court Review**

3 Rules of Court, rule 3.769 requires court approval for class action settlements.² “Before
4 final approval, the court must conduct an inquiry into the fairness of the proposed settlement.”
5 (Rules of Court, rule 3.769(g).) Rule 3.769 further requires a noticed motion for preliminary
6 approval of class settlements:

- 7 (a) A settlement or compromise of an entire class action, or a cause of action
8 in a class action, or as to a party, requires the approval of the court after
9 hearing.
10 ...
11 (b) Any party to a settlement agreement may serve and file a written notice of
12 motion for preliminary approval of the settlement. The settlement
13 agreement and proposed notice to class members must be filed with the
14 motion, and the proposed order must be lodged with the motion.

15 Courts have discretion to approve settlements that are fair, not collusive, and consider “all
16 the normal perils of litigation as well as the additional uncertainties inherent in complex class
17 actions.” (*In re Beef Industry Antitrust Litigation* (5th Cir. 1979) 607 F.2d 167, 179, cert. den. *sub*
18 *nom. Iowa Beef Processors, Inc. v. Meat Price Investigators Ass’n* (1981) 452 U.S. 905.)

19 **b. The Settlement Is a Reasonable Compromise of Claims**

20 An understanding of the amount in controversy is an important factor in whether the
21 settlement “of the class members’ claims is reasonable in light of the strengths and weaknesses of
22 the claims and the risks of the particular litigation.” (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168
23 Cal.App.4th 116, 129; see also *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186
24 Cal.App.4th 399, 409.) The most important factor in this regard is ““the strength of the case for
25 plaintiffs on the merits, balanced against the amount offered in settlement.”” (*Kullar*, at p. 130;
26 see also *Munoz*, at p. 409.)

27 ///

28 ² The California Supreme Court has authorized California’s trial courts to use Federal Rule
23 and cases applying it for guidance in considering class issues. (*Vasquez v. Superior Court*
(1971) 4 Cal.3d 800, 821; *Green v. Obledo* (1981) 29 Cal.3d 126, 145-146.) Where appropriate,
the Parties cite Federal Rule 23 and federal case law in addition to California law.

1 Kullar’s instructions to the court are not to “decide the merits of the case or to substitute
2 its evaluation of the most appropriate settlement for that of the attorneys.” (*Kullar v. Foot Locker*
3 *Retail, Inc.*, *supra*, 168 Cal.App.4th at p. 133.) Kullar does not require a statement of the maximum
4 amount the class could recover if plaintiff prevailed on all his claims, provided there is a record
5 that allows “‘an understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of
6 outcomes of the litigation.’” (*Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles*, *supra*, 186
7 Cal.App.4th at p. 409.) “[A]s the court does when it approves a settlement as in good faith under
8 Code of Civil Procedure § 877.6, the court must at least satisfy itself that the class settlement is
9 within the ‘ballpark’ of reasonableness.” (*Kullar*, at p. 133.)

10 **i. The Settlement Amount of \$400,000 Is Fair and Reasonable**

11 The Settlement Agreement was only possible following an investigation and evaluation of
12 the relevant policies and procedures, as well as the data produced, as referenced in Section III
13 above, permitting Class Counsel to engage in an analysis of liability and potential damages. (Han
14 Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 31.)

15 The claims are predicated on the alleged: (1) failure to pay overtime wages; (2) failure to
16 pay minimum wages; (3) failure to provide meal and rest breaks and pay applicable premium
17 wages; (4) failure to timely pay wages; (5) failure to issue compliant wage statements; (6) failure
18 to reimburse business expenses; (7) violation of PAGA; and (8) violation of Business &
19 Professions Code section 17200. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 32.) Defendant vehemently denies the
20 theories of liability. (*Id.* at ¶ 33.)

21 While Plaintiff believes that the case is suitable for certification, uncertainties with respect
22 to certification are always present. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 34.) As the California Supreme Court
23 ruled in *Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319, class certification is
24 always a matter of the trial court’s sound discretion. (*Ibid.*) Decisions following *Sav-On Drug*
25 *Stores, Inc.* have reached different conclusions regarding certification of wage-and-hour claims.³
26 (*Ibid.*) Thus, the calculations for potential damages were discounted.

