Barbara DuVan-Clarke (State Bar No. 259268)
BDC@blackstonepc.com
Danielle L. GruppChang (State Bar No. 313881)
dgruppchang@blackstonepc.com
P.J. Van Ert (State Bar No. 234858)
pjvanert@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
Lizeth Marin (State Bar No. 360465)
lmarin@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiff BLANCA OLIVAREZ, individually, and on behalf of Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BLANCA OLIVAREZ, individually, and on behalf of Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COMERICA MANAGEMENT CO., INC., a Michigan corporation; FIFTH THIRD BANK, N.A., an Ohio corporation; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-24-613901

Honorable Jeffrey S. Ross
Department 613

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT, PAGA COUNSEL FEES PAYMENT, PAGA COUNSEL LITIGATION EXPENSES PAYMENT, AND ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES PAYMENT

Date:	December 18, 2026
Time:	9:00 a.m.
Department:	613
Complaint Filed:	April 12, 2024
FAC Filed:	November 10, 2026
Trial Date:	Not Set

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on December 18, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. in Department 613 of the above-captioned Court located at the Civic Center Courthouse, 400 McAllister Street, San Francisco, California 94102, Plaintiff Blanca Olivarez ("Plaintiff") will and hereby does move the Court for an Order granting approval of the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA") settlement. Specifically, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter an Order:

1. Granting approval pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2) of the PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement") attached as **Exhibit 3** to the Declaration of Lizeth Marin in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement and Award of PAGA Counsel Fees Payment, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and Administration Expenses Payment ("Marin Decl.");
2. Directing the distribution of the Gross Settlement Amount of One Million Four Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,400,000.00) pursuant to the terms of the Agreement;
3. Approving the Net Settlement Amount, estimated to be Eight Hundred Ninety Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty Five Dollars and Seventy Five Cents ($899,765.75), of which seventy-five percent (75%) will be distributed to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and twenty-five percent (25%) of which will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees;
4. Approving an award of reasonable attorneys' fees of one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $466,666.67 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $1,400,000.00) to PAGA Counsel;
5. Approving the amount of Twenty Six Thousand Five Hundred Seventy Seven and Fifty Eight Cents ($26,577.58) to PAGA Counsel for reimbursement of actual litigation expenses payment pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(k)(1);
6. Appointing CPT Group, Inc. as the Administrator; and

///

7. Approving an award of Six Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents ($6,990.00) in anticipated costs to CPT Group, Inc. for its settlement administration services.

In accordance with California Labor Code sections 2699 *et. seq*., on November 13, 2026, a copy of the proposed Settlement Agreement was submitted to the LWDA via online submission through the LWDA's website. (Marin Decl., ¶ 24 and Exh. 4).

This Motion is based upon this Notice, the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declarations of Lizeth Marin, Plaintiff Blanca Olivarez, the Administrator (Julie Green of CPT Group, Inc.), and Bennett Berger, the pleadings and other records on file with the Court in this matter, and any other further evidence or argument that the Court may properly receive at or before the hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 13, 2026

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

By: Lizeth Marin
Lizeth Marin
Attorney for Plaintiff Blanca Olivarez

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND 2

III. THE SETTLEMENT TERMS 5

A. Definition of the Aggrieved Employees 5

B. Amount of Settlement 5

C. Allocation and Funding of the Gross Settlement Amount 5

IV. STANDARD FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT 7

V. THE AGREEMENT IS FAIR AND SHOULD BE APPROVED 9

A. The Agreement is Presumed to Be Fair 9

B. The Agreement is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable in Light of the Parties' Respective Legal Positions and Recovery Risks 9

1. Strength of Plaintiff's Case 10

2. Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation 12

3. The Benefits Conferred by the Agreement Balance in Favor of Approval 12

4. The Scope of the Release is Narrowly Tailored 14

5. Experience and Views of Counsel Favor Approval 14

6. The Extent of Discovery and Stage of Proceedings Favor Approval 15

VI. THE REQUESTED PAGA COUNSEL FEES PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE 15

VII. THE REQUESTED PAGA COUNSEL LITIGATION EXPENSES PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE 20

VIII. THE ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE 20

IX. CONCLUSION 21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Sup. Ct., 46 Cal.4th 993 (2009) 8

Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2, 163 Cal.App.4th 1157 (2008) 11

Arias v. Sup. Ct., 46 Cal.4th 969 (2009) 9

Arias, 46 Cal. 4th, at 987 14

Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp. 480 F.Supp. 1195 (S.D.N.Y. 1979) 18

Bernstein v. Virgin Am., Inc., 3 F.4th 1127, 1144 (9th Cir. 2021) 11

Casida v. Sears Holdings Corp., 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9302 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2012) 7

Chu v. Wells Fargo Investments, LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15821 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2011) 14

City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp., 495 F.2d 448, 455 & n.2 (2nd Cir. 1974) 13

Clark v. Am. Residential Servs. LLC, 175 Cal. App. 4th 785 (2009) 9

Consumer Privacy Cases, 175 Cal.App.4th 545 (2009) 17

DCH Auto Wage and Hour Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4833 14

Elliot v. Spherion Pac. Work, LLC, 572 F.Supp.2d 1169 (C.D. Cal. 2008) 10

Franco v. Ruiz Food Prods., 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 169057 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2021) 14

Garcia v. Gordon Trucking, Inc., 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 160052 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2012) 14

In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig., 526 F.Supp. 494 (D.D.C. 1981) 17

In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig., 654 F.3d 935, 942 (9th Cir. 2011) 17

In re TD Ameritrade Account Holder Litig., 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 103222 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 12, 2011) 7

Ketchum v. Moses (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1138 19

Ketchum v. Moses, 24 Cal.4th 1122 (2001) 17

Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc. (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116 10

Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc., 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016) 16, 17

