

Eric K. Yaeckel [CSB No. 274608]
yaeckel@sullivanlawgroupapc.com

Ryan T. Kuhn [CSB No. 324538]
ryan@sullivanlawgroupapc.com

SULLIVAN & YAECKEL LAW GROUP, APC
2330 Third Avenue
San Diego, California 92101
(619) 702-6760 * (619) 702-6761 FAX

Attorneys for Plaintiffs MARCELINO ORTUNO, in a Representative capacity only, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated

[Additional Counsel on following page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

MARCELINO ORTUNO and JOSE BRIAN DE LA ROSA, both in a Representative capacity only, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DUNN-EDWARDS CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1-10, inclusive

Defendants

CASE NO. 37-2023-00046612-CU-OE-CTL

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAGA SETTLEMENT APPROVAL

Date: September 19, 2025

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Dept.: C-74

Judge: Hon. Blaine K. Bowman

1 RYAN CHUMAN, SBN 300695
ryanc@protectionlawgroup.com
2 ARNEL O. TAN, SBN 272428
arnel@protectionlawgroup.com
3 JOSEPH O. MARSHALL, SBN 354066
joe@protectionlawgroup.com
4 CHRISTINE V. REYES, SBN 346719
christine@protectionlawgroup.com
5 **PROTECTION LAW GROUP, LLP**
149 Sheldon Street
6 El Segundo, California 90245
Telephone: (424) 290-3095
7 Facsimile: (866) 264-7880

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

9 JOSE BRIAN DE LA ROSA
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Summary of Motion.. 1

II. Summary of Settlement Terms.....1

III. Controlling Law.....2

IV. Discussion.....4

 A. The Nature and Scope of the Alleged Violations.....5

 B. Analysis of Potential Liability, on a Representative Basis.....5

 1. The Parameters of the Proposed PAGA Group5

 2. The Analysis of the Claims and Scope of Liability6

 i. Meal and Rest Period Claims6

 ii. Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations7

 iii. Wage Statements, Reimbursement and Other Derivative Penalties7

 iv. The Arguments for Mitigation of PAGA Penalties8

 3. Counsel Are Well Experienced in PAGA Matters and Recommend the Settlement.....8

 C. The Allocation of Penalties, and *Limited Release* of Claims.....9

 D. Request for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs & Enhancement Awards.....9

 1.Request for Reasonable Costs of Litigation9

 2.Request for Reasonable Attorneys’ Fees10

 3.A Lodestar Cross Check Further Confirms the Reasonableness of the Fee.....12

 4.Request for PAGA Representative Enhancement.....13

 5.CAC Services Group, LLC.....14

 E. The LWDA Was Notified Multiple Times, and Does Not Object14

V. Conclusion.....15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Amaral vs. Cintas Corp. No. 2</i> (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1213-1214	3,10
<i>Bank of America v. Cory</i> 164 Cal. App. 3d 66, 91 (1985)	11
<i>Beasley v. Wells Fargo Bank</i> 235 Cal. App. 3d 1407, 1419 (1991).....	10
<i>Billinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.</i> 306 F.R.D. 245, 267-68 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	13
<i>Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.</i> (2018) 30 Cal. App. 5th 504.....	8
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 43.....	11
<i>Chu v. Wells Fargo Investments LLC</i> 2011 WL 672645, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2011).....	4
<i>Coalition for Los Angeles County Planning v. Board of Supervisors</i> (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 241, 251	12
<i>Donohue v. AMN Servs., LLC</i> (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58.....	9
<i>Downey Cares v. Downey Community Development Commission</i> (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 983, 994	12
<i>Fernandez v. Victoria Secret Stores, LLC</i> No. CV 06-04149 MMM SHX, 2008 WL 8150856, at *16 (C.D. Cal. July 21, 2008)	12
<i>Fleming v. Covidien Inc.</i> 2011 WL 7563047, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2011)	3
<i>Flores v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc.</i> 2017 WL 2224265, at *1 (C.D. Cal. May 19, 2017).....	3,4,9
<i>Franco v. Ruiz Food Prods., Inc.</i> 2012 WL5941801, at *14 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2012).....	3
<i>Garcia v. Gordon Trucking</i> 2012 WL 5364575, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2012).....	3,4
<i>Haralson v. U.S. Aviation Servs. Corp.</i> 383 F. Supp. 3d 959, 972 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	4
<i>Hicks v. Toys ‘R’ Us–Delaware, Inc.</i> 2014 WL 4703915, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 2, 2014).....	3

