

BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, LLP

Marcus J. Bradley, Esq. (SBN 174156)
Kiley L. Grombacher, Esq. (SBN 245960)
31365 Oak Crest Drive, Suite 240
Westlake Village, CA 91361
Telephone: (805) 270-7100
Facsimile: (805) 270-7589
Email: mbradley@bradleygrombacher.com
Email: kgrombacher@bradleygrombacher.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, REBECA BALBUENA
ANDRES and MARTIN SOHAL on behalf of
themselves and others similarly situated

(See additional counsel information next page)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF STANISLAUS

**IN RE: STANISLAUS FOOD
PRODUCTS COMPANY
EMPLOYMENT CASES**

LEAD CASE NO. CV-23-001433
[Assigned to Hon. John Freeland, Dept. 23]

CLASS ACTION

Included Actions:

*Rigoberto Valle v. Stanislaus Food Products
Company*, Case No. CV-23-001433

*Mario Castillo v. Stanislaus Food Products
Company*, Case No. CV-23-003465

*Victoria Martinez v. Stanislaus Food
Products Company*, Case No. CV-23-
004653

*Rebeca Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food
Products Company*, Case No. CV-23-
007019

*Martin Sohal v. Stanislaus Food Products
Company*, Case No. CV-24-000548

**DECLARATION OF MARCUS J.
BRADLEY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

1 **DREW LEWIS, PC**

2 Drew Lewis, Esq. (SBN 309288)
3 3010 Lava Ridge Ct. Ste. 120
4 Roseville, CA 95661
5 Telephone: (833) 600-7400
6 Email: drew@drewlewis.law

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff, RIGOBERTE VALLE

8 **BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.**

9 Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq. (SBN 285256)
10 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 450
11 Los Angeles, California 90067
12 Telephone: (310) 975-1493
13 Fax No.: (310) 675-0861
14 Email: mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com

15 **FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.**

16 Joshua S. Falakassa, Esq. (SBN 295045)
17 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 450
18 Los Angeles, California 90067
19 Telephone: (818) 456-6168
20 Fax No.: (888) 505-0868
21 Email: josh@falakassalaw.com

22 Attorneys for Plaintiff, MARIO CASTILLO

23 **HAINES LAW GROUP, APC**

24 Paul K. Haines, Esq. (SBN 248226)
25 Fletcher W. Schmidt, Esq. (SBN 286462)
26 Matthew K. Moen, Esq. (SBN 305956)
27 Susan J. Perez, Esq. (SBN 329044)
28 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, California 90245
Telephone: (424) 292-2350
Fax No.: (424) 292-2355
Email: phaines@haineslawgroup.com
Email: fschmidt@haineslawgroup.com
Email: mmoen@haineslawgroup.com
Email: sperez@haineslawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, VICTORIA MARTINEZ

1 **DECLARATION OF MARCUS J. BRADLEY**

2 I, Marcus J. Bradley, declare as follows:

3 1. I am an attorney at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, counsel of record for Plaintiffs
4 Rebeca Balbuena Andres (“Plaintiff Andres” or “Ms. Andres”) and Martin Sohal (“Plaintiff
5 Sohal” or “Mr. Sohal”) in the above-captioned case. I am submitting this declaration in support
6 of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Plaintiffs’
7 request for reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs for service awards. I am familiar with the file,
8 the documents, and the history related to this case. The following statements are based on my
9 personal knowledge and review of the files. If called on to do so, I could and would testify
10 competently thereto.

11 **CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE OF THIS DECLARATION**

12 2. This declaration is organized into several parts.

13 3. In the first part, I provide a summary of the total lodestar of Plaintiffs Andres’s and
14 Sohal’s counsel in this case and the total out-of-pocket costs incurred. I then go on to provide a
15 summary of our experience and expertise in wage and hour class actions. I also provide a
16 discussion of our billing rates showing that they are within the market range of hourly rates
17 charged by attorneys of comparable skill and experience working on similar matters. I then
18 provide a summary breakdown of the lodestar by individual biller.