Lealao v. Beneficial Cal., Inc., 82 Cal.App.4th 19 (2000) 16, 17

Lealao, 82 Cal.App.4th at 47-48 19

Linney, 151 F.3d at 1239 15

Mallick v. Sup. Ct., 89 Cal.App.3d 434 (1979) 9
Maria P. v. Riles, 43 Cal.3d 1281 (1987) 16
Mendez v. Tween Brands, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66454 (E.D. Cal. June 30, 2010) 8
Ochoa-Hernandez v. Cjaders Foods, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32774 (Apr. 2, 2010) 8
Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com., 688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982) 7, 12
Sandoval v. Roadlink United States Pac., Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 130378, at 26 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2011) 15
Schiller v. David's Bridal, Inc., 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80776 (E.D. Cal. June 11, 2012) 14
Serrano v. Priest, 20 Cal.3d 25 (1977) 16
Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Management, Inc., 203 Cal.App.4th 1112 (2012) 11
Westside Community for Independent Living, Inc. v. Obledo, 33 Cal.3d 348 (1983) 16
Williams v. Superior Court, 3 Cal. 5th 531 (2017) 15

Statutes

California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*. ..... i, 1
Labor Code ("Lab. Code") § 2699(l) 7, 13
Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq* 14

Other Authorities

Newberg on Class Actions 18
Newberg on Class Actions 4th (4th ed. 2002) § 14.6 18
Weil and Brown, California Practice Guide, *Civil Procedure Before Trial* 17

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA"), Plaintiff Blanca Olivarez ("Plaintiff") seeks approval of the PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement") entered into with Defendant Comerica Management Co., Inc. ("Comerica") and Fifth Third Bank, N.A. ("Fifth Third Bank"), a successor by merger to Comerica Management Co., Inc. (together, "Defendants") (collectively, with Plaintiff, the "Parties"), which is attached as Exhibit 3 to the Declaration of Lizeth Marin in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement, PAGA Counsel Fees Payment, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and Administration Expenses Payment ("Marin Decl."). The Agreement terms are outlined as follows:

- Gross Settlement Amount: One Million Four Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,400,000.00).
- PAGA Counsel Fees Payment: Attorneys' fees of one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $466,666.67 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $1,400,000.00), to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.
- PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment: Reimbursement of actual litigation costs and expenses in the amount of Twenty Six Thousand Five Hundred Seventy Seven Dollars and Fifty Eight Cents ($26,577.58) to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.
- Administration Expenses Payment: Six Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents ($6,990.00), to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.
- Estimated Net Settlement Amount: Eight Hundred Ninety Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty Five Dollars and Seventy Five Cents ($899,765.75), of which 75% ($674,824.32), will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and the remaining 25% ($224,941.44), will be paid to the Aggrieved Employees.

As set forth herein, the Settlement Agreement is the product of informed discovery, arms-length negotiations, and provides a fair, adequate, and reasonable recovery for the State of California and Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiff therefore respectfully requests that the Court grant approval of the proposed Settlement Agreement, among other requested relief.

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Defendant Comerica was a major U.S. financial services companies and Fifth Third Bank is a successor by merger to Comerica. (Marin Decl., ¶ 2). Defendant Comerica employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt Retail Personal Banker II from approximately April 2022 to September 2025. (Marin Decl., ¶ 2; Declaration of Blanca Olivarez in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement, PAGA Counsel Fees Payment, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and Administration Expenses Payment ["Olivarez Decl."], ¶ 2).

On September 5, 2023, Plaintiff provided written notice by electronic submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendant Comerica, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3, of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendant Comerica. (Marin Decl., ¶ 3 and Exh. 1).

On April 12, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq.* in the action entitled *Blanca Olivarez v. Comerica Management Co, Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case No. CGC-24-613901 ("Action"). (Marin Decl., ¶ 4). The Action asserts a single cause of action for civil penalties under PAGA for violations of multiple provisions of the California Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders. (Ibid).

On July 29, 2024, Defendant Comerica filed a Motion to Compel Arbitration("Motion to Compel Arbitration") and supporting documents, which sought an order to compel Plaintiff to arbitrate her individual PAGA claim and to stay the representative PAGA claim in Court. (*Id*., ¶ 5).

On August 15, 2024, Plaintiff filed an Opposition to Defendant Comerica's Motion to Compel Arbitration and supporting documents. (*Id*., ¶ 6).

On August 21, 2024, Defendant filed a Reply in support of its Motion to Compel Arbitration and supporting documents. (*Id*., ¶ 7).

On August 28, 2024, the Motion to Compel Arbitration evidentiary hearing was heard before Judge Andrew Y.S. Cheng. (*Id*., ¶ 8). The Court heard testimony from Plaintiff and considered all briefing, documentary evidence, testimony, oral arguments, and proposed orders on the motion. (Ibid).

///

On September 6, 2024, the Court entered an Order Granting Motion to Compel Arbitration, which granted Defendant Comerica's Motion to Compel Arbitration of Plaintiff's individual PAGA claim and stayed the representative PAGA claim in the Court during the pendency of the arbitration. (*Id*., ¶ 9).

On October 4, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Demand for Arbitration against Comerica before the American Arbitration Association ("AAA"), Case No. 01-24-0008-0878 ("Arbitration Case"). (*Id*., ¶ 10). The Arbitration Case asserts individual wage-and-hour claims, unfair business practices based on the individual wage-and-hour claims, and an individual PAGA claim. (Ibid).

On February 18, 2025, Plaintiff filed an Amended Demand for Arbitration in the Arbitration Case. (*Id*., ¶ 11). The amended demand added FEHA-related claims, including disability discrimination, failure to accommodate, failure to engage in the interactive process, failure to prevent discrimination, and retaliation. (Ibid).

On April 21, 2025, Comerica served initial disclosures in the Arbitration Case. (*Id*., ¶ 12).

On December 3, 2025, the Parties participated in a formal mediation conducted by Eve Wagner ("Mediator"), a neutral and respected mediator with extensive experience in complex wage and hour matters, which did not result in a settlement at that time. (*Id*., ¶ 13).

