

Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827)
Ryan Slinger (SBN 351297)
Harris Koepenick (SBN 364423)
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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

BRIANA HOLMES, SHERRI
CUTHBERTSON, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated and on behalf of other
aggrieved employees pursuant to the
California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HAMPTON TEDDER ELECTRIC
COMPANY, a California corporation; and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVRS2600142

Honorable Tony Raphael
Department R14

CLASS ACTION

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

Date: October 15, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Department: R14

Complaint Filed: January 7, 2026
FAC Filed: July 1, 2026
Trial Date: None Set

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

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on October 15, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard before the Honorable Tony Raphael in Department R14 of the Superior Court of California for the County of San Bernardino, located at 8303 Haven Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730, Plaintiffs Briana Holmes (“Plaintiff Holmes”) and Sherri Cuthbertson (“Plaintiff Cuthbertson”) (together, “Plaintiffs” or “Class Representatives”) will, and hereby do, move for an order:

- Granting preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement described herein and as set forth in the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”), attached as “**EXHIBIT 3**” to the Declaration of Ryan Slinger in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement;
- Certifying the proposed Class for settlement purposes;
- Appointing Plaintiffs Briana Holmes and Sherri Cuthbertson as Class Representatives;
- Appointing Arby Aiwarzian, Ryan Slinger, and Harris Koepenick of Lawyers *for* Justice, PC as Class Counsel;
- Approving the proposed Notice of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release (“Class Notice”), attached as “**EXHIBIT A**” to the [Proposed] Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, and directing the mailing thereof in accordance with the Settlement Agreement;
- Approving Phoenix Settlement Administrators as the Settlement Administrator; and
- Scheduling a hearing to consider final approval of the Settlement.

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

1 This motion is based upon the following memorandum of points and authorities, the
2 Settlement Agreement, the Declarations of Proposed Class Counsel (Ryan Slinger) and Proposed
3 Class Representatives (Briana Holmes and Sherri Cuthbertson) in support thereof, as well as the
4 pleadings and other records on file with the Court in this matter, and such evidence and oral
5 argument as may be presented at the hearing on this motion.

6 Dated: August 28, 2026

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

7
8 By: /s/ Ryan Slinger
9 Ryan Slinger
10 Harris Koepenick
11 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	SUMMARY OF MOTION.....	1
II.	PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
III.	SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS	3
IV.	LEGAL STANDARD FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS.....	5
V.	THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT	6
A.	The Settlement Resulted from Arm’s-Length Negotiations Based Upon Extensive Investigation and Discovery.	7
B.	The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.....	8
C.	The Settlement Is of Significant Value.....	9
VI.	CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE	10
A.	The Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous.	10
B.	The Class Share a Well-Defined Community of Interest.	11
VII.	APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND ALLOCATION FOR CLASS COUNSEL’S FEES AND CLASS COUNSEL’S COSTS	12
VIII.	THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS ADEQUATE	14
IX.	APPOINTMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR	15
XI.	CLASS REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT AWARD	16
XII.	CONCLUSION	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135	7
<i>Bartold v. Glendale Federal Bank</i> (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 816.....	10
<i>Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.</i> (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195 .	14
<i>Capitol People First v. Department of Developmental Services</i> (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 676....	11
<i>Cartt v. Superior Court</i> (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 960.....	14, 15
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43	14
<i>City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corporation</i> (2d Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 448.....	6
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794	5, 6, 7
<i>Estrada v. Dr. Pepper/Seven-Up</i> , Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 262247 (May 2005)	14
<i>Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp.</i> (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 908.....	10
<i>In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc., Securities Litigation</i> (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 127 F.Supp.2d 418	9
<i>In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litigation</i> (D. D.C. 1981) 526 F.Supp. 494.....	14
<i>Ketchum v. Moses</i> (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122	13
<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i> (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116.....	9
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.</i> (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480	13
<i>Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc.</i> (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19	13
<i>Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429	10
<i>Mendoza v. United States</i> (9th Cir. 1980) 623 F.2d 1338.....	14
<i>Moore v. IKEA</i> , Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC 263646 (Sept. 2006)	14
<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission of City and County of San Francisco</i> (9th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 615	6
<i>Rose v. City of Hayward</i> (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 926	10
<i>Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319.....	10, 11
<i>Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i> (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294.....	16
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224.....	6, 7