19 4. Next, I discuss the real and practical need for law firms, such as ours, to receive their
20 full lodestar and an appropriate multiplier in cases such as this. I further discuss the value of the
21 proposed Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement,”
22 “Settlement,” or “Agreement”), and the risks and uncertainties confronting the Plaintiffs and us
23 in achieving the Settlement.
24 5. I then provide documentation to account for the out-of-pocket costs we incurred in this

25 case.
26 6. Finally, I provide a summary of the contributions of Ms. Andres and Mr. Sohal in

27 support of the service award they are seeking.
28

1 **SUMMARY OF FEES AND COSTS SOUGHT**

2 7. Plaintiffs are seeking a total attorneys' fee award of \$1,166,666.66. Plaintiffs
3 Andres's and Sohal's attorneys are seeking reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket costs of
4 \$3,513.82¹. As of March 28, 2025, the total lodestar for Bradley/Grombacher, LLP in
5 prosecuting and resolving the class claims in this action is \$60,950.00.

6 8. In addition, our lodestar of \$60,950.00 does not include the work we will perform
7 after April 4, 2025, such as attending the hearing on the Motion for Final Approval, effectuating
8 the settlement, working with the Administrator, and communicating with Class Members.

9 **EXPERIENCE OF COUNSEL**

10 9. Below is a chart detailing our lodestar. Before presenting this chart, I first provide
11 background on the primary attorneys from my firm who were assigned to this case and the basis
12 for the billing rates we are seeking for their work.

13 10. Bradley/Grombacher, LLP is a national firm with extensive experience litigating
14 wage and hour class and representative actions as well as complex consumer class actions. Details
15 on the work, experience, and accomplishments of the firm can be found at
16 www.bradleygrombacher.com. In just the past few months, two federal district courts have
17 commented on excellent results obtained by Bradley/Grombacher LLP, attributable to our skilled
18 advocacy and determination. *See, In re Johnson & Johnson Aerosol Sunscreen Mktg., Sales*
19 *Pracs. & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, (S.D. Fla. Feb. 28, 2023) 2023 WL 2284684, at *9 ("The Court has
20 observed class counsel's diligence, ability, and experience in pleadings and motion practice; in
21 their presentation of the settlement to this Court; and in their attention to matters of notice and
22 administration after the announcement of the settlement. The excellent job Class Counsel have
23 done for the class is also demonstrated in the benefits afforded by the Settlement."); *Razo v. AT&T*
24 *Mobility Servs., LLC*, (E.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2023) 2023 WL 3093845, at *24, *26 (commenting on
25
26
27

28 ¹ \$1,581.15 are costs incurred in the *Sohal* matter and \$1,932.67 incurred in the *Andres* matter.

1 the skill class counsel displayed faced with complex issues and significant uncertainty as to the
2 viability of the claims throughout much of the case).

3 **Experience of Marcus J. Bradley, Esq.**

4 11. I have been counsel for Plaintiffs Andres and Sohal and the putative class members
5 throughout this case. I am a partner at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, which has extensive experience
6 litigating wage and hour class and representative actions as well as complex consumer class
7 actions. Details on the work, experience, and accomplishments of the firm can be found at
8 www.bradleygrombacher.com.

9 12. I personally have represented plaintiffs in employment and consumer class actions
10 since I began practicing law in 1994. In 2000, I joined Mazursky, Schwartz & Angelo as an
11 associate and became a partner in January 2005 at which time the firm was renamed Schwartz,
12 Daniels & Bradley. I remained as a partner at Schwartz, Daniels & Bradley handling primarily
13 wage and hour class actions until the dissolution of the firm effective December 31, 2008. In
14 January 2009, I moved my existing practice transferring a number of wage and hour cases and
15 became a partner with the law firm of Marlin & Saltzman, a long-established firm with whom I
16 had been co-counsel on dozens of wage and hour class actions during my tenure at Schwartz,
17 Daniels & Bradley. On September 1, 2016, I formed Bradley/Grombacher, LLP along with a
18 former associate at Marlin & Saltzman, Kiley L. Grombacher.