On February 27, 2026, Plaintiff filed a Second Amended Demand for Arbitration in the Arbitration Case. (*Id*., ¶ 14). The second amended demand added claims regarding whistleblower retaliation and wrongful termination. (*Id*., ¶ 14).

On March 10, 2026, Plaintiff served initial disclosures in the Arbitration Case. (*Id*., ¶ 15). On March 23, 2026, Plaintiff served supplemental initial disclosures in the Arbitration Case. (Ibid).

On March 26, 2026, after continued settlement negotiations and with the aid of the Mediator, the Parties reached a settlement of the Action and Arbitration Case. (*Id*., ¶ 16).

On August 21, 2026, Plaintiff provided an amended written notice by electronic submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendants, which added Fifth Third Bank as an employer and added specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendants. (*Id*., ¶ 17 and Exh. 2). Together, the September 5, 2023 notice and August 21, 2026 amended notice are referred to as the "PAGA Notice". (*Id*., ¶ 17).

On September 21, 2026, the Parties executed the Settlement Agreement. (*Id*., ¶ 18 and Exh. 3).

On November 10, 2026, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq*. ("Operative Complaint") in the Action, which added factual allegations reflecting Plaintiff's status as a former employee to support her waiting time penalties allegation that Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due in accordance with California Labor Code section 203, and a claim regarding an alleged failure to pay sick leave at the correct rate of pay. (*Id*., ¶ 19).

During the course of formal discovery in Plaintiff's Arbitration Case and informal discovery in connection with mediation, PAGA Counsel conducted an intense investigation into the facts of the Action. This included obtaining data, information, and documents relating to the underlying alleged violations, including, but not limited to, a random fifteen percent (15%) sampling of Aggrieved Employees' time and pay data, relevant wage and hour policies, Plaintiff's employee file, and Aggrieved Employees' data points so that Plaintiff could assess the number of alleged potential violations and value of the recoverable penalties, as well as evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of her claims. (*Id*., ¶ 20).

Based on the data, information, and documents received, as well as thorough discussions with Defendants' counsel, PAGA Counsel was able to (i) determine the total number of distinct individuals falling within the definition of "Aggrieved Employees" for the relevant statutory period, (ii) the number of affected pay periods at issue among them, and (iii) construct a damages model that calculated the maximum realistic amount of PAGA penalties that could be levied against Defendants within the relevant statutory period. (*Id*., ¶ 21). Defendants, however, disputed Plaintiff's claims and disputed both the existence of and extent of liability as alleged by Plaintiff, which allowed PAGA Counsel to further assess the strength of Plaintiff's claims. (Ibid). PAGA Counsel's experience in litigating similar representative wage and hour claims, the degree of investigation that was conducted here, and the amount of data, information, and documents that was obtained, was sufficient to determine the potential value of the PAGA claims, and to evaluate the strength of these claims for purposes of settlement. (Ibid).

The Parties believe the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. (*Id*., ¶ 22). The Parties understand, acknowledge, and agree that the Settlement Agreement constitutes a compromise of Plaintiff's PAGA claims, and that it is the desire and intention of the Parties to affect a final and complete resolution of the Action. (Ibid).

Defendants deny all claims in the Action, and do not waive, but rather expressly reserve, all rights to challenge all such claims and allegations upon all legal, procedural, and factual grounds should the Agreement not become final. (*Id*., ¶ 23). The Agreement reflects a compromise reached to end litigation in the Action. (Ibid). Following significant investigation and extensive settlement negotiations, Plaintiff now seeks approval of the proposed Settlement Agreement, which will resolve all representative claims alleged in the Action. (Ibid).

III. THE SETTLEMENT TERMS

A. Definition of the Aggrieved Employees

For purposes of settlement only, the Parties have agreed that the "Aggrieved Employees" shall be defined as "all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant Comerica Management Co., Inc. in California during the PAGA Period." (Marin Decl., ¶ 25; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 1.4). The "PAGA Period" is the period from September 5, 2022 through March 31, 2026. (Marin Decl., ¶ 25; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 1.20). There are approximately one thousand (1,000) Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of fifty thousand pay periods for Defendant Comerica in California for at least one day during the PAGA Period ("PAGA Pay Periods"). (Marin Decl., ¶ 25; Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 1.19 and 4.1).

B. Amount of Settlement

The Parties have agreed to settle the PAGA claims at issue in the Action for a non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount of One Million Four Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,400,000.00). (Marin Decl., ¶ 26; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 1.12).

C. Allocation and Funding of the Gross Settlement Amount

The Gross Settlement Amount is a common fund and therefore includes all requested costs, fees, and other allocations. (Marin Decl., ¶ 26). The Gross Settlement Amount includes: (1) attorneys' fees up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $466,666.67); (2) attorneys' actual

litigation costs and expenses in the amount of Twenty Six Thousand Five Hundred Seventy Seven and Fifty Eight Cents ($26,577.58); and (3) Administration Expenses Payment, in the amount of Six Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents ($6,990.00). (Marin Decl., ¶ 26; Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 3.2.1 and 3.2.2).

After the above-estimated amounts are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the Net Settlement Amount will amount to Eight Hundred Ninety Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty Five Dollars and Seventy Five Cents ($899,765.75), of which seventy-five percent (75%), or Six Hundred Seventy Four Thousand Eight Hundred Twenty Four Dollars and Thirty Two Cents ($674,824.32), will be paid to the LWDA ("LWDA PAGA Payment"), and twenty-five percent (25%), or Two Hundred Twenty Four Thousand Nine Hundred Forty One Dollars and Forty Four Cents ($224,941.44), will be distributed and paid to Aggrieved Employees on a *pro rata* basis based on their number of PAGA Pay Periods. (Marin Decl., ¶ 27; Settlement Agreement ¶¶ 1.15, 3.2.3, and 3.2.3.1).