Statutes

Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781	14
Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781(f)	5

Other Authorities

Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 11.25 (4th Ed.)	6
Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 11.47 (4th Ed.)	9
Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 14.03 (4th Ed.)	14
Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 8.21 (4th Ed.)	15
Conte & Newberg, Newberg on Class Actions § 8.29 (4th Ed.)	15
<i>Manual for Complex Litigation</i> § 21.311 (4th ed. 2007)	15
<i>Manual for Complex Litigation</i> § 21.312 (4th ed. 2007)	15

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)	15
Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)	21

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. SUMMARY OF MOTION

Plaintiffs Briana Holmes and Sherri Cuthbertson (“Plaintiffs” or “Class Representatives”) seek preliminary approval of the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”) entered into by and between Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and other aggrieved employees, on the one hand, and Defendant Hampton Tedder Electric Company (“Defendant” or “HTEC”), on the other hand. Subject to approval by the Court, Plaintiffs and Defendant (collectively, the “Parties”) have agreed to settle the lawsuits for a Gross Settlement Amount of \$450,000.00.¹

Plaintiffs also seek to provisionally certify the following Class for settlement purposes, which Defendant does not oppose:

All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for HTEC within the State of California at any time during the Class Period (“Class” or “Class Members”).²

Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion from the Class Settlement (“Settlement Class Member”) will receive a *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount (“Individual Settlement Share”). The net payment of each Settlement Class Member’s Individual Settlement Share (“Individual Settlement Payment”) will be distributed to Settlement Class Members on a *pro rata* basis based on the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period (“Workweeks”).³

¹ Settlement Agreement, attached as “EXHIBIT 3” to Declaration of Ryan Slinger (“Slinger Decl.”), ¶ 9.s. Should the Workweeks during the Class Period increase beyond 10% (i.e., exceeds 86,385 Workweeks), then either (a) HTEC shall increase the Gross Settlement Amount on a pro-rata basis equal to the percentage increase in the number of Workweeks above 10% (e.g., if the number of Workweeks increases by 11%, then the Gross Settlement Amount will increase by 1%), or (b) the Class Period and PAGA Period shall end on the last day on which the Workweeks do not exceed 86,385 (“Alternate End Date”). *See id.*, ¶ 39.

² *Id.*, ¶ 9.e. “Class Period” is defined as the period from November 18, 2021 through the date of (a) preliminary approval or (b) the Alternate End Date, whichever is sooner. *See id.*, ¶ 9.g.

³ *Id.*, ¶¶ 9.u, 9.v, 9.pp, & 9.qq.

1 The Settlement, upon final approval by the Court and funding of the Gross Settlement
2 Amount, will operate to resolve the Released Class Claims of Plaintiffs and Settlement Class
3 Members and the Released PAGA Claims of the State of California.⁴

4 **II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

5 Defendant is a family-owned and operated electrical company that is a major contractor
6 of Southern California Edison. Defendant provides high voltage design, construction,
7 maintenance and testing for overhead, underground, and underwater high voltage systems.
8 Plaintiff Holmes is a former employee of Defendant. Plaintiff Cuthbertson is still currently
9 employed by Defendant.

10 On January 7, 2026, Plaintiff Holmes filed a Class Action Complaint for Damages in the
11 Superior Court for the County of San Bernardino, thereby commencing the above-captioned
12 lawsuit.⁵

13 On January 8, 2026, Plaintiff Holmes provided written notice by electronic upload to the
14 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendant of the specific
15 provisions of the California Labor Code that were alleged to be violated (“Holmes PAGA
16 Notice”).⁶

17 On March 12, 2026, Plaintiff Cuthbertson provided written notice by electronic upload to
18 the LWDA and by certified mail Defendant of the specific provisions of the California Labor
19 Code that were alleged to be violated (“Cuthbertson PAGA Notice”).⁷