19 13. I have been responsible for all facets of class action employment and other
20 complex litigation, from pre-filing investigation through trial and appeal. Since approximately
21 May 2000, I have spent most of my time representing workers in wage and hour matters. I, along
22 with my current and former partners, have litigated these issues in class actions to favorable
23 settlements that have recouped over \$800,000,000.00 in unpaid wages, including the following
24 more notable cases:

- 25
26 a. *Gutierrez v. State Farm Mutual*, Los Angeles Superior Court (BC236552). Class
27 action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for approximately 2,600
28 insurance claims adjusters employed by State Farm. The class was certified and summary

1 adjudication was granted as to liability in favor of the class. The case settled for \$135
2 million just prior to trial, with final approval granted with no objections filed.

3 b. *Bednar v. Allstate Insurance Company*, Los Angeles Superior Court (BC240813).
4 Class action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for approximately
5 1,200 insurance claims adjusters employed by Allstate. The class was certified and
6 summary adjudication was granted as to liability in favor of the class. The case settled for
7 \$120 million just prior to trial, with final approval granted with no objections filed.

8 c. *Roberts v. Coast National Insurance*, Orange County Superior Court
9 (01CC08478). Class action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for
10 insurance claims adjusters employed by Coast National Insurance. Certification granted,
11 and then the matter was tried before a binding arbitrator. The case settled during the
12 arbitration for an excess of \$18 million.

13 d. *CNA Class Action Litigation*, Los Angeles Superior Court Class (JCCP 4230).
14 Class action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for insurance claims
15 adjusters employed by Defendant. Case settled for \$33 million, with final approval granted
16 with no objections filed.

17 e. *Dotson v. Royal Sun Alliance*, Orange County Superior Court (02CC01787). Class
18 action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for insurance claims
19 adjusters employed by Royal Sun Alliance. Case settled for \$12.3 million, with final
20 approval granted with no objections filed.

21 f. *Parris v. Lowe's Home Improvement*, Los Angeles County Superior Court
22 (BC260702). Class action seeking payment of "off-the-clock" hours worked by all hourly
23 employees of Lowe's Home Improvement stores in the State of California. The class was
24 certified by the Court of Appeal and remanded to the trial court for further proceedings.
25 Shortly thereafter, a \$29.5 million settlement was reached and approved without objection.

26 g. *Pardo v. Toyota Motor Sales, et al.* Los Angeles County Superior Court
27 (BC372781). Class action mis-classification of workers with claims for overtime and
28

missed meal and rest breaks. The case settled for \$7.75 million and was approved with no objections.

h. *Smith/Ballard v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.* United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Case No. 4:06-cv-05411-SBA). Wage and hour class action seeking unpaid vacation and personal time, unpaid wages, and related penalties on behalf of over 245,000 employees. The action was certified and settled for \$86 million while Defendant's appeal of the certification was pending in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

i. *Hoyng v. AON*, Los Angeles County Superior Court (BC377184). Wage and hour class action seeking overtime and related compensation for mis-classification on behalf of Relationship and Account Specialists. The case settled for \$10.5 million which was approved with no objections filed.

j. *In RE Bank of America Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litigation*, MDL 2138, United States District Court for the District of Kansas. California state and FLSA wage and hour litigation for various violations including unpaid overtime and "off-the-clock" work. Settled for \$73 million.

k. *Lemus v. H & R Block Litigation*, United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Case No. 3:09-cv-03179-SI) Class certified, and settlement reached prior to trial. Total settlement of \$35 million.

l. *Harris v. Vector Marketing Corporation*, United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Case No. 3:08-cv-05198-EMC). Class action case on behalf of approximately 70,000 employees misclassified as "trainees."

m. *Bickley v. Schneider National Trucking*, United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Case No. 4:08-cv-05806-JSW). Wage and hour class action on behalf of approximately 6,000 truck drivers. Settled for \$29.5million.

n. *Roberts v. TJX*, United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Case No. 13-CV-04731-MEJ). Wage and hour violations on behalf of approximately

1 82,000 employees. Settled for \$8.5 million.