1	<i>In re Rite Aid Corp. Securities Litig.</i>	
2	396 F.3d 294, 300 (3d Cir. 2005)	11
3	<i>In re Toys ‘R’ Us-Del FACTA Litig.</i>	
4	295 F.R.D. at 471	13
5	<i>Iskanian v. CLS Trans. Los Angeles</i>	
6	(2014) 59 Cal. 4th 348, 360	2,10,13
7	<i>Kern Rivet Public Access Committee v. City of Bakersfield</i>	
8	(1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 1205, 1228	12
9	<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l Inc.</i>	
10	1 Cal. 5th 480, 506 (2016)	11
11	<i>Lealao v. Beneficial Cal. Inc.</i>	
12	82 Cal. App. 4th 19, 47 (2000)	12
13	<i>O’Connor v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i>	
14	201 F. Supp. 3d 1110, 1135 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....	3,4
15	<i>People ex rei. Stratham v. Acacia Research Corp.</i>	
16	210 Cal. App. 4th 487, 501 (2012).....	10 ,14
17	<i>Sakkab v. Luxottica</i>	
18	(9th Cir. 2015) 803 F.3d 425.....	3
19	<i>Syed v. M-I LLC</i>	
20	2017 WL 714367, at *13 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2017)	3
21	<i>Sternwest Com. v. Ash</i>	
22	(1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 74, 75.....	12
23	<i>Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i>	
24	(N.D. Cal. 1995) 901 F. Supp. at 299	13
25	STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS	
26	California Labor Code § 203	7
27	California Labor Code § 510	7
28	California Labor Code § 2698 <i>et seq.</i>	1,5
29	California Labor Code § 2699(e)(2)	3,8
30	California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).....	10
31	California Labor Code § 2699(i)	4
32	California Labor Code § 2699(l)	3,9
33	California Labor Code § 2802	7
34	Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 1033.5(c)(4)	10

1 **I. SUMMARY OF MOTION**

2 This is a “Wage and Hour” representative action, under California’s Private Attorneys General
3 Act of 2004 (“PAGA”). The named Plaintiffs respectfully submit the instant Points and Authorities
4 in support of their motion for Approval of the PAGA Settlement. This Request is **Unopposed**. The
5 LWDA was timely notified of this proposal, and does **not** object to the allocations. (See concurrently
6 filed Proof of Service on LWDA).

7 **II. SUMMARY OF SETTLEMENT TERMS**

8 This is a Labor Code §2698 *et seq.* “Wage and Hour” (“PAGA”) action brought against
9 DUNN-EDWARDS CORPORATION, (Hereinafter, “Defendant”). As this is a “PAGA” action **only**,
10 the Limitations Period begins on August 22, 2022. (Kuhn Decl., ¶3).

11 Following the exchange of discovery, analysis of numerous sets of time and wage data, a full
12 day mediation before Hon. Kenneth J. Medel (Ret.), and extensive “arms length” negotiations, on May
13 28, 2025, the Parties reached a proposed settlement that includes a payment of penalties to the LWDA.
14 (Kuhn Decl., ¶4).

15 On **May 28, 2025**, Plaintiffs’ Counsel gave notice of the instant Settlement to the LWDA.
16 (Kuhn Decl., ¶5). To date, Plaintiffs’ counsel has not received notice that the LWDA would intervene.
17 (*Id.*)

18 On **July 22, 2025**, Plaintiffs’ counsel uploaded via the LWDA’s electronic filing portal the
19 Settlement Agreement. (Kuhn Decl., ¶6). To date, Plaintiffs’ counsel has not received notice that the
20 LWDA would intervene. (*Id.*)

21 On **August 14, 2025**, Plaintiffs’ counsel uploaded via the LWDA’s electronic filing portal
22 copies of this Motion, including the Notice, this supporting Memorandum, Declaration, and Proposed
23 Order & Judgment. (Kuhn Decl., ¶7). To date, Plaintiffs’ counsel has not received any opposition from
24 the LWDA. (*Id.*).

25 Defendant has confirmed that as of the date of this settlement, there are **1,339** PAGA group
26 members and **55,312** pay periods at issue. (Kuhn Decl. ¶8). After deduction of all “contingent costs”
27 set forth below, each PAGA member will receive an average payment of **\$146.51**. *Id.*
28

The Total Value of the proposed Settlement is **\$1,250,000.00** which is broken down as follows:

- * **\$416,666.66** Attorneys' Fees (33% of total settlement value);
- * **\$21,000.00** PAGA Counsel Expenses Payment
- * **\$7,600.00** Settlement Administrator Fees
- * **\$20,000.00** Plaintiffs' Enhancement Award
- * Sub-Total of **\$784,733.34**. 75% (**\$588,550.01**) shall be assigned/paid to the LWDA as penalties.
- * The remaining 25% (**\$196,183.33**) in cash will be disbursed among all employees based on work weeks employed during the PAGA period.(Kuhn Decl., ¶9)

Further, there are **no** restrictions for any of the employees to file individual actions, as the settlement agreement only covers PAGA claims. (Kuhn Decl., ¶10); **Exhibit 1**, ¶27).

Plaintiffs' counsel authoring the instant motion is well versed in class and representative (PAGA) litigation. Based on that experience, counsel submits this settlement represents a fair and adequate payment to the LWDA and aggrieved employees. (Kuhn Decl., ¶11-18).

Should the Court deem it necessary, a lodestar cross-check confirms the propriety of the requested attorneys fees. Given the actual fees incurred, in the amount of approximately **\$476,060.00**, no lodestar multiplier is necessary.