20 On July 1, 2026, Plaintiff Holmes filed a First Amended Class Action Complaint for
21 Damages and Enforcement Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698, *Et*
22 *Seq.* (“Operative Complaint”), adding a PAGA cause of action, a violation of Labor Code §
23 227.3 failure to pay vacation claim, and Plaintiff Cuthbertson as a named plaintiff.⁸

24
25
26 ⁴ *Id.*, at ¶¶ 33.a and 34. See *id.* at ¶ 9.ii for the full scope of the “Released Class Claims” *id.* at ¶ 9.jj for the full scope
of the “Released PAGA Claims,” and *id.* at ¶ 9.kk for the definition of the “Released Parties.”

27 ⁵ Slinger Decl. ¶ 2.

28 ⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 4, Exh. 1.

⁷ *Id.*, ¶ 4, Exh. 1.

⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 5.

On July 10, 2026, Defendant filed its Answer to the Operative Complaint.⁹

Plaintiffs' core allegations are that Defendant has violated California wage and hour law, including but not limited to laws set forth in the California Labor Code, by engaging in a uniform practice and procedure, with respect to Plaintiffs, Class Members, and PAGA Members of, *inter alia*, failing to pay all overtime and minimum wages, at all or at the correct rate of pay, failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium pay, failing to timely pay wages (including vacation) during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide compliant wage statements, failing to maintain requisite payroll records, and failing to reimburse necessary business expenses, and thereby engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*, and conduct giving rise to civil penalties recoverable under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*). Plaintiffs contend that they, and the Class Members, are entitled to, *inter alia*, unpaid wages, penalties (including and not limited to, penalties pursuant to PAGA), and attorneys' fees and costs.¹⁰

The Parties have actively litigated the Action since it was commenced on January 7, 2026. On February 19, 2026, the Parties participated in arm's-length and informed negotiations with Mediator Hon. Raul A. Ramirez (Ret.) ("Mediator"), a respected mediator of complex wage and hour actions.¹¹ With the aid of the mediator's evaluations and presentation of a mediator's proposal, the Parties reached the Settlement described herein to resolve the Action in its entirety.¹²

III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS

Under the terms of the Settlement, Defendant will pay a Gross Settlement Amount of \$450,000.00 to resolve the Action.¹³ Subject to approval by the Court, the Net Settlement Amount will be calculated by deducting the following amounts from the Gross Settlement

⁹ *Id.*, ¶ 3.

¹⁰ Slinger Decl., ¶ 28.

¹¹ *Id.*, ¶ 1.29.

¹² *Id.*, ¶ 1.29.

¹³ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 9.s.

1 Amount: (1) attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 1/3 of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e.,
2 \$150,000.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount remains \$450,000.00) ("Class Counsel's Fees") and
3 litigation costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed \$20,000.00 ("Class Counsel's Costs") to
4 Class Counsel; (2) Settlement Administration Costs, which are currently estimated not to exceed
5 \$14,500.00 to the Settlement Administrator ("Settlement Administration Costs"); (3) PAGA
6 Allotment of \$25,000.00 ("PAGA Allotment"); and (4) payments in the amount of up to
7 \$7,500.00 to each Plaintiff (\$15,000.00 total) ("Enhancement Awards").¹⁴ The Parties have
8 agreed to retain Phoenix Settlement Administrators ("Phoenix" or "Settlement Administrator") to
9 handle the notice and settlement administration process.¹⁵

10 The Parties have agreed that the Settlement Administrator will determine each Settlement
11 Class Member's share of the available Net Settlement Amount ("Individual Settlement Share"),
12 in accordance with the Settlement Agreement on a *pro rata* per Workweeks basis, which will be
13 adjusted after Final Approval to reflect the total Workweeks worked by Settlement Class
14 Member.¹⁶ The Parties have agreed that the Settlement Administrator will determine each PAGA
15 Member's *pro rata* share of the 35% share of the PAGA Allotment, in accordance with the
16 Settlement Agreement on a *pro rata* per PAGA Pay Periods basis.¹⁷

17 The Parties agree, for purposes of this Settlement, that Individual Settlement Shares will
18 be allocated 20% to wages subject to withholdings and 80% to penalties, interest, and non-wage
19 damages.¹⁸ The Settlement Administrator will withhold the employee's share of taxes and
20 withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Share, and issue
21 checks to Settlement Class Members for their Individual Settlement Payments. Each Individual
22 PAGA Payment will be allocated as 100% penalties and will not be subjected to withholdings.¹⁹

23
24
25
26 ¹⁴ Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 9.s & 13-16.