Within twenty-one (21) calendar days after entry of the Court Approval Order and Judgment, Defendants, through Defense Counsel, will deliver to the Administrator each Aggrieved Employee's (i) full name; (ii) last known mailing address; (iii) Social Security number; and (v) number of PAGA Pay Periods (collectively, "Aggrieved Employee Data"). (Marin Decl., ¶ 28; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 1.5 and 4.2).

Within fourteen (14) calendar days of the Effective Date, Defendants will transmit the Gross Settlement Amount to a qualified settlement account established by the Administrator. (Marin Decl., ¶ 29; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 4.3)

Within fourteen (14) calendar days after Defendants fund the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will distribute the Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment, and the PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. (Marin Decl., ¶ 30; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 4.4). Disbursement of the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment shall not precede disbursement of the Individual PAGA Payments. (Marin Decl., ¶ 30; Settlement Agreement, ¶4.4).

Each Individual PAGA Payment check will be valid for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days from the date the checks are mailed, and thereafter, will be voided and cancelled. (Marin Decl.,

¶ 31; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 4.4.1). Any funds associated with such canceled checks will be distributed by the Administrator to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Aggrieved Employee(s). (Marin Decl., ¶ 31; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 4.4.3).

If the actual number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by the Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period grows by more than ten percent (10%), or more than a total of 55,000 PAGA Pay Periods (50,000 plus 5,000), Defendants shall increase the Gross Settlement Amount by the percentage increase in the number of PAGA Pay Periods above 10% (e.g., if the number of PAGA Pay Periods increases by 11%, the Gross Settlement Amount will increase by 1%). (Marin Decl., ¶ 32; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 7.1).

IV. STANDARD FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT

The settlement of a PAGA claim requires court approval. (California Labor Code ("Lab. Code") § 2699(s)(2)). The Court must be mindful that a "[s]ettlement is a compromise, which balances the possible recovery against the risks inherent in litigating further." (*In re TD Ameritrade Account Holder Litig.*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 103222 at *24 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 12, 2011)). "[T]he very essence of a settlement is ... 'a yielding of absolutes and an abandoning of highest hopes,'" as "it is the very uncertainty of outcome in litigation and avoidance of wasteful and expensive litigation that induce consensual settlements." (*Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com.*, 688 F.2d 615, 624-26 (9th Cir. 1982)). As such, "the settlement or fairness hearing is not to be turned into a trial or rehearsal for trial on the merits," or "judged against a hypothetical or speculative measure of what might have been achieved." (Ibid).

Although the California Labor Code does not set forth the criteria by which a PAGA settlement is to be evaluated, it is presumed that a reviewing court may take into consideration some of the factors that courts use when reviewing a class action settlement. However, "a PAGA claim asserted on a non-class representative basis...is not considered a class action but a law enforcement action, and therefore does not have to meet the requirements of [a class action]." (*Casida v. Sears Holdings Corp.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9302 at *8 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2012)).

A court's review of a PAGA settlement necessarily implicates the following unique features that render the approval process distinct from approval of a class action settlement under Code of Civil

Procedure Section 382 and California Rules of Court Rule 3.769. First, in evaluating the adequacy of the settlement amount, the Court's focus is not concerned with the amount aggrieved employees are to receive, but rather, must focus on the total settlement amount in achieving PAGA's objective. Indeed, "[t]he remedy sought in a PAGA suit consists of civil penalties, not individual or class damages," and while a "[PAGA] action is ... designed to protect the public and penalize the employer for past illegal conduct," a reviewing court must be mindful of the fact that settlement of a PAGA claim involves a compromise. (*Mendez v. Tween Brands, Inc.*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66454 at *11 (E.D. Cal. June 30, 2010)). "Unlike class actions, these civil penalties are not meant to compensate unnamed employees because the action is fundamentally a law enforcement action." (*Ochoa-Hernandez v. Cjaders Foods, Inc.*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32774 at *12 (Apr. 2, 2010)). The Court should not lose sight of the fact that, "[u]nlike a class action seeking damages or injunctive relief for injured employees, the purpose of PAGA is to incentivize private parties to recover civil penalties for the government that otherwise may not have been assessed and collected by overburdened state enforcement agencies." (Ibid).

Second, consistent with the fact that unnamed employees have no property interest in a PAGA claim, "[u]nnamed employees need not be given notice of the PAGA claim, nor do they have the ability to opt-out of the representative PAGA claim." (*Ochoa-Hernandez*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32774 at *13). Indeed, "[PAGA] does not create property rights or any other substantive rights" as "[i]t is simply a procedural statute allowing an aggrieved employee to recover civil penalties – for Labor Code violations – that otherwise would be sought by state labor law enforcement agencies." (*Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Sup. Ct.*, 46 Cal.4th 993, 1003 (2009)). This renders the approval process of a PAGA settlement distinct from a class action settlement, as there is no need for the Court to employ the "two-step approval process" required under California Rules of Court Rule 3.769.

Finally, unlike class action settlements, the scope of release permitted in a PAGA settlement is limited. While "judgment in [a PAGA] action is binding not only on the named employee plaintiff but also on government agencies and any aggrieved employee not a party to the proceeding...the nonparty employees, because they were not given notice of the action or afforded any opportunity to

be heard, would not be bound by the judgment as to remedies other than civil penalties." (*Arias v. Sup. Ct*., 46 Cal.4th 969, 985-87 (2009)). Thus, the scope of a release in a PAGA settlement is confined to the PAGA penalties alleged in the complaint and/or the plaintiff's notice to the LWDA and to the claims that were, or could have been, alleged pursuant to PAGA based on the factual allegations in the complaint and/or the plaintiff's notice to the LWDA. In the case at hand, as the only claims at issue are PAGA claims, those will be the only claims extinguished through the Settlement.

V. THE AGREEMENT IS FAIR AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

A. The Agreement is Presumed to Be Fair

California courts recognize that "a presumption of fairness exists where . . . [a] settlement is reached through arm's-length bargaining." (*Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.,* 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245 (2001); *see also Clark v. Am. Residential Servs. LLC*, 175 Cal. App. 4th 785, 799 (2009)). Here, the Agreement is presumptively fair because: (1) it occurred after counsel for the Parties engaged in significant investigation to evaluate the strength and potential value of the PAGA claims, and the risks of litigating these claims through trial; and (2) it was negotiated at great length and effort by counsel with significant experience in similar complex labor and employment matters. (Marin Decl., ¶ 33).