Plaintiffs also seek reimbursement for reasonable litigation expenses incurred in the amount of **\$21,000.00**. (Kuhn Decl. ¶27).

The parties proposed notice, to accompany the settlement checks following approval, is attached to the parties Settlement Agreement as **Exhibit 7**.

III. CONTROLLING LAW

PAGA "authorizes an employee to bring an action for civil penalties on behalf of the state against his or her employer for Labor Code violations committed against the employee and fellow employees." *Iskanian v. CLS Trans. Los Angeles* (2014) 59 Cal. 4th 348, 360. "To compensate for the lack of [a]dequate financing of essential labor law enforcement functions,' the California legislature

1 enacted PAGA to permit aggrieved employees to act as private attorneys general to collect civil
2 penalties for violations of the Labor Code.” *Sakkab v. Luxottica* (9th Cir. 2015) 803 F.3d 425.

3 “The superior court shall review and approve any settlement of any civil action filed pursuant
4 to [PAGA].” Cal. Lab. Code. § 2699(l). In so doing, the court must consider whether the proposed
5 “PAGA settlement is fair and adequate in view of the purposes and policies of the statute.” *O'Connor*
6 *v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 201 F. Supp. 3d 1110, 1135 (N.D. Cal. 2016). Those purposes and policies
7 include “benefit[ing] the public by augmenting the state’s enforcement capabilities, encouraging
8 compliance with Labor Code provisions, and deterring noncompliance.” *Id.* at 1132-33; Accord *Syed*
9 *v. M-I LLC*, 2017 WL 714367, at *13 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2017) (concluding “the settlement amount
10 related to plaintiffs’ PAGA claims is fair, reasonable, and adequate in light of the public policy goals
11 of PAGA.”).

12 However, “neither the California legislature, nor the California Supreme Court, nor the
13 California Courts of Appeal, nor the [LWDA] has provided any definitive answer” as to what the
14 appropriate standard is for approval of a PAGA settlement. *Flores v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts*
15 *Worldwide, Inc.*, 2017 WL 2224265, at *1 (C.D. Cal. May 19, 2017).

16 A court may award a lesser amount than the maximum civil penalty amount if, based on the
17 facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust,
18 arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory. Lab. Code, § 2699(e)(2); *Amaral vs. Cintas Corp. No. 2*
19 *(2008)* 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1213-1214. See e.g., *Fleming v. Covidien Inc.*, 2011 WL 7563047, at
20 *4 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2011) (reducing PAGA penalties by 82%).

21 Courts have routinely approved PAGA settlements where the PAGA allocation reflects a much
22 smaller percentage of the gross settlement amount. There are numerous comparable cases in which the
23 total settlement exceeded \$2,000,000 and the PAGA penalty was \$10,000 or less. See e.g. *Hicks v.*
24 *Toys ‘R’ Us–Delaware, Inc.*, 2014 WL 4703915, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 2, 2014); *Franco v. Ruiz Food*
25 *Prods., Inc.*, 2012 WL5941801, at *14 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2012); *Garcia v. Gordon Trucking*, 2012
26 WL 5364575, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2012); *Chu v. Wells Fargo Investments, LLC*, 2011 WL
27 672645, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2011).
28

1 In *Haralson v. U.S. Aviation Servs. Corp.*, 383 F. Supp. 3d 959, 972 (N.D. Cal. 2019), the
2 Court discussed two policies for the approval of a PAGA claim:

3 Where PAGA claims are settled in the same agreement with the underlying Labor Code
4 claims, courts have also looked to the interplay of the two recoveries to determine
5 whether PAGA's purposes have been served. The *O'Connor* (Uber) court, for instance,
6 adopted a “sliding scale,” noting that “[b]y providing fair compensation to the class
7 members as employees and substantial monetary relief, a settlement not only vindicates
8 the rights of the class members as employees, but may have a deterrent effect upon the
9 defendant employer and other employers, an objective of PAGA.” 201 F. Supp. 3d at
10 1134. Similarly, “if the settlement resolves the important question of the status of
11 workers as employees entitled to the protection of the Labor Code or contained
12 substantial injunctive relief, this would support PAGA's interest in augmenting the
13 state's enforcement capabilities, encouraging compliance with Labor Code provisions,
14 and deterring noncompliance.” *Id.* at 1134-35.

15 Further, the Court in *Flores v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc.* (“Flores”) the court
16 was asked to approve a PAGA settlement (the “Settlement”). *Flores v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts*
17 *Worldwide, Inc.*, 253 F. Supp. 3d 1074, 1075–76 (C.D. Cal. 2017). In deciding whether the court
18 should approve the Settlement, the court looked at the California legislature, the California Courts of
19 Appeal, the California Supreme Court, and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
20 for a definitive answer as to what precedent the court should follow in either approving or denying the
21 settlement. *Id.* The court was not able to find a definitive answer. *Id.* As such, the court followed the
22 rationale in *O'Connor v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 201 F.Supp.3d 1110, 132-35 (N.D. Cal. 2016), which states
23 a court is permitted to approve a PAGA settlement if the settlement is “fair and adequate in view of
24 the purposes and policies of the statute.” *Id.*