2 o. *Opyrchal v. New York Life Insurance*, United States District Court for the Central
3 District of California (Case No. 2:07-cv-00518-VBF). Class action for the failure to pay
4 commissions pursuant to a compensation plan. Settled for \$10 million.

5 p. *Neuvenheim v. Gamestop Corp.*, United States District Court for the Central
6 District of California (Case No. 2:09-cv-06799-ODW). Class action on behalf of
7 nonexempt employees for wage and hour violations.

8 q. *Hightower v. JP Morgan Chase*, United States District Court for the Central
9 District of California (Case No. 2:11-cv-01802-PSG). Class action on behalf of
10 nonexempt employees for wage and hour violations. Settled for \$12 million.

11 14. On many of the above cases, I was either lead or co-lead counsel including cases
12 in multi-district litigation or coordinated proceedings where I worked collaboratively and
13 cooperatively with co-counsel to bring about an efficient and beneficial resolution for all class
14 members as the above results demonstrate.

15 15. I have argued cases in trial courts as well as before courts of appeal. My writings
16 on legal topics pertaining to litigating wage and hour class and representative actions have
17 appeared in professional publications, and I have been called upon to speak at conferences and
18 seminars for professional organizations, including a recent presentation titled "Planning for and
19 Executing Trial in Class and Collective Wage & Hour Cases."

20 16. I have also been honored as a Super Lawyer in the area of class actions by Los
21 Angeles Magazine for multiple years including 2025. I am also a member of a number of
22 professional organizations, including the Consumer Attorneys of Los Angeles, the Consumer
23 Attorneys of California, the California Employment Lawyers Association, and the American
24 Association for Justice. My 2022 billing rate is \$950 an hour.

25
26 **Experience of Kiley L. Grombacher Esq.**

27 17. My Partner, Ms. Grombacher, specializes her practice in complex litigation
28 including consumer and employment class actions. She has litigated hundreds of employment and

1 consumer class actions throughout her career which began at Arias, Ozzello & Gignac where she
2 gained extensive experience litigating consumer cases.

3 18. Thereafter, Ms. Grombacher joined Marlin & Saltzman in 2010 where she focused
4 her practice almost exclusively on wage and hour, collective, and representative actions, including
5 the reported case, *Faulkinbury v. Boyd & Associates*, which clarified the holding in seminal case,
6 *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, to establish that legality of certain company policies
7 could be determined on a class-wide basis even if the application of the policies varies by
8 individual.

9 19. Ms. Grombacher has been selected by Super Lawyers Magazine as a “Rising Star”
10 in the field of complex litigation since 2015 and as a Super Lawyer since 2017. She has published
11 articles on the field of class action litigation including “A Class-Action Primer” which appeared
12 in *The Advocate*, which is the Journal of Consumer Attorneys of Southern California.

13 20. Ms. Grombacher has also lectured on various topics involving complex case
14 management and recently spoke at the Beverly Hills Bar Association’s Class Action and Complex
15 Case Management Conference. She is also a member of a number of professional organizations,
16 including the Consumer Attorneys of Los Angeles and the American Association for Justice.

17 **Experience of Lirit A. King, Esq.**

18 21. Lirit King is a sixteenth-year associate formerly at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP who
19 also worked on this case. Ms. King earned her Juris Doctor from Southwestern University. Ms.
20 King focuses her practice on employment law and is a skilled litigator. Before joining Bradley
21 Grombacher, Ms. King worked at a national law firm as a staff attorney. Ms. King has also worked
22 at plaintiff employment law firms specializing in discrimination, wage and hour, and ERISA
23 violations, acting as associate counsel and as a second chair trial attorney in numerous successful
24 lawsuits. Ms. King has proven to be a strong asset to the firm.