27 ¹⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 9.nn.

28 ¹⁶ *Id.*, ¶¶ 9.v & 17.

¹⁷ *Id.*, ¶¶ 9.t & 18.

¹⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 28.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Defendant will provide the funds for any employer-side taxes related to the Individual Settlement Shares.²⁰

Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment checks will be negotiable for 180 calendar days from the date of their issuance, and thereafter, shall be canceled.²¹ Thereafter, funds from uncashed Individual Settlement Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment checks shall be transmitted to Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino.²²

Any Class Member may request to be excluded from the Class Settlement by mailing a Request for Exclusion postmarked on or before the date that is 45 calendar days from the date of the initial mailing of the Class Notice by the Settlement Administrator (“Response Deadline”).²³ PAGA Members shall be bound to the PAGA Settlement irrespective of whether they exercise their option to opt out of the Class Settlement.²⁴

Only Class Members who have not submitted a Request for Exclusion (i.e., Settlement Class Member) may object to the Class Settlement by submitting an Objection, to the Settlement Administrator prior to the Response Deadline or by presenting their objection orally at the Final Approval hearing, regardless of whether they submitted a written objection.²⁵

In order to dispute the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods attributable to an individual Class Member and/or PAGA Member, that Class Member and/or PAGA Member must submit a written letter to the Settlement Administrator, and include copies of any supporting evidence they may have.²⁶

IV. LEGAL STANDARD FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS

The settlement of a class action requires approval by the court. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1800; Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1781(f). Courts review class action

²⁰ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 12.

²¹ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 23.c.

²² Ibid.

²³ *Id.*, ¶¶ 9.mm & 24.

²⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 24.

²⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 25.

²⁶ *Id.*, ¶¶ 9.rr & 22.c.

1 settlements in a two-step process: (1) an earlier conditional review by the court; and (2) a later
2 detailed review after the period during which notice is distributed to class members for their
3 comments or objections. Conte & Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* § 11.24 (4th Ed. 2002).
4 Preliminary approval of a settlement does not require a court to make a final determination that
5 the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Rather, that decision is made only at the final
6 approval stage. Cal. R. Ct. 3.769(g).

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

15 **V. THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT**

16 The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether a proposed settlement is fair
17 under the circumstances of the case. *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1800. To make this fairness
18 determination, courts must consider several relevant factors, including “the strength of the
19 Plaintiff’s case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of
20 maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of
21 discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and view of counsel, the
22 presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed
23 settlement.” *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801. “The list of factors is not exclusive and the court is
24 free to engage in a balancing and weighing of the factors depending on the circumstances of each
25 case.” *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245. Furthermore, courts
26 give “proper deference to the private consensual decision of the parties.” *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at
27 1027 (citation omitted).

28 The proponent of the settlement has the burden to show that it is fair and reasonable.

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

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

8 The Parties have actively litigated the Action since it commenced on January 7, 2026.
9 Both sides investigated the veracity, strength, and scope of the claims throughout the case, and
10 Class Counsel was actively preparing the matter for class certification and trial.²⁷

11 Class Counsel conducted significant investigation and informal discovery regarding the
12 facts of the case, including and not limited to, the exchange, review, and analysis of a volume of
13 documents and data from Plaintiffs, Defendant, and other sources.²⁸ The volume of data and
14 documents that Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed included and was not limited to: Plaintiffs’
15 employment records, Class Members’ time data and pay records, Defendant’s collective
16 bargaining agreements, arbitration agreements, Employee Handbook, internal memoranda, job
17 descriptions, company policy acknowledgements, forms, procedures, and policies, among other
18 information and documents.²⁹ Class Counsel had the opportunity to interview Plaintiffs to gather
19 facts and to identify potential witnesses.³⁰ In addition, Class Counsel has extensive experience in
20 California wage-and-hour class actions.³¹

