

1 Raul Perez (SBN 174687)
Raul.Perez@capstonelawyers.com
2 Orlando Villalba (SBN 232165)
Orlando.Villalba@capstonelawyers.com
3 Helga Hakimi (SBN 257381)
Helga.Hakimi@capstonelawyers.com
4 Joey Parsons (SBN 340074)
Joey.Parsons@capstonelawyers.com
5 CAPSTONE LAW APC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1000
6 Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 556-4811
7 Facsimile: (310) 943-0396

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff Rose Watson

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

11 ROSE WATSON, as an aggrieved employee
pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act
12 (“PAGA”), on behalf of the State of California
and other non-party Aggrieved Employees,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 PRESSED JUICERY, INC., a Delaware
16 corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

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

Case No. 23CV011127

Assigned to the Hon. Jill H. Talley

**DECLARATION OF RAUL PEREZ IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR COURT
APPROVAL OF THE PARTIES’ PAGA
SETTLEMENT**

Date: September 6, 2024

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: Department 23

Complaint Filed: November 6, 2023

Trial Date: None Set

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

2

3
4
5
6
7

8
9
0
1
2

3
4
5
6
7
8

9
0
1
2

3
4
5
6

7
8

1 intimately familiar with Defendant's labor policies and practices, and over the course of multiple
2 interviews, knowledgeably summarized those policies and practices to Plaintiff's Counsel. During those
3 interviews, she explained how the policies and practices were instituted and provided valuable insight
4 into how they gave rise to the alleged Labor Code violations. Based on these interviews with Plaintiff,
5 Plaintiff's Counsel determined that there were legally sufficient grounds for pursuing an action against
6 Defendant.

7 7. Plaintiff's Counsel prepared a detailed letter (17 pages) to notify the LWDA of
8 Plaintiff's intent to seek civil penalties and other available relief recoverable under PAGA for Labor
9 Code violations. Significant research and effort were expended to prepare a PAGA notice that was
10 consistent with the developing legal requirements so as to withstand any challenge from Defendant
11 regarding the notice's sufficiency. And in preparation for drafting the complaint, Plaintiff's Counsel
12 conducted their own preliminary investigation into the factual bases for Plaintiff's claims, which entailed,
13 *inter alia*, a careful examination of Plaintiff's employment records.

14 8. In response to Plaintiff's informal discovery requests, Plaintiff's Counsel received a
15 considerable amount of documents and data, including employee demographic data, a sample of
16 Aggrieved Employees time records, and Defendant's California labor policies and procedures manuals
17 which covered a broad range of topics including, *inter alia*, employee clock-in policies and procedures,
18 attendance policies, meal periods/rest periods, overtime pay, etc. The document and data exchanges
19 allowed Plaintiff's Counsel to fully assess the nature and magnitude of the claims being settled, as well
20 as the impediments to recovery, and ultimately enabled Plaintiff's Counsel so as to make an independent
21 assessment of the reasonableness of the settlement's terms.

22 9. In summary, Plaintiff's Counsel performed a thorough investigation into the claims at
23 issue, which included: (1) determining Plaintiff's suitability through interviews, background
24 investigations, and analyses of her employment files and related records; (2) evaluating all of Plaintiff's
25 potential representative claims; (3) researching similar PAGA actions as to the claims brought, the nature
26 of the positions, and the type of employer; (4) analyzing a sample of Aggrieved Employees' time
27 records; (5) reviewing Defendant's labor policies and procedures manuals; (6) researching settlements in
28 similar cases; (7) evaluating Plaintiff's claims and estimating Defendant's liability for purposes of

1 settlement; (8) drafting the mediation brief; and (9) participating in the mediation.

2 10. By engaging in such a thorough investigation and evaluation of Plaintiff's PAGA
3 claims, Plaintiff's Counsel can opine that the Settlement, for the consideration and on the terms set forth
4 in the Settlement Agreement, is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interests of LWDA and
5 Aggrieved Employees in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant
6 delay and uncertainty associated with litigation, and various defenses asserted by Defendant.

7 **CAPSTONE LAW APC FIRM PROFILE**

8 11. Since its founding in 2012, Capstone has emerged as a major force in aggregate
9 litigation, making law on cutting-edge issues.

10 12. In February, 2015, Ryan H. Wu and I were honored with the *California Lawyer*
11 Attorney of the Year (CLAY) award in labor and employment for our work in the landmark case
12 *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014), which preserved the right of
13 California workers to bring representative actions under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act
14 ("PAGA") notwithstanding a representative action waiver in an arbitration agreement.