25 **Experience of Emilie MacLean, Esq.**

26 22. Emilie MacLean is a former associate at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP who also
27 worked on this case. Ms. MacLean earned her Juris Doctor and Master of Dispute Resolution
28

1 from Pepperdine University, and her Master of Laws from the University of Toronto. For nearly
2 4 years, prior to receiving her license to practice law in California, Ms. MacLean worked as a law
3 clerk at our firm under my supervision, where she has drafted the briefing on a number of complex
4 legal issues.

5 23. The number of hours that Plaintiffs Andres's and Sohal's counsel devoted to this
6 case is reasonable. See, e.g., *Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1133 (fee award should
7 be "fully compensatory [and] absent circumstances rendering the award unjust, an attorney fee
8 award should ordinarily include compensation for *all* the hours reasonably spent."); *Serrano III*
9 (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 49 (counsel are entitled to compensation for all hours reasonably expended);
10 *Hensley v. Eckerhart* (1983) 461 U.S. 424, 435-36.

11 24. Counsel's work on this case included fact-intensive interviews with Plaintiffs
12 Andres and Sohal at the beginning, middle, and end of the case; the drafting and filing of
13 pleadings; legal research on complex issues; informal settlement negotiations; and drafting of the
14 settlement papers and approval motion.

15 **COUNSEL'S BILLING RATES ARE BASED ON THE PREVAILING MARKET**
16 **RATES AND HAVE BEEN REPEATEDLY APPROVED BY THE COURTS**
17

18 25. This portion of my declaration documents the reasonableness of the billing rates
19 charged by my firm in this case.

20 26. Our lodestar for this case is based on our law firm's billing rates for 2025. We set
21 the billing rates of our attorneys and paralegals/law clerks through a process of continual
22 monitoring of prevailing market rates charged by both defense and plaintiffs' law firms, for
23 individuals with similar levels of skill and experience who are doing comparable work as our
24 attorneys and staff. We gather this information from surveys, the review of other fee applications,
25 and conversations with attorneys in the relevant billing market. We set the billing rates for our
26 firm to be consistent with the prevailing market rates in the private sector for attorneys and staff
27 of comparable skill, qualifications, and experience.

28 27. Federal and state courts in California have consistently approved the rates charged

by Bradley/Grombacher, LLP. See, e.g., *Hector Avina v. Shultz Steel Company* (Los Angeles County Super. Ct. August 4, 2022) Case No. 20STCV18569 (approving 2021 rates); *Garcia v. XPO Logistics Freight, Inc.*, (San Bernardino County Super. Ct. April 19, 2021) Case No. CIVDS2015538 (approving 2020 rates); *Smith v. Hoag Memorial Hospital* (Orange County Super. Ct. Mar. 6, 2020) Case No. 30-2017-00952013 (approving 2019 rates); *Haro v. Laboratory Corp. of America*, (C.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2020) Case No. 2:18-cv-09091-AB-RAO (approving 2019 rates); *Maldonado v. Dayton Superior Corp.* (Riverside County Super Ct. September 10, 2019) Case No. RIC1615240 (approving 2018 rates). Over the years, there have been many other decisions approving our attorneys' billing rates using either a lodestar-multiplier approach and/or a percentage of the recovery approach with a lodestar-multiplier cross-check.

BILLING PRACTICES AND LODESTAR

28. We utilize billing software which records time in tenth-of-an-hour increments and train the lawyers and staff at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP to do so as contemporaneously as possible with the expenditure of the time.