25 In deciding whether the settlement was “fair and adequate,” the *Flores* court examined how
26 the parties “divvied up” the civil penalties under Section 2699(i) of the California Labor Code. *Flores*
27 at 1076-77. As the court felt the parties’ division of penalties was fair and adequate pursuant to the
28 statute, the court approved the settlement. *Id.*

24 **IV. DISCUSSION**

25 The parties reached the terms of their proposed settlement agreement following the exchange
26 of extensive information and employment records. The parties submit the proposed settlement of
27 PAGA penalties is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

1 **A. THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS**

2 The Complaint alleges Labor Code violations which triggered penalties under the PAGA
3 statute (Labor Code §2698 et seq.) (See ROA #1.) Plaintiffs also allege all employees were denied
4 compliant Meal and Rest Periods, minimum wages, overtime, accurate wage statements,
5 reimbursements, and suffered waiting time violations. (See ROA #1, Exhibit 1: “Plaintiff’s LWDA
6 Notice” attached thereto).

7 Specifically, Plaintiffs allege that they - and other employees - received “short,” “late,” or
8 “missing” Meal Periods, including those documented within Defendant’s Time Records. (Decl. Kuhn,
9 ¶28). Plaintiffs also challenged whether Defendant maintained lawful meal and rest periods. Plaintiffs
10 alleged they- and other employees -were not properly compensated due to Defendant’s failure to
11 maintain accurate time records. (*Id.*) Finally, Plaintiffs also challenged whether Defendant maintained
12 lawful meal and rest period policies. (*Id.*)

13 **B. ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL LIABILITY, ON A REPRESENTATIVE BASIS**

14 The catalyst of this litigation concerned allegations that the aggrieved employees were denied
15 legally compliant meal and rest periods, and were not paid for all hours worked. Investigations
16 (including expert analysis) completed by Plaintiffs’ counsel revealed that Defendant’s timekeeping
17 policies and employee records were not in compliance with California law. (Decl. Kuhn, ¶29).
18 However, these investigations also revealed that the “rate of violation” by Defendant was significantly
19 less than 100%. (*Id.*). On many of those occasions, it appears that Defendant did, in fact, comply with
20 the law. (*Id.*)

21 **1. The Parameters of the Proposed PAGA Group**

22 To confirm, this settlement is meant to encompass all current and former non-exempt
23 employees who worked in California during the “PAGA period.”. (Ex. 1: ¶ 5).

24 Defendants have confirmed, and Plaintiffs’ expert has independently verified, that there are
25 approximately **1,339** employees who worked a total of **55,312** pay periods as of July 22, 2025. **Exhibit**
26 **1: ¶16(c).** (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 8).
27
28

1 If the Court approves the “contingent costs” as requested in the moving papers, the total
2 amount of PAGA penalties will be **\$784,733.34**. 75% (**\$588,550.01**) shall be assigned/paid to the
3 LWDA as penalties. The remaining 25% (**\$196,183.33**) will be disbursed among all employees based
4 on pay periods worked during the PAGA period. If you divide the \$196,183.33 in penalties between
5 the 1,339 employees, it results in an average payout of **\$146.51** per employee. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 8). **Please**
6 **Note:** This is an average only. The actual payout per employee will vary based on the total pay periods
7 worked during the PAGA period.

8 **2. The Analysis of the Claims and Scope of Liability**

9 Prior to settlement, Plaintiffs and retained experts conducted a thorough expert analysis of the
10 documents and data produced by Defendant. This included an analysis of all relevant written policies
11 and *all* time and wage records and phone records, computer log records and emails for other putative
12 aggrieved employees. Given the expert report Plaintiffs’ Counsel were able to realistically assess the
13 value of Plaintiffs’ claims, and intelligently engage Defense Counsel in settlement discussions that
14 culminated in the proposed settlement now before the Court. Plaintiffs expert calculated the estimated
15 maximum scope of liability as being between **\$2,000,000.00** and **\$3,000,000.00**. (Kuhn Decl. ¶30).
16 However, as is set forth more fully below, all counsel are aware “maximum” awards in PAGA only
17 cases are exceedingly rare. Moreover, most trial Courts (including this Trial Court, in the *Carrington*
18 matter) decline to “stack” PAGA penalties. “Stacking” refers to imposing multiple penalties for one
19 alleged “harm.” *E.g.* one single late meal period could arguably violate at least four Labor Code
20 provisions that allow for separate penalties pursuant to PAGA. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 31).