15 13. Recognized as a leading firm in the prosecution of PAGA enforcement actions,
16 Capstone is responsible for some of the most important decisions in this area. In *Williams v. Superior*
17 *Court (Marshalls of Calif.)*, 3 Cal.5th 531 (2017), Capstone attorneys achieved a watershed decision
18 before the California Supreme Court as to the broad scope of discovery in PAGA actions. In *Baumann v.*
19 *Chase Inv. Servs. Corp.*, 747 F.3d 1117 (9th Cir. 2014), a case of first impression, Capstone successfully
20 argued that PAGA actions are state enforcement actions not covered by the Class Action Fairness Act.

21 14. Capstone has made important contributions to consumer protection law. In *McGill v.*
22 *Citibank N.A.*, 2 Cal. 5th 945 (2017), Capstone represented plaintiffs in a major decision holding that the
23 right to seek public injunctive relief under the state's consumer protection laws cannot be waived and
24 that consumers need not satisfy class certification requirements to enjoin unfair business practices on
25 behalf of the public. In *Nguyen v. Nissan N.A.*, 726 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2019), Capstone attorneys reversed
26 a denial of class certification, making law that clarified the use of "benefit of the bargain" damages
27 models in consumer class actions.

28 15. Capstone served as class counsel in a number of significant wage and hour settlements,

1 including \$12 million on behalf of a nationwide class of in *Hightower v. JPMorgan Chase Bank*, Case
2 No. 11-01802 (C.D. Cal.), over \$10 million on behalf of non-exempt hourly workers in *Zamora v.*
3 *Balboa Life & Casualty LLC*, Case No. BC360026 (L.A. Super. Ct.); and \$9 million on behalf of
4 pharmacists in *Dittmar v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 14-1156 (S.D. Cal.). In *Vorise v. 24 Hour*
5 *Fitness USA, Inc.*, No. C 15-02051 (Contra Costa Super. Ct.), Capstone and co-counsel negotiated an
6 \$11 million PAGA settlement on behalf of over 36,000 employees for Labor Code violations.

7 16. Capstone has an established practice in automotive defect class actions and is currently
8 appointed sole class counsel, following contested class certification, in *Victorino v. FCA US, LLC*, No.
9 16-1617-GPC, 2019 WL 5268670 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2019) and *Salas v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A.,*
10 *Inc.*, No. 15-8629-FMO, 2019 WL 1940619 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2019).

11 17. Capstone has settled over 100 high-stakes class and representative actions. Capstone's
12 settlements have directly compensated hundreds of thousands of California workers and consumers.
13 Capstone's actions have also forced employers to modify their policies for the benefit of employees,
14 including changing the compensation structure for commissioned employees and changing practices to
15 ensure that workers will be able to take timely rest and meal breaks. A leader in prosecuting PAGA
16 enforcement actions, Capstone has secured millions of dollars in civil penalties for the State of
17 California.

18 18. The following is a representative sample of Capstone's settlements:

- 19 a. *Navarro v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, No. BC592098 (LA County
20 Superior Court): gross settlement of \$16.5 million on behalf of
21 approximately 180,000 non-exempt employees for wage and hour
22 violations;
- 23 b. *Hightower et al v. Washington Mutual Bank*, No. 2:11-cv-01802-PSG-
24 PLA (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$12 million on behalf of
25 approximately 150,000 personal bankers, tellers, sales associates, and
26 assistant branch manager trainees for wage and hour violations;
- 27 c. *Vargas v. Ford Motor Co.*, 12-08388-AB (C.D. Cal.): providing cash
28 payments and unique buyback program for nearly 2 million consumers;

- d. *Moore v. Petsmart, Inc.*, No. 5:12-cv-03577-EJD (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$10 million on behalf of over 19,000 non-exempt PetSmart employees for wage and hour violations;
- e. *Dittmar v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 14-1156 (S.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$9 million on behalf of approximately 1,200 pharmacists for wage and hour violations;
- f. *Perrin v. Nabors Well Services Co.*, No. 56-2007-00288718 (Ventura Super. Ct.): gross settlement of over \$6.5 million on behalf of oil rig workers for sleep time and other wage violations;
- g. *Cook v. United Insurance Co.*, No. C 10-00425 (Contra Costa Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$5.7 million on behalf of approximately 650 sales representatives;
- h. *Alvarez v. MAC Cosmetics, Inc.*, No. CIVDS1513177 (San Bernardino Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$5.5 million for approximately 5,500 non-exempt employees.
- i. *Aceves v. AutoZone, Inc.*, No. 14-2032 (C.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$5.4 million in a case alleging FCRA violations;
- j. *Berry v. Urban Outfitters Wholesale, Inc.*, No. 13-02628 (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$5 million on behalf of over 12,000 nonexempt employees;
- k. *The Children's Place Retail Stores Wage & Hour Cases*, No. JCCP 4790: gross settlement of \$5 million on behalf of 15,000 non-exempt employees;
- l. *York v. Starbucks Corp.*, Case No. 08-07919 (C.D. Cal.): gross settlement of nearly \$5 million on behalf of over 100,000 non-exempt workers for meal break and wage statement claims;
- m. *Rodriguez v. Swissport USA*, No. BC 441173 (Los Angeles Super. Ct.): gross settlement of nearly \$5 million on behalf of 2,700 non-exempt

employees following contested certification;