21 The Parties engaged in extensive settlement negotiations and participated in a full-day
22 mediation conducted by Hon. Raul A. Ramirez (Ret.), a well-respected mediator experienced in
23 mediating complex labor and employment matters.³² Prior to and during the mediation and
24 settlement negotiations, the Parties exchanged extensive information and engaged in discussions

25 ²⁷ Slinger Decl., ¶¶ 12-14.

26 ²⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 13.

27 ²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

28 ³² *Id.*, ¶ 12.

1 regarding their evaluations of the case and various aspects of the case, including but not limited
2 to, the risks and delays of further litigation, including the risks of proceeding with class
3 certification and/or representative adjudication, the law relating to off-the-clock theory,
4 arbitration agreements, regular rate, meal and rest periods, PAGA representative claims, and
5 wage-and-hour enforcement; the evidence produced and analyzed; and the possibility of
6 appeals.³³ During all settlement discussions, the Parties conducted their negotiations at arm's
7 length in an adversarial position.³⁴ Arriving at a settlement that was acceptable to both Parties
8 was not easy. Both sides felt strongly about their ability to prevail at certification and at trial.³⁵
9 After conducting investigations, informal discovery, extensive settlement negotiations, and with
10 the aid of the mediator's evaluation, the Parties have agreed that the matter is well-suited for
11 settlement given the legal issues relating to Plaintiffs' principal claims, as well as the costs and
12 risks to both sides that would attend further litigation.³⁶

13 **B. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.**

14 The Settlement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the matter.³⁷ The
15 Settlement was calculated using the information and data uncovered during litigation, case
16 investigation, and the informal exchange of information.³⁸ The Settlement takes into account the
17 potential risks and rewards inherent in any case and, in particular, in the matter at issue.³⁹
18 Moreover, considering all of the facts and circumstances of the lawsuit, the Settlement represents
19 a fair, reasonable, and adequate recovery for the Class.⁴⁰

20 Assuming that the Class Counsel's Fees, Class Counsel's Costs, Enhancement Awards,
21 PAGA Allotment, and Settlement Administration Costs are approved by the Court and paid in
22 the full amounts provided for by the Settlement, the Settlement provides for a Net Settlement
23

24 ³³ Slinger Decl., ¶ 12.

25 ³⁴ Ibid.

26 ³⁵ *Id.*, ¶¶ 12, 17-19.

27 ³⁶ Ibid.

28 ³⁷ *Id.*, ¶¶ 12, 14, 15 & 23.

³⁸ *Id.*, ¶¶ 12-14.

³⁹ Slinger Decl., ¶¶ 17-19.

⁴⁰ *Id.*, ¶¶ 12, 14, & 23.

Amount that is currently estimated to be \$225,500.00.⁴¹ Additionally, 35% of the PAGA Allotment (i.e., PAGA Member Amount), which is \$8,750.00 out of \$25,000.00, will be distributed to the PAGA Members. The entire Net Settlement Amount will be fully paid out to the Settlement Class Member, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

The amount of each Settlement Class Member's Individual Settlement Share and each PAGA Member's Individual PAGA Payment will be calculated based on their Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods during the Class Period and PAGA Period, respectively.⁴² "An allocation formula need only have a reasonable, rational basis [to warrant approval], particularly if recommended by experienced and competent class counsel." *In re American Bank Note Holographics, Inc., Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 127 F.Supp.2d 418, 429-30. Here, the allocation is reasonably related to the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods actually worked for Defendant during the relevant period and should be approved.

In light of the foregoing considerations, Class Counsel believes that the Settlement as a whole is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interest of the Class Members, PAGA Members, and the State of California.⁴³ Although the recommendations of Class Counsel are not conclusive, the Court can properly take the recommendations into account, particularly if Class Counsel appear to be competent, and have experience with this type of litigation, and investigation have been completed, as is the case here. *Newberg*, §11.47. Accordingly, the Court should grant preliminary approval of the Settlement.