27
28 ³ (See e.g. *Harris v. Superior Court* (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 164 [reversing decertification
of class claiming misclassification and ordering summary adjudication in favor of employees],

1 **ii. The PAGA Penalties of \$40,000 Are Reasonable**

2 The provisions of the Labor Code potentially triggering the PAGA penalties include Labor
3 Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 229, 246(l), 510, 512(a), 558,
4 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 43.) Defendant
5 asserted that, regardless of the results of the underlying causes of action, the PAGA penalties are
6 not mandatory but permissive and discretionary. (*Ibid.*) Defendant also maintained that it had a
7 strong argument that it would be unjust to award the maximum PAGA penalties given the state of
8 the law regarding the PAGA penalties. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 43; *Thurman v. Bayshore Transit*
9 *Mgmt.* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 1112 [reducing penalties by 30% under this authority].) When
10 limited to the initial violation, the PAGA penalties could be limited to about **\$29,000** (290
11 employees x \$100 penalty for initial violation) on the low end and around **\$203,000** (290
12 employees x \$100 penalty for initial violation x 7 theories of recovery) on the high end. (Han
13 Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 44-46.)

14 Plaintiff recognized that the risk that any PAGA award could be reduced. (Han Decl.,
15 *supra*, at ¶ 47.) Many of the causes of action brought were also duplicative of the statutory claims.
16 (*Ibid.*) Allocating \$40,000 to PAGA penalties was reasonable given that Defendant is also paying
17 an additional \$360,000 in the class settlement. (*Ibid.*) When the PAGA penalties are negotiated in
18 good faith and “there is no indication that [the] amount was the result of self-interest at the expense
19 of other Class Members,” such amounts are reasonable.⁴ (*Ibid.*)

20 Considering the defenses, supporting evidence, and position that the case is not suitable for
21 class treatment, the Settlement Agreement is reasonable, adequate, and fair.

22 _____
23 review granted Nov. 28, 2007, (2007) 171 P.3d 545 [not cited as precedent, but rather for
24 illustrative purposes only]; *Walsh v. IKON Office Solutions, Inc.* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1440
25 [affirming decertification of class claiming misclassification]; *Aguiar v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2006)
26 144 Cal.App.4th 121 [reversing denial of certification]; *Dunbar v. Albertson’s Inc.* (2006) 141
27 Cal.App.4th 1422 [affirming denial of certification].)

28 ⁴ (*Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.* (N.D.Cal. Apr. 3, 2009, No. CV-08-0844 EDL) 2009
U.S.Dist.LEXIS 33900, at *24; see e.g. *Nordstrom Com. Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576, 579,
“[T]rial court did not abuse its discretion in approving a settlement which does not allocate any
damages to the PAGA claims”.)

c. Discount Analysis Justifies the Settlement

Excluding the civil penalties, which could be completely discretionary, the total estimated potential exposure, assuming certification and prevailing at trial, would be about **\$3,501,067.49** on the low end and around **\$3,760,207.49** on the high end. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 48.)

Category	Potential Exposure	Certification Risk	Merits Risk	Realistic Exposure
Rest Break Premiums	\$439,284.26	75%	65%	\$38,437.37
Meal Break Premiums	\$102,594.76	65%	65%	\$12,567.86
Overtime/Minimum Wage: Off-the-Clock Work	\$518,280 to \$777,420	65%	55%	\$81,629.10 to \$122,443.65
Regular Rate	\$54,066.87	35%	55%	\$15,814.56
Unreimbursed Business Expenses	\$205,540	25%	75%	\$38,538.75
Wage Statement Penalty	\$623,500	65%	65%	\$76,378.75
Waiting Time Penalty	\$1,557,801.60	65%	65%	\$190,830.70
MAXIMUM TOTAL EXPOSURE	\$3,501,067.49 to \$3,760,207.49⁵			\$454,197.09 to \$495,011.64⁶

The realistic recovery for this case is about **\$454,197.09** on the low end and **\$495,011.64** on the high end. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 56.) The Gross Settlement Amount is about ten percent (10.64%) of the maximum potential exposure and around eighty-one percent (80.81%) of the maximum realistic exposure at trial, which is a reasonable settlement. (*Ibid.*)

The only question at preliminary approval is whether the settlement is within the range of possible approval. (*In re General Motors Corp. Engine Interchange Litigation* (7th Cir. 1979) 594 F.2d 1106, 1124; *Acosta v. TransUnion, LLC* (C.D. Cal. 2007) 240 F.R.D. 564, 575.) “The fact that a proposed settlement may only amount to a fraction of the potential recovery does not, in and of itself, mean that the proposed settlement is grossly inadequate and should be disapproved.” (*Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.* (2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448, 455; see also *Linney v. Cellular Alaska P’ship* (9th Cir. 1998) 151 F.3d 1234, 1242, “[I]t is the very uncertainty of outcome in litigation and avoidance of wasteful and expensive litigation that induce consensual settlements. The

⁵ (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶¶ 35-42.)

⁶ (*Id.* at ¶¶ 49-55.)

1 proposed settlement is not to be judged against a hypothetical or speculative measure of what
2 might have been achieved by the negotiators”). This settlement is in line with the realistic exposure
3 if Plaintiff had prevailed at trial and provides a reasonable recovery for the Class Members.

4 **d. Conditional Certification of the Class Is Appropriate**

5 Code of Civil Procedure section 382 “authorizes class actions ‘when the question is one of
6 a common or general interest, of many persons, or when the parties are numerous, and it is
7 impracticable to bring them all before the court.’” (*Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court*,
8 *supra*, 34 Cal.4th at p. 326.) California courts certify class actions if plaintiff identifies “both [1]
9 an ascertainable class and [2] a well-defined community of interest among class members.” (*Ibid.*)

10 The Class is ascertainable and numerous as to make it impracticable to join all the Class
11 Members, and there are common questions of law and fact that predominate over any questions
12 affecting the individual Class Member. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 57.) Plaintiff contends that
13 Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of the Class Members, and Class Counsel will fairly and
14 adequately protect the interests of the Class Members. (*Ibid.*) Plaintiff asserts that the prosecution
15 of separate actions by the individual Class Members would create the risk of inconsistent or
16 varying adjudications. (*Ibid.*)

17 **i. The Proposed Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous**

18 “Ascertainability is required in order to give notice to putative class members as to whom
19 the judgment in the action will be res judicata.” (*Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp.* (2001)
20 89 Cal.App.4th 908, 914.) “A class is ascertainable if it identifies a group of unnamed plaintiffs
21 by describing a set of common characteristics sufficient to allow a member of that group to identify
22 himself or herself as having a right to recover based on the description.” (*Bartold v. Glendale*
23 *Federal Bank* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 816, 828.) The proposed class must also be sufficiently
24 numerous. (*Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429, 435.)

25 This case involves approximately three hundred seventy-six (376) Class Members,
26 meaning that the Class is sufficiently numerous. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 58; *Ghazaryan v. Diva*
27 *Limousine, Ltd.* (2008) 169 Cal.App.4th 1524, 1531, n.5 [finding a proposed class of “as many as
28 190 current and former employees” is sufficiently numerous].)

1 **ii. Class Members Share a Well-defined Community of Interest**

2 The community of interest requirement “embodies three factors: (1) predominant common
3 questions of law or fact; (2) class representatives with claims or defenses typical of the class; and
4 (3) class representatives who can adequately represent the class.” (*Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v.*
5 *Superior Court, supra*, 34 Cal.4th at p. 326.) “[T]he community of interest requirement for
6 certification *does not mandate that class members have uniform or identical claims.*” (*Capitol*
7 *People First v. Department of Developmental Services* (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 676, 692 (emphasis
8 in original).) The courts focus on the defendant’s internal policies and “pattern and practice . . . in
9 order to assess whether that common behavior toward similarly situated plaintiffs renders class
10 certification appropriate.” (*Ibid.*) The application of each of these factors is discussed below.

11 **1. Common Issues Predominate**

12 The “common issues” requirement “involves analysis of whether the proponent’s ‘theory
13 of recovery’ is likely to prove compatible with class treatment.” (*Capitol People First v.*
14 *Department of Developmental Services, supra*, 155 Cal.App.4th at p. 690.) In other words, courts
15 determine whether the elements necessary to establish liability are susceptible to common proof,
16 even if the class members must individually prove their damages. (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
17 *Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1024). These types of claims are regularly granted class
18 certification when the plaintiff can present evidence of common policies. (See e.g. *Jones v. JGC*
19 *Dallas LLC* (N.D.Tex. Nov. 29, 2012, Civil Action No. 3:11-CV-2743-O) 2012 U.S.Dist.LEXIS
20 185042 [certified collective action involving 190 dancers]; *Espinoza v. Galardi South Enters.*
21 (S.D.Fla. Jan. 11, 2016, No. 14-21244-CIV-GOODMAN) 2016 U.S.Dist.LEXIS 2904 [court
22 certified class of dancers on state law claims].)