- n. *Asghari v. Volkswagen Group of North America*, Case No. 13-02529 (C.D. Cal.): Settlement providing complementary repairs of oil consumption defect, reimbursement for repairs, and extended warranty coverage of certain Audi vehicles valued at over \$20 million;
- o. *Klee v. Nissan of North America*, Case No. 12-08238 (C.D. Cal.): Settlement providing complimentary electric vehicle charging cards and extending warranty coverage for the electric battery on the Nissan Leaf valued at over \$10 million.

19. Attached as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of Capstone's firm resume.

ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS

20. I have reviewed a summary of the billing records for this action, which are maintained during the regular course of business and billed contemporaneously. The bill for attorneys' fees is summarized in the chart below:

Attorney	Title	CA Bar Yr.	Rate	Hours	Fees
Raul Perez	Partner	1994	\$950	19.6	\$18,620.00
Orlando Villalba	Senior Counsel	2004	\$700	36.5	\$25,550.00
Helga Hakimi	Senior Counsel	2008	\$650	30.9	\$20,085.00
Mao Shiokura	Senior Counsel	2009	\$625	20.3	\$12,687.50
Jezzette Ron	Associate	2021	\$425	56.2	\$23,885.00
Joey Parsons	Associate	2021	\$425	24.4	\$10,370.00
Total				187.9	\$111,197.50

21. While adjusting our rates to track market increases, Capstone's rates have steadily remained reasonable and competitive, and have been consistently approved by many federal and state courts over the past several years. *See, e.g., Madrigal v. Solage Management, Inc.*, No. CIV2100081 (Marin County Superior Court Dec. 5, 2023) (approving Capstone's rates for Associates (\$425-\$475) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$625-\$950)); *Juarez v. TWM/Fresno, LLC*, No. STK-CV-UOE-2022-0002562 (San Joaquin County Superior Court Nov. 16, 2023) (approving Capstone's rates for Associates (\$475) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$625-\$950)); *Jimenez v. Apple Core Enterprises, Inc.*, No. CIVSB2134762 (San Bernardino County Superior Court Nov. 7, 2023) (approving Capstone's rates

1 for Associates (\$425) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$625-\$950)); *Ortega v. Cirks Construction, Inc.*, No.
2 34-2022-00316370-CU-OE-GDS (Sacramento County Superior Court Oct. 4, 2023) (approving
3 Capstone's rates for Associates (\$475-\$500) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$600-\$950)); *Rodriguez v.*
4 *Imperial Western Products, Inc.*, No. CVRI2000071 (Riverside County Superior Court Sep. 20, 2023)
5 (approving Capstone's rates Senior Counsel/Partners (\$625-\$950)); *Garcia v. Barney's College, Inc.*,
6 No. RG21113350 (Alameda County Superior Court June 12, 2023) (approving Capstone's rates for
7 Associates (\$450-\$475) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$650 to \$950)); *Gonzaga v. Molina Healthcare,*
8 *Inc.*, No. 21STCV03598 (Los Angeles County Superior Court Feb. 2, 2023) (approving Capstone's rates
9 for Associates (\$475) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$625 to \$950)); *Amaral v. Unify Financial Credit*
10 *Union*, No. 20STCV36466 (Los Angeles County Superior Court Jan. 31, 2023) (approving Capstone's
11 rates for Associates (\$475) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$625 to \$950)); *Johnson v. Equity Residential*
12 *Services, LLC*, No. MSC19-02145 (Contra Costa County Superior Court Nov. 1, 2022) (approving
13 Capstone's rates for Associates (\$500) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$625 to \$950)); *Lopez v. Big Creek*
14 *Lumber Company*, No. 21CV-00613 (Merced County Superior Court Oct. 31, 2022) (approving
15 Capstone's rates for Associates (\$475) and Senior Counsel/Partners (\$625 to \$950)).