21 **i. Meal and Rest Period Claims**

22 Plaintiffs were able to identify hundreds of examples of “missing” or “late” Meal Periods
23 without the provision of a Meal Period Penalty Payment. However, Defendant argued that these
24 records do not conclusively show whether (1) Defendant actually failed to provide the Meal Period,
25 (2) there was a voluntary waiver, (3) employees forgot to clock out, or (4) employees voluntarily chose
26 to skip or take them late even though they were provided. (Kuhn decl. ¶32).
27
28

1 Plaintiffs also alleged Defendants' written policies were illegal, and improperly restricted class
2 members from leaving the premises during their Rest Periods. Defendants argued that witness
3 testimony would demonstrate that - in practice - Defendants did not restrict its employees from "leave
4 the premises" during Rest Periods.(Kuhn decl. ¶33). The rest period claims would have been harder
5 to prove on a representative basis given that rest breaks were not recorded on the time records. *Id.*

6 **ii. Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

7 Plaintiffs allege that Defendant failed to pay minimum wages to employees for all time spent
8 under Defendant's control. This allegation is based on the following alleged facts: Defendant failed
9 to maintain accurate Time Records to the detriment of the employees. More specifically, although
10 Defendants would receive "to-the-minute" start and end times, Defendants would thereafter alter -
11 deduct time from - the Time Record, prior to payment of compensation to the employees. (Kuhn Decl.
12 ¶34).

13 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees all
14 compensation, including overtime compensation, due in violation of, among other statutes, Labor Code
15 section 510. These violations occurred due to Defendants' illegal policies, referenced above, whereby
16 employees experienced monetary under-compensation. The systematic failure to provide proper
17 overtime compensation is a violation of California law. Additionally, Defendants also failed to provide
18 the actual Overtime Rate of Pay by ignoring certain compensation when calculating the Regular Rate
19 of Pay including, but not limited to, various forms of bonus and/or incentive pay, and the value of
20 employee benefits and employee discounts, in violation of Labor Code section 510. (*Id.*)

21 **iii. Wage Statements, Reimbursement and Other Derivative Penalties**

22 The remaining claims are largely derivative, in that Wage Statement and Labor Code § 203
23 penalties would only be permissible if the above claims are proven. Plaintiffs had also alleged
24 violations for failure to reimburse business expenses pursuant to Labor Code § 2802. However, it
25 appeared Defendant had compliant reimbursement policies and any un-reimbursed expenses would
26 have been very minimal. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 35).

1 **iv. The Arguments for Mitigation of PAGA Penalties**

2 Plaintiffs' counsel is aware of the Court's discretion to mitigate penalties pursuant to California
3 Labor Code section 2699(e)(2). (Kuhn Decl. ¶36). To confirm, Plaintiffs' counsel experienced the
4 mitigation of "PAGA" penalties before this Trial Court, in *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.* (2018) 30
5 Cal.App.5th 504. (*Id.*) In *Carrington*, the Court significantly mitigated PAGA penalties (to \$5 per
6 violation), due to the efforts made by the employer to comply with the law. (*Id.*)

7 Plaintiffs' counsel agrees that penalties *should* be mitigated where violations are minimal (or
8 rare), or where the employer makes significant efforts to comply with the Labor Code. (Kuhn Decl.
9 ¶37-38).

10 As many of the above factors could be argued by Defendant in this case, it is the opinion of
11 Plaintiffs' counsel that the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable. Specifically, Plaintiffs'
12 counsel's understanding is that Defendant has reviewed its policies and practices, and made updates
13 to attempt to ensure future compliance with California law. (Kuhn Decl., ¶39).

14 **3. Counsel Are Well Experienced in PAGA Matters and Recommend the Settlement**

15 The Lead Trial Counsel for Plaintiffs, Mr. William Sullivan, has been a California-licensed
16 attorney for 30 years. He has approximately 29 years of experience in "class action" litigation, both
17 as plaintiff and defense counsel. Mr. Sullivan has acted as Trial Counsel (for Plaintiff) in multiple
18 "Wage and Hour" Class/Representative actions, including the (San Diego Superior Court) Trial which
19 is the subject of the Published decision entitled *Carrington v. Starbucks* (2018) 30 Cal.App.5th 504.
20 Mr. Sullivan estimates that, throughout the course of his 30-year career, he has acted as Lead Plaintiff's
21 counsel on "Wage and Hour" Class/Representative actions that have collected more than \$300 million
22 for employees and/or the State of California, either through judgment following trial, or via negotiated
23 settlement. (Kuhn Decl. ¶11).

24 Plaintiffs' counsel, Eric K. Yaeckel, has over 14 years of experience prosecuting class and
25 representative action claims under the California Labor Code. (Kuhn Decl. ¶12-17). Plaintiffs' counsel
26 are the attorneys of record in a matter that was recently heard (and favorably decided) before the
27
28

1 California Supreme Court, titled *Donohue v. AMN Servs., LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58. (*Id.*) The
2 *Donohue* matter was a certified class and PAGA action. (*Id.*)

3 Plaintiffs' counsel, Ryan T. Kuhn, has approximately 7 years of experience prosecuting class
4 and representative action claims under the California Labor Code. (Kuhn Decl. ¶12-17).

5 Based on said experience, it is the opinion of all Plaintiffs' counsel that this settlement
6 represents a fair and adequate payment. (Kuhn Decl. ¶18).