C. The Settlement Is of Significant Value.

Pursuant to *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, the Parties conducted extensive informal discovery and exchanged a volume of documents, data, and information prior to mediation.⁴⁴ The information that Class Counsel obtained from Plaintiffs, Defendant, and other sources allowed Class Counsel to develop valuation models in order to evaluate the potential value and merit of the claims, and perform a complete evaluation of

⁴¹ Slinger Decl., ¶ 15.

⁴² Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 17 & 18.

⁴³ Slinger Decl., ¶¶ 12, 14, & 23.

⁴⁴ *Id.*, ¶¶ 12-14 & 19.

Defendant's defenses thereto.⁴⁵ As outlined in the Declaration of Ryan Slinger, Class Counsel performed an extensive analysis of each and every claim pursuant to *Kullar* prior to entering into the Settlement.⁴⁶

VI. CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE

The requisites for establishing class certification are met, and the Parties have stipulated to conditional certification of the Class for settlement purposes only.⁴⁷ California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 “authorizes class actions when the question is one of a common or general interest, of many persons, or when the Parties are numerous, and it is impracticable to bring them all before the court.” *Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319, 326. California courts certify class actions where the Plaintiff identifies “both [1] an ascertainable class and [2] a well-defined community of interest among class members.” *Id.*

A. The Class Is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous.

“Ascertainability is required in order to give notice to putative class members as to whom the judgment in the action will be *res judicata*.” *Hicks v. Kaufman & Broad Home Corp.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 908, 914. “A class is ascertainable if it identifies a group of unnamed Plaintiffs by describing a set of common characteristics sufficient to allow a member of that group to identify himself or herself as having a right to recover based on the description.” *Bartold v. Glendale Federal Bank* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 816, 828. The proposed Class must also be sufficiently numerous. *Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429, 435; *see also Rose v. City of Hayward* (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 926, 934-35 (indicating that a class of 30 to 40 individuals satisfies the numerosity requirement as joinder is not practical at that point). The Class here is estimated to be approximately 1,385 individuals, as of January 25, 2026, which is sufficiently numerous.⁴⁸ Further, all Class Members can and will be identified by Defendant to the Settlement Administrator through a review of Defendant's employment records regarding

⁴⁵ Slinger Decl., ¶ 19.

⁴⁶ *Id.*, ¶¶ 12-14 & 17-19.

⁴⁷ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 10.

⁴⁸ Slinger Decl., ¶ 17.

hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant within the State of California during the Class Period. As such, the Class is ascertainable and sufficiently numerous.

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

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

Here, common issues of law and fact predominate as to each of the claims alleged and asserted in the Action. Based on the documents and information obtained through informal discovery and exchange of information in the case, Plaintiffs contend that Class Members performed similar job duties and were subject to uniform operations and employment policies, practices, and procedures during the Class Period, including payroll and recordkeeping practices.⁴⁹ As a result, Plaintiffs claim that all of the Class Members were uniformly not paid all compensation due to them from Defendant during the time period at issue. Plaintiffs maintain that the outcome of this litigation would be determined by Defendant's alleged uniform operations and employment policies and procedures that applied across its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant within the State of California during the Class Period.

As members of the Class who were subject to these same policies, practices, and procedures, Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the Class. Moreover, Plaintiffs have no interests adverse to the Class. Plaintiffs have taken steps to initiate and maintain this action and to ensure

⁴⁹ Slinger Decl., ¶ 17.

that it comes to a fair and reasonable resolution.⁵⁰ Importantly, Plaintiffs have retained a law firm well-versed in wage and hour class actions, which has at all times represented the best interests of Plaintiffs and the Class.⁵¹

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

VII. APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND ALLOCATION FOR CLASS COUNSEL’S FEES AND CLASS COUNSEL’S COSTS