29. The following chart provides a summary of the billing rates and hours worked by the attorneys at our firm through March 28, 2025:

Name and Title of Professional	Bar Admission Date	Hours	Rate (2025)	Lodestar
<i>Partners</i>				
Marcus Bradley	1994	34	\$975	\$33,150.00
<i>Associates</i>				
Lirit King	2007	20	\$850	\$17,000.00
Emilie MacLean	2023	18	\$600	\$10,800.00

Name and Title of Professional	Bar Admission Date	Hours	Rate (2025)	Lodestar
TOTAL HOURS AND LODESTAR FOR BRADLEY GROMBACHER		72		\$60,950.00

30. The figures stated above were prepared and maintained by my firm in the ordinary course of business and reflect the hours of work performed on this matter.

CONTINGENT RISK

31. Bradley/Grombacher, LLP takes its cases on a contingent fee basis. We rely on awards for attorneys' fees and costs to continue our work for the enforcement of labor standards. Indeed, we did not charge Plaintiffs Andres and Sohal, or the putative class members, any fees or costs to litigate and bring this case to a successful conclusion. In addition to attorneys' fees, referenced above, our office has to date incurred \$3,513.82 in out-of-pocket costs, which we have not yet recouped. During the course of this litigation, we also had to forego requests by other prospective clients to bring other cases with merit to ensure that we could continue to adequately and successfully represent Plaintiffs Andres and Sohal and the putative class in this matter.

32. Like some other important and complex employment class and representative actions, this case carried a risk of no recovery at all for either the putative class members or the attorneys representing them. When we do succeed in vindicating statutory and employment rights on behalf of employees, such as in this case, our firm depends upon the recovery of our full lodestar plus an appropriate multiplier. Otherwise, we could not continue to represent employees who are denied wages but whose cases may be time-consuming and difficult to prove.

33. As discussed above, the road to success in this case was far from certain. While we remained confident in, and committed to, the merits of the case throughout the litigation and settlement process, we also were realistic regarding the risks at each stage going forward. First, the parties would have engaged in lengthy and complex motion practice. This would have included the risks of having the Court determine the PAGA claim was unmanageable. This case

1 was particularly risky given the difficulty of demonstrating manageability of claims based on
2 evidence of an unlawful “pattern and practice,” as well as of proving such claims at trial, without
3 evidence of facially unlawful policies.

4 34. Assuming we could demonstrate manageability, there would be further motion
5 practice, including motions for summary judgment. In addition, assuming Plaintiffs prevailed on
6 liability as to one or more of their claims, the measure of penalties would have been hotly
7 contested and presented further risk. Additionally, Defendant might appeal any number of
8 determinations regarding manageability, liability, evidentiary rulings, and the measure of
9 penalties, potentially causing years of further delay.

10 35. Our risks in this case were further compounded by the vigorous and skillful manner
11 in which Defendant’s counsel represented its clients. Defendant and its counsel also negotiated
12 hard throughout the negotiation process. All of this contributed to our risk of recovering nothing
13 or close to nothing for our commitment and investment in the case. Given these uncertainties, we
14 undertook significant risk to finally resolve the case for the substantial value ultimately secured.

15 36. In sum, the result after trial and appeals was highly uncertain, except for the fact
16 that it would potentially mean years of delay. In the face of this uncertainty, we remained
17 committed to the cause and ultimately secured a strong settlement for the putative class.

18 COSTS

19 37. Plaintiffs Andres and Sohal have incurred costs of the suit of approximately
20 \$3,513.82 as of April 4, 2025. **Exhibit 1** is a ledger identifying each individual charge incurred
21 by our firm in this action. The date corresponding to each individual charge may reflect the date
22 the charge was entered into our accounting system, rather than the date when the charge occurred.

23 38. The expenses incurred by our firm consist of filing fees, court fees, and service of
24 process. We do not bill for mail and copies and postage.

25 39. The charges correspond to the actual costs incurred in this case, rather than a pro-
26 rata or other share of our firm’s generalized costs.

27 40. These expenses were necessary to the prosecution and successful resolution of the
28

1 case.