B. The Agreement is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable in Light of the Parties' Respective Legal Positions and Recovery Risks

In deciding whether to approve a proposed settlement, a trial court has broad powers to determine if it is fair given the circumstances of the case. (*Mallick v. Sup. Ct.*, 89 Cal.App.3d 434, 438 (1979)). In exercising these powers, the overriding concern is to ensure that a proposed settlement is "fair, adequate, and reasonable." (*Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801 (internal quotations omitted)). A settlement is not judged against what might have been recovered had a plaintiff prevailed at trial, nor does the settlement have to obtain one hundred percent of the damages sought to be fair and reasonable. (*Wershba*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 246, 250). In evaluating the reasonableness of a settlement, a trial court must consider "the strength of plaintiffs' case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and views of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to

the proposed settlement."[1] (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 128 (2008)). Even though a *Kullar* analysis is not required for approval of a PAGA settlement, a brief analysis is included to support approval of the Settlement Agreement. (*See* Marin Decl., ¶¶ 39-55).

These factors require balancing and are non-exhaustive. Trial courts should therefore tailor the factors to each case and give due regard to "what is otherwise a private consensual agreement between the parties." (*Dunk, supra,* 48 Cal. App. 4th at 1801).

1. Strength of Plaintiff's Case

In order to prevail at trial, Plaintiff would have to prove violations of the California Labor Code underlying her PAGA claims, demonstrate that Aggrieved Employees suffered, and demonstrate that Defendants' conduct gives rise to penalties. (*See Elliot v. Spherion Pac. Work, LLC*, 572 F.Supp.2d 1169, 1181-82 (C.D. Cal. 2008) ["Plaintiff's claim under [PAGA] is wholly dependent upon her other claims. Because all of Plaintiff's other claims fail as a matter of law, so does her PAGA claim."]).

Here, Plaintiff's core allegations are that Defendants systematically violated the California Labor Code by, *inter alia,* failing to properly pay wages for all hours worked, failing to pay overtime, premiums, and sick leave at the correct rate, failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, failing to maintain accurate payroll records, failing to provide accurate wage statements, and failing to reimburse necessary business expenses. (Marin Decl., ¶ 34).

Defendants maintained several defenses to Plaintiff's theories of liability, which, if successfully argued and proven, had the potential to eliminate or substantially reduce recovery. (*Id*., ¶ 35). Throughout this litigation, Defendants maintained, and continue to maintain, that they had, and continue to have, compliant employment policies and practices throughout the time period at issue. (Ibid). Defendants deny that they ever violated any provision of the California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, those sections for which Plaintiff seeks penalties under PAGA. (Ibid). Defendants further denied, and continue to deny, that the lawsuit is appropriate for representative treatment for

[1] As this is not a class action, the *Kullar* factors pertaining to the risk of maintaining class action status through trial and the reaction of class members to the proposed settlement are inapplicable.

any purpose other than settlement. (Ibid). Defendants also challenged Plaintiff's standing as an aggrieved employee and denied that any of Defendants' other employees whom Plaintiff seeks to represent are aggrieved. (Ibid).

Defendants also argued that an important feature of PAGA is that the Court retains discretion to lower the penalties if, based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is "unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory." (Ibid; Lab. Code § 2699(e)(2); *see also Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Management, Inc.*, 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1136 (2012) [holding that a court may reduce the amount of PAGA penalties awarded to an employee based upon discretionary factors]).

Even if violations of the California Labor Code occurred, which Defendants deny, Defendants contended that said violations would only be considered "initial violations" and thus heightened "subsequent violation" penalties were not warranted. (Marin Decl., ¶ 36; Lab. Code § 2699(f)(2); *see also Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2*, 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1208-09 (2008) ["Until the employer has been notified that it is violating a Labor Code provision [...], the employer cannot be presumed to be aware that its continuing underpayment of employees is a 'violation' subject to penalties."]).

Defendants also contended that, with respect to PAGA claims, the Court was unlikely to assess cumulative penalties for the maximum number of possible, separate California Labor Code violations, because it would be unjust, arbitrary, oppressive, and/or confiscatory, especially where certain conduct may be regulated by multiple provisions of the California Labor Code that are interrelated and work in tandem. (Marin Decl., ¶ 37). While the PAGA does provide the potential for a heightened penalty for subsequent violations, courts are often hesitant to award a heightened penalty where there is no prior citation by the Labor Commissioner, as is the case here. (*See Bernstein v. Virgin Am., Inc.*, 3 F.4th 1127, 1144 (9th Cir. 2021) (holding no heightened penalty where defendant was not notified by Labor Commissioner or any court that it was subject to the California Labor Code)). The Ninth Circuit's holding in *Bernstein* also supports that a settlement valuation that does not "stack" penalties. (Ibid).

///

///

While Plaintiff maintains that her PAGA claims have merit, in reaching the Agreement, Plaintiff and her counsel took into account the strengths and weaknesses of each side's position, and the uncertainty of how the case might have concluded as litigation continued, at trial, and/or upon appeal. (Marin Decl., ¶ 38). Based on these disputes, which had the potential to completely eliminate Plaintiff's recovery, the range of realistic "litigation outcomes" on Plaintiff's PAGA claims was defined by a "maximum possible liability" amount of approximately $19,959,900 and a "risk-adjusted realistic value" amount of approximately $1,496,993. (*Id*., ¶ 55). In light thereof, the Gross Settlement Amount of $1,400,000 is a significant settlement. (Ibid).

2. Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation

Approval of the Settlement Agreement is also appropriate in light of the risk, expense, and complexity of further litigation. As discussed above, the Settlement Agreement takes into consideration the specific factual and legal hurdles faced by Plaintiff in establishing Defendants' penalty-liability in this case, which may have resulted in a net-zero recovery. Any recovery on these claims is not certain. And even when liability is found, PAGA claims are discretionary, such that the Court could decline to award their full value. Some of Plaintiff's claims are also derivative, and as such, Plaintiff must prevail on her underlying California Labor Code claims in order to prevail on the derivative claims. These risks – when balanced with the fact that the Agreement achieved a very significant recovery (as demonstrated below), and that further litigation posed a risk of diminishing such recovery by increasing litigation expenses – weigh strongly in favor of settlement approval.

3. The Benefits Conferred by the Agreement Balance in Favor of Approval

The Settlement Agreement provides a *significant* monetary benefit that falls well within the range of an acceptable settlement under the circumstances, which is the standard on which the instant Agreement must be judged. As held by the Ninth Circuit: "The proposed settlement is not to be judged against a hypothetical or speculative measure of what might have been achieved by the negotiators." (*Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 688 F.2d at 625 (emphasis in original)). As the Second Circuit has pointed out: "The fact that a proposed settlement may only amount to a fraction of the potential recovery does not, in and of itself, mean that the proposed settlement is grossly inadequate and should be disapproved." (*City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.*, 495 F.2d 448, 455 & n.2 (2nd Cir.

1974)).

The Net Settlement Amount is currently estimated to be Eight Hundred Ninety Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty Five Dollars and Seventy Five Cents ($899,765.75). After all deductions are made from the Gross Settlement Amount for the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment, Six Hundred Seventy Four Thousand Eight Hundred Twenty Four Dollars and Thirty Two Cents ($674,824.32) (i.e. 75% of the Net Settlement Amount) will go to the LWDA, and Two Hundred Twenty Four Thousand Nine Hundred Forty One Dollars and Forty Four Cents ($224,941.44), (i.e. 25% of the Net Settlement Amount) will go to the Aggrieved Employees, as required by California Labor Code § 2699(i) in effect at the time of this matter ("civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: 75 percent to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency . . . and 25 percent to the aggrieved employees."). (Marin Decl., ¶ 56). There is no reason to doubt the fairness of the proposed plan of allocation of the Net Settlement Amount as it fully complies with current California Labor Code section 2699(m). (Ibid).

The Settlement Agreement is a compromise of highly disputed claims. (*Id*., ¶ 57). Plaintiff and her counsel recognize the expense and length of continued proceedings necessary to litigate the matter through trial and any possible appeals. (Ibid). Plaintiff and her counsel have also taken into account the uncertainty and risk of the outcome of further litigation, and the difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation. (Ibid). Plaintiff and her counsel are also aware of the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability, both generally and in response to Defendants' defenses thereto, and the difficulties in establishing Defendants' liability for, and the right to recover, penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and other Aggrieved Employees. (Ibid). Plaintiff and her counsel have also taken into account Defendants' agreement to enter into a settlement that confers significant relief upon the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California. (Ibid). Considering all of the facts in this case, Plaintiff and her counsel have determined that the Agreement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the PAGA claims, and that it is in the best interests of the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California. (Ibid).

///

The result achieved in this case is well within the range of what is considered an acceptable settlement under the circumstances, especially when compared to the settlement of PAGA claims in other cases. (*Id*., ¶ 58). (*See, e.g., DCH Auto Wage and Hour Cases,* Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4833 (May 2017) [approving $15,000 out of $4 million toward settlement of PAGA claims]; *Garcia v. Gordon Trucking, Inc.,* 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 160052, at *9 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2012) [approving $10,000 out of $3.7 million toward settlement of PAGA claims]; *Schiller v. David's Bridal, Inc.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80776, at *40 (E.D. Cal. June 11, 2012) [approving $7,500 out of $518,245 toward settlement of PAGA claims]; *Chu v. Wells Fargo Investments, LLC,* 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15821, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2011) (approving $10,000 out of $6.9 million toward settlement of PAGA claims]; *Franco v. Ruiz Food Prods.,* 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 169057, at *14 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2021) [approving $10,000 out of $2.5 million toward settlement of PAGA claims]). Here, the value obtained for settlement of the PAGA claims is significant, and it will be distributed in accordance with and in fulfillment of the objectives of the PAGA statute.

4. The Scope of the Release is Narrowly Tailored

As discussed above, the California Supreme Court has concluded that in the context of PAGA "the nonparty employees, because they were not given notice of the action or afforded any opportunity to be heard, would not be bound by the judgment as to remedies other than civil penalties." (*See Arias*, 46 Cal. 4th, at 987). Thus, the scope of the limited release provided in exchange for the foregoing consideration is limited to the civil penalties asserted in the Operative Complaint and/or the PAGA Notice, under California Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* (*See* Settlement Agreement, at ¶ 5).

As such, this factor balances strongly in favor of approval of the Agreement.

5. Experience and Views of Counsel Favor Approval

PAGA Counsel is experienced in complex representative and class action wage-and-hour litigation. (Marin Decl., ¶ 64). In the view of PAGA Counsel, the benefits conferred by the Agreement are eminently fair and reasonable, and in the best interests of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees in light of the risk, delay, and uncertainty of continued litigation and the substantial monetary benefits provided for by the Agreement. (*Id*., ¶ 59). Furthermore, courts have acknowledged that "the interests of a plaintiff, counsel, and other potentially aggrieved employees are largely aligned.

All stand to gain from proving as convincingly as possible as many Labor Code violations as the evidence will sustain[.]" (*Williams v. Superior Court*, 3 Cal. 5th 531, 548-549 (2017) [citing Labor Code § 2699(g)(l)(i)]).

6. The Extent of Discovery and Stage of Proceedings Favor Approval

In evaluating this element, the Court should be mindful that "'formal discovery is not a necessary ticket to the bargaining table'" [*Linney v. Cellular Alaska P'ship*, 151 F.3d 1234, 1239], as the relevant consideration is "whether 'the parties have sufficient information to make an informed decision about settlement.'" (*See Sandoval v. Roadlink United States Pac., Inc.*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 130378, at 26 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2011)).