Class Counsel has litigated the matter since January 7, 2026 and was actively preparing the matter for class certification and trial.⁵² The ongoing work has been extensive, demanding, and ultimately successful in achieving a substantial settlement resolution. Class Counsel reviewed a volume of documents and data⁵³ and also interviewed and obtained information from Plaintiffs and other percipient witnesses, researched applicable law, undertook damages/valuation calculations, and met and conferred with Defendant’s counsel regarding the pleadings and the production of documents and data prior to mediation.⁵⁴ Counsel for the Parties also undertook extensive settlement discussions, which included participating in mediation.⁵⁵

Class Counsel is well-experienced in wage-and-hour class action litigation and used that experience to obtain a great result for the Class.⁵⁶

The Settlement establishes a Gross Settlement Amount of \$450,000.00, and provides for Class Counsel to apply to the Court consisting of attorneys’ fees in an amount not to exceed 1/3 of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., \$150,000.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount remains \$450,000.00) and reimbursement of actual costs and expenses in an amount up to \$20,000.00.⁵⁷ The attorneys’ fees provided for by the Settlement are commensurate with: (1) the risk that Class

⁵⁰ Declaration of Briana Holmes in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Holmes Decl.”), ¶ 4; Declaration of Sherri Cuthbertson in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Cuthbertson Decl.”), ¶ 4.

⁵¹ Slinger Decl., ¶¶ 23-24.

⁵² *Id.*, ¶¶ 12-14.

⁵³ *Id.*, ¶ 13.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Id.*, ¶ 12.

⁵⁶ *Id.*, ¶¶ 6-7.

⁵⁷ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 13.

Counsel took in bringing and litigating the case, (2) the extensive time, effort and expense that Class Counsel dedicated to the case, (3) the skill and determination that Class Counsel has shown, (4) the results that Class Counsel has achieved throughout the litigation, (5) the value of the Settlement that Class Counsel has achieved for the Class Members, PAGA Members, and the State of California, and (6) the other cases that Class Counsel had to turn down in order to devote its time and efforts to this matter. The proposed Class Notice provides Class Members that an award of the Class Counsel's Fees and Class Counsel's Costs will be sought, and the amount allocated toward the Class Counsel's Fees and Class Counsel's Costs by the Settlement.⁵⁸

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

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

⁵⁸ *Id.*, Exh. A.

Historically, courts have awarded fees as high as fifty percent (50%) of the settlement, depending on the circumstances of the case. *Newberg*, § 14.03; *see also 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 settlement); *Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.* (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 480 F.Supp. 1195 (awarding approximately 53% of the settlement as attorneys’ fees). California courts routinely approve class action attorneys’ fee awards “averag[ing] around one-third of the recovery.” *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 n.11 (lower court found 20 to 40 percent range of contingency fee in marketplace was appropriate in class actions); *see also Estrada v. Dr. Pepper/Seven-Up*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC262247 (May 2005) (wage and hour); *Moore v. IKEA*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC263646 (Sept. 2006) (wage and hour).

Class Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.⁵⁹

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

VIII. THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS ADEQUATE

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

“Sufficient information about the case should be provided to enable class members to make an informed decision about their participation.” *Manual for Complex Litigation* § 21.311

⁵⁹ Slinger Decl., ¶ 20.

at 413 (4th ed. 2004). The proposed Class Notice describes the Settlement, the deadlines and procedures to submit an objection to the Class Settlement, submit a Request for Exclusion from the Class Settlement, and/or dispute regarding Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods, and the date and time set for the Final Approval Hearing.⁶⁰ The proposed Class Notice summarizes the proceedings to date and the terms and conditions of the Settlement in an informative and coherent manner.⁶¹ The proposed Class Notice recognizes that the Court has not yet granted final approval of the settlement.⁶² The proposed Class Notice also apprises the Class Members and PAGA Members of, *inter alia*, how their Individual Settlement Share and if applicable, their Individual PAGA Payment is calculated and the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods credited to them.⁶³ The proposed Class Notice fulfills the requirement of neutrality in notice procedure. *Newberg*, at § 8.39.