2 **PROPOSED SERVICE AWARD**

3 41. Ms. Andres and Mr. Sohal devoted their time and provided an invaluable service
4 to the prosecution of this case. They worked with us regularly, providing important information,
5 documents, and insight regarding Defendant's policies and practices. They were also actively
6 involved in discussions regarding the resolution of this matter and approved the settlement terms
7 on behalf of themselves and the putative class members.

8 42. Ms. Andres and Mr. Sohal have also submitted declarations attesting to their
9 service in support of the service award they are seeking and in support of approval of the
10 settlement generally.

11 43. In light of Ms. Andres's and Mr. Sohal's specific efforts and the favorable impact
12 on the litigation that resulted from those efforts, we are proposing a \$7,500.00 service award for
13 Ms. Andres and a \$7,500.00 service award for Mr. Sohal.

14 44. We believe that the service award to Ms. Andres and Mr. Sohal fairly reflects the
15 time, risks, and contributions they made to achieve this settlement on behalf of themselves and
16 the putative class.

17 45. Moreover, as part of the settlement agreement, Ms. Andres and Mr. Sohal released
18 any and all claims they had against Defendants, not just those relating to this case. This release is
19 broader than that which applies to the other putative class members.
20

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and based on my personal knowledge.



Marcus J. Bradley, Esq.

EXHIBIT 1

BRADLEY GROMBACHER LLP
Transaction Report
All Dates

Date		Transacti on Type	Num	Adj	Name	Memo/Description	Account	Split	Debit	Credit	Balance
Sohal v. Stanislaus - 20240111											
01/25/2024		Bill	8961168	No	COMMERCIAL PROCESS	Sohal v. Stanislaus - 20240111	ADVANCED COSTS:Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	1,495.25		1,495.25
01/29/2024		Bill	VN214515-01	No	COMMERCIAL PROCESS	Sohal v. Stanislaus - 20240111	ADVANCED COSTS:Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	85.90		1,581.15
Total for Sohal v. Stanislaus - 20240111									\$ 1,581.15		
TOTAL									\$ 1,581.15		\$ 1,581.15

BRADLEY GROMBACHER LLP
Transaction Report
All Dates

Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108										
Date	Transaction Type	Num	Adj	Name	Memo/Description	Account	Split	Debit	Credit	Balance
12/05/2023	Bill	8669879	No	COMMERCIAL PROCESS	Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108	ADVANCED COSTS:Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	1,494.22		1,494.22
12/15/2023	Bill	VN213542-01	No	COMMERCIAL PROCESS	Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108	ADVANCED COSTS:Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	101.90		1,596.12
02/13/2024	Bill	VN214913-01	No	COMMERCIAL PROCESS	Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108	ADVANCED COSTS:Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	191.15		1,787.27
02/14/2024	Bill	9060654	No	COMMERCIAL PROCESS	Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108	ADVANCED COSTS:Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	17.05		1,804.32
03/29/2024	Expense		No	Superior Court of Stanislaus	Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108 // Remote Appearance for Emille	ADVANCED COSTS:Court Costs	Kiley - VS 6077	28.00		1,832.32
04/05/2024	Expense		No	Superior Court of Stanislaus	Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108 /// STANISLAUS SUPERIOR MODESTO CA XXXX-XXXXXX-X2001	ADVANCED COSTS:Court Costs	AMEX 2001(KG)	28.00		1,860.32
12/19/2024	Expense		No	Superior Court of Stanislaus	Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108 – Remote Court Appearance ///STANISLAUS VCOURT 00MODESTO CA XXXX5009	ADVANCED COSTS:Court Costs	AMEX:CC - 4002(MB)	72.35		1,932.67
01/06/2025	Credit Card		No	Superior Court of Stanislaus	Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108 – Refund \$2.35 service fees /// STANISLAUS VCOURT MODESTO CA XXXX5009	ADVANCED COSTS:Court Costs	AMEX:CC - 4002(MB)		2.35	1,930.32
Total for Balbuena Andres v. Stanislaus Food Products Co. - 20231108								\$ 1,932.67	\$ 2.35	
TOTAL								\$ 1,932.67	\$ 2.35	\$ 1,930.32