Here, the extent of formal discovery in Plaintiff's arbitration proceeding and informal discovery in connection with mediation conducted was sufficient to enable PAGA Counsel to evaluate the strength and value of the PAGA claims for purposes of settlement. (Marin Decl., ¶ 60). Prior to mediation, Defendants provided Plaintiff with data, information, and documents relating to the underlying alleged violations, including, but not limited to, a random fifteen percent (15%) sampling of Aggrieved Employees' time and pay data, relevant wage and hour policies, Plaintiff's employee file, and Aggrieved Employees' data points. (*Id*., ¶ 20). As discussed above, PAGA Counsel's investigation was sufficient to, among other things, tabulate with precision the total number of alleged California Labor Code violations at issue during the relevant statutory period and identify the total number of individuals falling within the definition of "Aggrieved Employees" for the relevant statutory period. (*Id*., ¶ 21).

Based on PAGA Counsel's experience litigating wage and hour claims, such investigation was sufficient to determine the potential value of the PAGA claims, and to evaluate the strength of these claims for purposes of settlement. (Ibid).

VI. THE REQUESTED PAGA COUNSEL FEES PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE

As the prevailing party in settlement, Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorneys' fees for bringing her PAGA claims. (Lab. Code § 2699(k) ["Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."]). PAGA Counsel is also entitled to attorneys'

fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5(a), as the instant action has resulted in the enforcement of important rights benefitting the public and secures monetary recovery for the State of California as well as the Aggrieved Employees. A fee award is justified where the legal action has produced its benefits by way of a voluntary settlement. (*See, e.g., Maria P. v. Riles*, 43 Cal.3d 1281, 1290-91 (1987); *Westside Community for Independent Living, Inc. v. Obledo*, 33 Cal.3d 348, 352-53 (1983); *Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal.3d 25, 34 (1977) ["when a number of persons are entitled in common to a specific fund, and an action brought by a plaintiff ... for the benefit of all results in the creation or preservation of that fund, such plaintiff ... may be awarded attorney's fees out of the fund."]).

In *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 506 (2016), the California Supreme Court confirmed that "[t]he percentage of fund method survives in California class action cases." Specifically, the *Laffitte* Court held:

> The recognized advantages of the percentage method-including relative ease of calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better approximation of market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement it provides counsel to seek an early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging the litigation-convince us the percentage method is a valuable tool that should not be denied our trial courts.

(*Id.*, at 503 [internal citation omitted]).

While trial courts have discretion to apply either a lodestar method or percentage-of-the-fund method, the California Supreme Court has taken the position that trial courts also "retain the discretion to forgo a lodestar cross-check and use other means to evaluate the reasonableness of a requested percentage fee." (*Lafitte*, 1 Cal.5th at 506; *see also Wershba*, 91 Cal.App. 4th at 253). Courts award fees to serve as an economic incentive for lawyers to undertake litigation, and thereby enhance and facilitate access to the judicial system for adjudication of meritorious claims, and to deter wrongdoing. This is especially true in situations where multiple similar alleged wrongs would not be economically feasible to pursue individually, such as here. 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*., 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 41 (2000); *see also Laffitte,* l Cal.5th at 506 [holding that "trial court did not abuse its discretion in using [the percentage of fund method],

in part to approve the fee request"]). 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*, 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132 (2001)).

The percentage method is particularly appropriate where a monetary settlement has been recovered and "the benefit [recovered can be] easily quantified." (*In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 654 F.3d 935, 942 (9th Cir. 2011)). Where the amount of a settlement is a "certain or easily calculable sum of money," California courts may calculate attorneys' fees as a reasonable percentage of the settlement created. (Weil and Brown, California Practice Guide, *Civil Procedure Before Trial,* Chapter 14, section 14:145; *Dunk, supra,* 48 Cal. App. 4th at 1808). The percentage fee method is preferred in representative actions because "it better approximates the workings of the marketplace than the lodestar approach." (*Lealao, supra,* 82 Cal.App.4th at 49). California law provides that the award for attorneys' fees should be equivalent to fees freely negotiated in the legal marketplace and paid in comparable litigation based on the result achieved and risk incurred. (*See Lealao,* 82 Cal.App.4th at 47-50; *Laffitte,* 1 Cal.5th 480 at 503). In cases where the settlement agreement provides that the defendant will pay the plaintiffs' attorneys a percentage of the fund created by the settlement, use of that percentage method is appropriate. (*Lealao,* 82 Cal.App.4th at 32). Fee awards that are too small will "chill the private enforcement essential to the vindication of many legal rights and obstruct the representative actions that often relieve the courts of the need to separately adjudicate numerous claims." (*Id.* at 53). Therefore, fees in representative actions should approximate the probable terms of a contingent fee contract negotiated by a sophisticated attorney and client in comparable litigation. (*Id.* at 48). "The ultimate goal ... is the award of a 'reasonable' fee to compensate counsel for their efforts, irrespective of the method of calculation." (*Consumer Privacy Cases*, 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 557-58 (2009) [quoting *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Superior Court, supra,* 126 Cal.App.4th at 1270]).

PAGA Counsel's application for attorneys' fees in light of the facts and circumstances surrounding the case is within the range of reasonableness. Historically, courts have awarded fees as high as fifty percent (50%) of the settlement in complex actions, depending on the circumstances of the case. (*See In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.*, 526 F.Supp. 494 (D.D.C. 1981) [awarding attorneys'

fees in the amount of 45% of the $7.3 million total settlement amount]; *Beech Cinema, Inc. v. Twentieth-Century Fox Film Corp.* 480 F.Supp. 1195 (S.D.N.Y. 1979) [awarding approximately 53% of the settlement as attorneys' fees]).