7 **C. THE ALLOCATION OF PENALTIES, AND LIMITED RELEASE OF CLAIMS**

8 While Labor Code section 2699(l) requires a court to "review and approve any penalties sought
9 as part of a proposed settlement agreement," it does not provide any guidance as to what is considered
10 an 'adequate' allocation of these penalties. However, Trial Courts have held that *where the* division
11 of penalties was fair and adequate and in accordance with the PAGA statute, the court should approved
12 the settlement. *Flores v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc.*, 253 F. Supp. 3d 1074, 1076–77
13 (C.D. Cal. 2017).

14 After subtracting the contingent costs set forth above, the parties seek to allocate **\$784,733.34**
15 of the total settlement to the Total Value of the PAGA Fund. 75% (**\$588,550.01**) shall be assigned/paid
16 to the LWDA as penalties. The remaining 25% (**\$196,183.33**) will be allocated and distributed among
17 the current or ex-employees within the PAGA Period.

18 The parties contend the settlement agreement amount is fair, adequate, and reasonable. (Decl.
19 Kuhn, ¶39). Moreover, the PAGA settlement does not bar any employee from pursuing their own
20 individual Labor Code claims. (Decl. Kuhn ¶10; **Exhibit 1**: "Release of PAGA Claims" ¶27). The
21 release only applies to the PAGA claims for penalties, based upon the allegations in Plaintiffs'
22 operative Complaint. (*Id.*)

23 **D. REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS & ENHANCEMENT AWARDS**

24 Plaintiffs also request the Court approve the requested attorneys' fees, costs reimbursement and
25 plaintiffs' enhancement awards for the reasons set forth below.

26 **1. Request for Reasonable Costs of Litigation**

27 Plaintiffs' Counsel are entitled to reimbursement of their discretionary litigation costs. Cal. Lab. Code
28

1 § 2699(g)(1). Out-of-pocket discretionary expenses are compensable if they would normally be billed to a fee-
2 paying client. *See Beasley v. Wells Fargo Bank*, 235 Cal. App. 3d 1407, 1419 (1991), *overruled in part on other*
3 *grounds in Olson v. Automobile Club of Southern Calif.*, 42 Cal. 4th 1142 (2008). Such discretionary costs may
4 be claimed as part of an attorneys' fees motion when seeking statutory fees under the Labor Code. *See Amaral*
5 *v. Cintas Corp. No. 2*, 163 Cal. App. 4th 1157, 1218 n.27 (2008) (awarding costs that are necessarily incurred).

6 As itemized in Plaintiffs' Counsel's declaration, Counsel advanced approximately **\$21,000.00** in out-of-
7 pocket costs to the State for, among other things, filing fees, expert fees, deposition costs and mediation fees.
8 (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 27). Because these reasonable costs were necessarily incurred during the case's pendency, these
9 costs are reasonable and should be awarded. *See also* Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 1033.5(c)(4) ("[i]tems not mentioned
10 in this section and items assessed upon application may be allowed or denied in the court's discretion.")

11 **2. Request for Reasonable Attorneys' Fees**

12 For the reasons discussed in detail below, an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of one third
13 of the gross settlement fund is fair and reasonable, and in line with what other California courts, both
14 state and federal, have awarded in settlements of similar litigation.

15 The PAGA statute provides that a plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees,
16 expenses, and costs. Section 2699(g)(1) of the California Labor Code provides that "[a]ny employee
17 who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs." In a
18 qui tam action, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs are typically awarded under the common fund
19 doctrine where, as here, the litigation creates a common fund of money in a specific amount for the
20 benefit of others. PAGA "is a type of qui tam action." *See Iskanian*, 59 Cal. 4th at 382. "A qui tam
21 action 'is a type of private attorney general lawsuit' [citation], in which 'the qui tam plaintiff stands in
22 the shoes of the state or political subdivision [citation].'" *People ex rei. Stratham v. Acacia Research*
23 *Corp.*, 210 Cal. App. 4th 487, 501 (2012).

24 Where, as here, a common fund is created in a qui tam action by the successful litigation of a
25 plaintiff and her attorneys, the plaintiff's attorneys are entitled to recover their fees from the common
26 fund:
27
28

1 Those benefitting from the recovery of the fund, in this case some depositors and eventually
2 the People of the State of California, must bear their share of the cost of litigation. Fees for
3 taxpayers' attorneys will be deducted from the judgment, and each claimant's share reduced
4 proportionately. To the extent the judgment relies upon section 1021.5 for recovery of attorney
5 fees, it must be modified to confine the award of fees to the common fund theory.
6 *Bank of America v. Cory*, 164 Cal. App. 3d 66, 91 (1985) (authorizing common fund fees in a qui tam
7 taxpayer suit against certain banks).

8 Likewise, through the successful efforts of Plaintiffs and their attorneys, a common fund was
9 created in the amount of **\$1,250,000.00** for the benefit of the employees and the State of California.