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

IX. APPOINTMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

The Parties have selected Phoenix Settlement Administrators as the Settlement Administrator. Within 14 calendar days of receipt of the Class List, the Settlement Administrator will perform an NCOA check and will mail the Class Notice to each Class Member and PAGA Member.⁶⁴ The Settlement Administrator will skip-trace returned Class Notice and re-mail the Class Notice to the new addresses within five calendar days.⁶⁵ In the case of a re-mailed Class Notice, the Response Deadline will be extended by 15 calendar days from initial Response Deadline.⁶⁶ The Settlement Administrator will receive and process Requests for

⁶⁰ Settlement Agreement, Exh. A.

⁶¹ *Ibid*.

⁶² *Ibid*.

⁶³ *Ibid*.

⁶⁴ *Id.*, ¶ 12.

⁶⁵ Settlement Agreement, ¶ 22.c.

⁶⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 9.mm.

Exclusion, Objections, and any challenges to Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods.⁶⁷ In addition, the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for printing, distributing, and tracking Class Notices and other documents for the Settlement; calculating and distributing payments due under the Settlement; issuing of 1099 and W-2 IRS Forms and all required tax reporting, filings, withholdings, and remittances; providing necessary reports and declarations; and other duties and responsibilities to process the Settlement and as requested by the Parties.⁶⁸ The Settlement Administration Costs is currently estimated to be \$14,500.00 and will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court.⁶⁹ Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court appoint Phoenix Settlement Administrators as the Settlement Administrator and direct the mailing of the Class Notice to the Class Members and PAGA Members in the manner outlined and based on the proposed deadlines as described herein and set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

XI. CLASS REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT AWARDS

Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court appoint them as the Class Representatives and preliminarily approve Enhancement Awards in an amount up to \$7,500.00 each (for a total of \$15,000.00).⁷⁰ It is within the Court's discretion to award payment to a Class Representative for their efforts and work. *Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F.Supp. 294, 299. The factors that courts may consider in determining whether to make an Enhancement Award include: (1) the risk to the Class Representatives in commencing suit, both financial and otherwise; (2) the notoriety and personal difficulties encountered by the Class Representatives; (3) the amount of time and effort spent by the Class Representatives; (4) the duration of the litigation; and (5) the personal benefit (or lack thereof) enjoyed by the Class Representatives as a result of the litigation. *Id.*

The Enhancement Awards are fair and appropriate. Plaintiffs spent a substantial amount of time and effort in producing relevant documents and past employment records and providing

⁶⁷ *Id.*, ¶¶ 22.c, 24, & 25.

⁶⁸ *Id.*, ¶ 29.

⁶⁹ *Id.*, ¶ 15.

⁷⁰ *Id.*, ¶ 14.

the facts and evidence necessary to attempt to prove the allegations.⁷¹ Plaintiffs were available whenever Class Counsel needed them and actively tried to obtain and provide information that would facilitate the pursuit of the class and PAGA claims.⁷² Accordingly, it is appropriate and just for Plaintiffs to receive \$7,500.00 for their services on behalf of the Class, PAGA Members, and the State of California, in addition to their individual settlement payments.

XII. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant Preliminary Approval of the Settlement; conditionally certify the Class for settlement purposes; preliminary appoint and designate Lawyers for Justice, PC as Class Counsel; appoint Plaintiffs Briana Holmes and Sherri Cuthbertson as Class Representatives; appoint Phoenix Settlement Administrators as Settlement Administrator; preliminarily approve the allocations for Class Counsel's Fees, Class Counsel's Costs, Enhancement Awards, PAGA Allotment, and Settlement Administration Costs; approve the proposed Class Notice; direct the Settlement Administrator to undertake the notice and settlement administration process in conformity with the deadlines and procedures provided by the Settlement Agreement; and to schedule a Final Approval Hearing to take place in approximately 6 months.

Dated: August 28, 2026

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC

By: /s/ Ryan Slinger
Arby Aiwarzian
Ryan Slinger
Harris Koepenick
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

⁷¹ Slinger Decl., ¶ 21; Holmes Decl., ¶ 4; & Cuthbertson Decl., ¶ 4.

⁷² Slinger Decl., ¶ 21; Holmes Decl., ¶¶ 3-6; & Cuthbertson Decl., ¶ 3-6.