Here, PAGA Counsel's request up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $466,666.67 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $1,400,000.00) is fair and reasonable based on the percentage of the recovery method. PAGA Counsel has vigorously litigated this case since it was commenced, with the very real possibility of an unsuccessful outcome and no fee recovery of any kind. (Marin Decl., ¶ 61). Counsel for Plaintiff undertook significant investigation and invested a significant amount of time analyzing relevant documents and data to evaluate the nature and extent of the alleged underlying California Labor Code violations and calculation of the potential monetary recovery as they relate to Plaintiff's PAGA claims under PAGA. (*Id*., ¶ 65-66). PAGA Counsel possesses combined extensive experience litigating wage and hour and other complex litigation matters, and the attorneys who worked on this matter have been approved as class counsel and/or have had their billable rates approved in the settlement of other class and PAGA actions, numerous times. (*Id*., ¶ 64).

In cases where a common fund analysis is not used, once the court establishes the lodestar amount, it should adjust the fee award by a multiplier in order to make an appropriate fee award. (*Serrano III, supra,* 20 Cal.3d at 48). In applying the multiplier, *Newberg on Class Actions* states that "[m]ultiples ranging from one to four frequently are awarded in common fund cases when the lodestar method is applied. A large common fund award may warrant an even larger multiplier." (4 *Newberg on Class Actions* 4th (4th ed. 2002) § 14.6).

In *Lealao,* the court held that trial courts should award lodestar fees by examining the percentage-of-the-benefit and adjusting the lodestar calculation accordingly. (*Id.* at 49 and 53). The court indicated that this is an upward adjustment and should be akin to a contingency fee recovery; the court stated, "[a]n adjustment reflecting the amount of the class recovery is not significantly different from an adjustment reflecting a percentage of that amount; and California courts have evaluated a lodestar as a percentage of the benefit." (*Id.* at 46). The *Lealao* method appears particularly appropriate because class and/or representative actions generally are contingency fee cases

for plaintiffs - and the class and/or representative action clients do not expect to pay an hourly fee.

The rationale of *Lealao* comports with the purpose of the multiplier. The multiplier is "primarily to compensate the attorney for the prevailing party at a rate reflecting the risk of nonpayment in contingency cases." (*Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1138). The *Lealao* court reasoned:

> Given the unique reliance of our legal system on private litigants to enforce substantive provisions of law through class and derivative actions, 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 marketplace, as it will otherwise be economic for defendants to increase injurious behavior. It has therefore been urged (most persistently by Judge Richard Posner) that in defining a reasonable fee in such representative actions, the law should mimic the market.
>
> In the class action context, that would mean attempting to award the fee that informed private bargaining, if it were truly possible, might have reached. The simplest way for the law to duplicate the bargain that informed parties would reach if agency costs were low is to look to fee award levels in actions brought by sophisticated private parties under the same or comparable statutes.

(*Lealao,* 82 Cal.App.4th at 47-48 (internal citations and quotations omitted)). The court added:

> [T]rial judges need the flexibility *Serrano III* provides, as it enables them to relate fee awards to the economic realities that determine the efficacy of the private enforcement contemplated by our civil justice system.
> Accordingly, we hold that, in cases in which the value of the class recovery can be monetized with a reasonable degree of certainty and it is not otherwise inappropriate, a trial court has discretion to adjust the basic lodestar through the application of a positive or negative multiplier where necessary to ensure that the fee awarded is within the range of fees freely negotiated in the legal marketplace in comparable litigation.

(*Id.* at 49-50).

In the present case, PAGA Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained. (Marin Decl., ¶ 62). PAGA Counsel is experienced in complex wage-and-hour litigation and used that experience to obtain a favorable result for Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California. (Ibid). Based on the reasonable hourly rates suggested by PAGA Counsel and the collective hours worked in this matter, the requested fee award would represent a multiplier of 2.15 over the current total fee lodestar. Considering the amount of fees requested, work performed, risks incurred, and experience of PAGA Counsel in handling similar matters, Plaintiff maintains that the requested attorneys' fees of one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $466,666.67 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $1,400,000.00) are

reasonable and should be awarded. (Ibid).

VII. THE REQUESTED PAGA COUNSEL LITIGATION EXPENSES PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE

The Agreement provides for reimbursement of PAGA Counsel's actual litigation expenses up to the amount of Thirty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($35,000.00). (Marin Decl., ¶ 67; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.1)). However, PAGA Counsel only seeks reimbursement of a total of Twenty Six Thousand Five Hundred Seventy Seven Dollars and Fifty Eight Cents ($26,577.58) in litigation costs and expenses. (Marin Decl., ¶ 67 and Exh. 7). Accordingly, PAGA Counsel respectfully requests that the Court reimburse it for actual litigation costs and expenses in the amount of Twenty Six Thousand Five Hundred Seventy Seven Dollars and Fifty Eight Cents ($26,577.58)

VIII. THE ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE

As set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Parties have agreed to retain, subject to approval by the Court, CPT Group, Inc., to handle the administration of the Agreement. (Marin Decl., ¶ 70; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 1.2). While the Settlement Agreement allocates up to Nine Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($9,000.00) for the Administration Expenses Payment, the fees and expenses of the Administrator are estimated not to exceed Six Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents ($6,990.00). (Marin Decl., ¶ 70; Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.2). These costs include, but are not limited to, expenses for preparing, printing, and mailing the Cover Letter and Individual PAGA Payment checks to the Aggrieved Employees, re-mailing the returned Individual PAGA Payment checks to any new addresses obtained, and handling inquiries from Aggrieved Employees regarding the Agreement, among other things. (Marin Decl., ¶ 70). Accordingly, the Court should grant approval of the Expenses Payment in the amount of Six Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents ($6,990.00) to CPT Group, Inc., a necessary third-party for handling the settlement process. (Ibid).

///

///

///

IX. CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court grant Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement, PAGA Counsel Fees Payment, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and Administration Expenses Payment and grant the relief requested herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 13, 2026

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

By: Lizeth Marin
Lizeth Marin
Attorney for Plaintiff Blanca Olivarez