10 The California Supreme Court recently upheld the use of the common fund theory of recovery
11 for attorneys' fees in *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l Inc.*, 1 Cal. 5th 480, 506 (2016). In *Laffitte*, the
12 settlement created a common fund of \$19 million. The Court approved the award of attorneys' fees in
13 the amount of one third of the gross \$19 million settlement (e.g., an award of \$6.33 million) under the
14 common fund theory. *Id.* By awarding counsel a percentage of the total recovery, rather than fees based
15 on hours worked, the common fund method encourages attorneys to efficiently litigate to achieve the
16 best results possible. See *Laffitte*, 1 Cal. 5th at 492-494. Indeed, "the percentage method is generally
17 favored in common fund cases because it allows courts to award fees from the fund in a manner that
18 rewards counsel for success and penalizes it for failure. *Id.* at 493 (quoting *In re Rite Aid Corp.*
19 *Securities Litig.*, 396 F.3d 294, 300 (3d Cir. 2005) (internal quotations omitted).

20 California state and federal courts routinely award attorneys' fees approximating one-third of
21 the common fund. See, e.g. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat. Inc.*, 231 Cal. App. 4th 860, 871 (2016)
22 ("33 1/3 percent of the common fund is consistent with, and in the range of, awards in other class
23 action lawsuits"); *Chavez*, 162 Cal. App. 4th at 66 n.11 ("Empirical studies show that, regardless
24 whether the percentage method or the lodestar method is used, fee awards in class actions average
25 around one-third of the recovery.")

26 A fee award in the amount of one-third of the common fund is also reasonable because it best
27 reflects the market rate for contingency fees. See *Lealao v. Beneficial Cal. Inc.*, 82 Cal. App. 4th 19,
28 47 (2000) ("attorneys providing the essential enforcement services must be provided incentives
roughly comparable to those negotiated in the private bargaining that takes place in the legal

1 marketplace. . . ."). Fees representing one-third of the recovery reflect the rate negotiated in "typical
2 contingency fee agreements [which] provide that class counsel will recover 33% if the case is resolved
3 before trial and 40% if the case is tried." *Fernandez v. Victoria Secret Stores, LLC*, No. CV 06-04149
4 MMM SHX, 2008 WL 8150856, at *16 (C.D. Cal. July 21, 2008) (citing an academic study collecting
5 contingency fee agreements and finding that a fee award constituting 34% of the fund is reasonable
6 on that basis). Because the negotiated fee structure mimics the marketplace, it is reasonable and should
7 be approved.

8
9 For all of these reasons, a common fund fee award in the amount of one third of the total
10 settlement (**\$416,666.66**) is fair and reasonable.

11 **3. A Lodestar Cross Check Further Confirms the Reasonableness of the Fee**

12 Should the Court deem it necessary, lodestar cross-check confirms the propriety of the
13 requested attorneys fees. Given the actual fees incurred, in the amount of **approximately \$476,060.00**,
14 no lodestar multiplier is necessary. (See Kuhn Decl. ¶ 19(e)).

15 California courts and the Ninth Circuit hold that the trial court in determining whether to apply
16 a multiplier should look at the case and its results as a whole. Historically California courts have
17 approved multipliers of 1.5 to 4. See *Coalition for Los Angeles County Planning v. Board of*
18 *Supervisors* (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 241, 251 (multiplier of 2+); *Kern Rivet Public Access Committee*
19 *v. City of Bakersfield* (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 1205, 1228 (multiplier of 1.5); *Downey Cares v.*
20 *Downey Community Development Commission* (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 983, 994 (multiplier of 1.5);
21 *Sternwest Com. v. Ash* (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 74, 75.

22 Counsel submits its fees are reasonable and in line with (or lower) than rates charged in the
23 community by attorneys with similar experience. (See Kuhn Decl. ¶¶ 19-26).

24 Moreover, the multiplier requested (to the extent the Court even deems such a lodestar
25 cross-check necessary) is within the range of what California and federal courts often apply in Class
26 Action cases. **Please Note:** there is no authority Plaintiff is aware of requiring a lodestar analysis in
27 a PAGA only matter, which is why Plaintiff cited to Class Action authority above. Moreover, the
28

1 results obtained here, including the average net recovery per PAGA Member exceed those normally
2 observed in PAGA only settlements. (See Kuhn Decl. ¶ 19(e)).

3 **4. Request for PAGA Representative Enhancement**

4 The named Plaintiffs request an enhancement payment of \$10,000 each (\$20,000 total) for their
5 service as the PAGA representatives and for recognition that they were also required to release all of
6 their underlying Labor Code claims via a full section 1542 release. There is no such restriction on the
7 other alleged aggrieved employees.

8 An enhancement is justified in light of the “reputational risk” that Plaintiffs assumed by
9 litigating claims against a former employer. *See Billingshausen v. Tractor Supply Co.*, 306 F.R.D. 245,
10 267-68 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (finding “personal detriment” upon testimony that future employers can easily
11 learn that a prospective employee served as a plaintiff through the internet).

12 Second, the separate settlement payment is reasonable because Plaintiffs “remained fully involved and
13 expended considerable time and energy during the course of the litigation.” *See In re Toys ‘R’ Us-Del FACTA*
14 *Litig.*, 295 F.R.D. at 471 (citation omitted). Plaintiffs devoted their time and effort toward assisting their attorneys
15 with the prosecution of the claims, and assisted counsel with finalizing the settlement. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 42).