23 Plaintiff asserts that common issues of fact and law predominate as to each of the claims
24 alleged. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 59.) Plaintiff contends that all the Class Members were subject to
25 the same or similar employment practices, policies, and procedures described above. (*Ibid.*)

26 **2. Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical of the Class Claims**

27 Typical claims rely on legal theories and facts that are substantially like those of other class
28 members. (*Classen v. Weller* (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 27, 46.)

1 Plaintiff is a former employee of Defendant and alleges that Plaintiff and the Class Members
2 were employed by the same company and injured by the common policies and practices related to
3 the claims described above. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 60.) Plaintiff seeks relief for these claims and
4 derivative claims on behalf of the Class. (*Ibid.*) Thus, the claims arise from the same employment
5 practices and are based on the same legal theories applicable to the Class. (*Ibid.*)

6 **3. Plaintiff Is Adequate to Represent the Class**

7 Plaintiff has proven to be an adequate class representative. (Han Decl., *supra*, at ¶ 61.)
8 Plaintiff conducted herself diligently and responsibly in representing the Class Members,
9 understands the fiduciary obligations, and actively participated in the prosecution of this case.
10 (*Ibid.*) Plaintiff spent time in meetings and conferences with Class Counsel to provide them with
11 a complete understanding of the work experience and environment. (*Ibid.*) Plaintiff has no interest
12 adverse to the interests of the other Class Members. (*Ibid.*)

13 **4. Class Action Is Superior for the Fair and Efficient Adjudication** 14 **of this Controversy**

15 A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of
16 this controversy. Plaintiff contends that the joinder of all the Class Members is impractical and
17 that class treatment will permit many similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims
18 for settlement purposes simultaneously in a single forum without the duplication of effort and
19 expense that numerous individual actions would necessitate. Because some Class Members are
20 also current employees, Plaintiff believes that the fear of retaliation further supports the superiority
21 of class-wide relief as this fear often discourages current employees from seeking legal redress.

22 **e. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate**

23 In deciding whether to approve a proposed class action settlement under Code of Civil
24 Procedure section 382, the Court must find a proposed settlement is “fair, adequate and
25 reasonable.” (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801.) A proposed class action
26 settlement is presumed fair under the following circumstances: (1) parties reached settlement after
27 arm’s-length negotiations; (2) investigation and discovery were sufficient to allow counsel and the
28 court to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) percentage of

objectors is small. (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, *supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at p. 1802.) All these elements are present herein.

f. Notice to the Class Complies with Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(f)

Rules of Court, rule 3.769(f), provides:

If the court has certified the action as a class action, notice of the final approval hearing must be given to class members in the manner specified by the court. The notice must contain an explanation of the proposed settlement and procedures for class members to follow in filing written objections to it and in arranging to appear at the settlement hearing and state any objections to the proposed settlement.


The Class Notice meets all these requirements. The Class Notice advises the Class Members of their right to participate in the Settlement, how and when to object to or request exclusion from the Settlement, and date, time, and location of the Final Approval Hearing.

V. CONCLUSION

Plaintiff submits the Settlement is in the best interests of the Class. Under the applicable class action criteria and guidelines, the Settlement should be preliminarily approved, Class should be conditionally certified for settlement purposes, and Class Notice should be approved.

Dated: April 13, 2026

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: 
Douglas Han
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**PROOF OF SERVICE
1013A(3) CCP**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101, Pasadena, CA 91103 and my electronic service address is jtorrez@justicelawcorp.com

On April 13, 2026, I served the foregoing document described as

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION, APPROVAL OF CLASS NOTICE, SETTING OF FINAL APPROVAL HEARING DATE; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF

for the following case: **Leonora Strauss v. Hanalei Holdings, LLC dba Bridgeview Post Acute**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA Case No.: CM- 1152140-26**
Court Case No.: 37-2024-00023715-CU-OE-CTL
San Diego County Superior Court

on interested parties in this action by electronically submitting as follows:

State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Pursuant to California Senate Bill No. 836, I caused the documents described above to be electronically submitted by and through the procedure stated on the website of the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

[X] STATE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on April 13, 2026, at Pasadena, California.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Torres", is written over a horizontal line.