16 The separate payment is also appropriate because Plaintiffs otherwise “will not gain any benefit beyond
17 that [he] would receive as an ordinary [Aggrieved Employee].” *In re Toys “R” Us FACTA Litig.*, 295 F.R.D. at
18 472; *Van Vranken*, 901 F. Supp. at 299 (holding that a substantial award is appropriate where a
19 [representative’s] claim made up “only a fraction of the common fund.”).

20 Lastly, because PAGA is a “type of qui tam action,” it is appropriate for the Plaintiffs to receive
21 a modest additional payment from the settlement as a “bounty” for their special effort in vindicating
22 the State’s interests by enforcing its labor laws. *See Iskanian*, 59 Cal. 4th at 382 (“A PAGA
23 representative action is therefore a type of qui tam action.”); *see also People ex rel. Strathmann v.*
24 *Acacia Research Corp.*, 210 Cal. App. 4th 487, 500 (2012) (“The person who brings the qui tam
25 action, called the ‘relator,’ stands in the shoes of the People of the State of California, who are deemed
26 to be the real party in interest . . . The relator in a qui tam action under section 1871.7 does not
27
28

1 personally recover damages but, if successful, receives [a portion] of the recovery as a bounty.”)
2 (internal citations omitted).

3 The Plaintiffs each contributed extensive time and resources in the prosecution of this cases.
4 (Kuhn Decl. ¶¶42-45; Heather Davis Decl. ¶75).

5 Here, by "sticking out their neck out" as PAGA Representatives in a publicly filed lawsuit,
6 Plaintiffs took a substantial risk that may adversely impact their ability to work in this field in the
7 future. Any company who does a detailed background check, will be able to determine that Plaintiffs
8 asserted legal claims against their former employer. An entire industry exists that allows employers
9 to run extensive background searches on potential employees. Companies who provide these services
10 specifically highlight the fact that their services allows employers to weed out litigious employment
11 candidates. (Kuhn Decl. ¶¶ 43-45).

12 Plaintiffs also risked personally owing a large cost award, into the tens of thousands of dollars,
13 had their claims been unsuccessful. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 46).

14 The enhancement also recognizes that although this involves a PAGA only settlement,
15 Plaintiffs agreed to release all claims (e.g., a full 1542 release) as a part of the proposed settlement.
16 (**Exhibit 1: “Release of PAGA Claims”** ¶ 18). In addition to the PAGA claims, Plaintiffs possessed
17 individual Labor Code violations that were required to be released as a result of this settlement. All
18 other employees are subjected to a limited release of PAGA claims only.

19
20 **5. CAC Services Group, LLC Will Serve as the Settlement Administrator**

21 The parties have agreed to engage CAC Services Group, LLC (“CAC”) as the Settlement
22 Administrator. CAC has agreed to carry out all Administration duties for an amount not to exceed
23 **\$7,600.00**. (Kuhn Decl. ¶48; **Exhibit 1: ¶20**).

24 CAC has extensive experience acting as a Settlement Administrator and is prepared to carry
25 out all Settlement Administration duties consistent with the parties Agreement and the Final Order of
26 this Court. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 49).

27 **E. THE LWDA WAS NOTIFIED MULTIPLE TIMES, AND DOES NOT OBJECT**

28 On **May 28, 2025**, Plaintiffs’ Counsel gave notice of the instant Settlement to the LWDA.

1 (Kuhn Decl., ¶5). To date, Plaintiffs' counsel has not received notice that the LWDA would intervene.
2 (*Id.*)

3 On **July 22, 2025**, Plaintiffs' counsel uploaded via the LWDA's electronic filing portal the
4 Settlement Agreement. (Kuhn Decl., ¶6). To date, Plaintiffs' counsel has not received notice that the
5 LWDA would intervene. (*Id.*)

6 On **August 14, 2025**, Plaintiffs' counsel uploaded via the LWDA's electronic filing portal
7 copies of this Motion, including the Notice, this supporting Memorandum, Declaration, and Proposed
8 Order & Judgment. (Kuhn Decl., ¶7). To date, Plaintiffs' counsel has not received any opposition from
9 the LWDA. (*Id.*).

10 To date, Plaintiff has not received a response from the LWDA regarding the proposed
11 settlement. If the LWDA contacts Plaintiff's counsel at any time prior to the September 19, 2025
12 hearing, Plaintiff's counsel will provide an updated declaration to the Court. (Decl. Kuhn ¶40).

13 **V. CONCLUSION**

14 The parties respectfully request that the Court approve their settlement and proposed allocation
15 of PAGA penalties to the LWDA and the represented employees.

16
17 Dated: August 14, 2025

SULLIVAN & YAECKEL LAW GROUP, APC

18
19 _____
20 Eric K. Yaeckel
21 Ryan T. Kuhn
22 Attorneys for Plaintiffs MARCELINO ORTUNO and
23 BRIAN DE LA ROSA, both in a Representative
24 capacity only, and on behalf of other members of the
25 general public similarly situated
26
27
28