16 22. Other courts have approved hourly rates in this range for plaintiff's side law firms. *See*
17 *Marshall v. Northrup Grumman Corp.*, No. 16-cv-06794, 2020 WL 5668935, at *7 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 18,
18 2020) (approving attorney rates between \$490 and \$1,060 per hour); *Edwards v. First Am. Corp.*, No.
19 07-cv-03796, 2016 WL 8999934, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 4, 2016) (rates of up to \$990 found reasonable);
20 *Urakhchin v. Allianz Asset Mgmt. of Am., L.P.*, No. 15-cv-01614, 2018 WL 8334858, at *6 (C.D. Cal.
21 July 30, 2018) (approving billing rates between \$600 and \$825 per hour for attorneys with more than ten
22 years of experience, \$325 to \$575 per hour for attorneys with 10 or fewer years of experience, and \$250
23 per hours for paralegals and clerks); *Gutierrez v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 07-cv-05923, 2015 WL
24 2438274, at *5 (N.D. Cal. May 21, 2015) (rates ranging \$475-\$975 for partners, \$300-\$490 for
25 associates); *In re Toyota Motor Corp. Unint. Accel. Mktg., Sales Pracs., & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, No. 10-
26 ml-02151, 2013 WL 12327929, at *33 n.13 (C.D. Cal. July 24, 2013) (rates ranging from \$150-\$950);
27 *Hashemi v. Bosley, Inc.*, No. CV 21-946 PSG (RAOX), 2022 WL 18278431, at *10 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 21,
28 2022) (finding that, in Los Angeles, partners litigating class action matters have hourly rates ranging

1 from \$304 to \$965, and associates have hourly rates ranging from \$287 to \$719); *Alvarez v. Sirius XM*
2 *Radio Inc.*, No. CV 18-8605 JVS(SSX), 2021 WL 1234878, at *11 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2021) (finding
3 hourly rates ranging from \$450 for an associate to \$950 for a partner “are reasonable given prevailing
4 rates in the Los Angeles region”); *In re MacBook Keyboard Litig.*, No. 5:18-CV-02813-EJD, 2023 WL
5 3688452, at *15 (N.D. Cal. May 25, 2023) (approving rates in a class action of \$875–\$1,195 per hour for
6 partners; \$385–\$850 per hour for associates).

7 23. Finally, Capstone’s rates are in line with the adjusted Laffey Matrix, which is a fee scale
8 that courts often consult in determining the reasonableness of hourly rates. *See* Exhibit 3.

9 24. As summarized in the table below, counsel has incurred a total of \$13,652.34 in costs
10 and expenses to date.

11 Cost & Expense Categories	Amount
12 Court Fees, Courier Fees, Filings & Service of Process	\$2,320.01
13 Fountain Consulting (data analysis)	\$2,300.00
14 Mediation Fees	\$9,000.00
Research Services (PACER, Westlaw, etc.)	\$32.33
15 Total	\$13,652.34

16 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
17 true and correct. Executed this 21st day of June, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.


18 
19 Raul Perez

Exhibit 1

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

ROSE WATSON, as an aggrieved employee
pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act
("PAGA"), on behalf of the State of California
and other non-party Aggrieved Employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRESSED JUICERY, INC., a Delaware
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV011127

PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Subject to Court approval by the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Sacramento ("Court"), Plaintiff Rose Watson ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Pressed Juicery, Inc. ("Defendant") (collectively with Plaintiff, the "Parties") hereby agree to the following binding settlement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement") of the action entitled *Watson v. Pressed Juicery, Inc.*, No. 23CV011127 (Sacramento County Superior Court) (the "Action").

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions are applicable to this Settlement Agreement. Definitions contained elsewhere in this Settlement Agreement will also be effective:

1. "Action" means *Watson v. Pressed Juicery, Inc.*, No. 23CV011127 (Sacramento County Superior Court).
2. "Aggrieved Employees" means all persons who were employed by Defendant in California as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees at any time during the Settlement Period.
3. "Court" means the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Sacramento.
4. "Gross Settlement Amount" means the settlement amount of Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000) to be paid by Defendant in full satisfaction of all Settled Claims arising from the Action.
5. "LWDA" means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.
6. "PAGA Penalties Fund" means the Gross Settlement Amount less the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Service Award, and Settlement Administrator Costs.
7. "Plaintiff's Counsel" means Capstone Law APC.
8. "Service Award" means the amount to be paid to Plaintiff as payment for her service on behalf of the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees, and for a general release of all claims arising out of her employment with Defendant.
9. "Settled Claims" means any and all claims for PAGA civil penalties incurred during the Settlement Period under the California Labor Code, Wage Orders, regulations, and/or other provisions of law alleged to have been violated in the Action, and any and all claims that could have been alleged in the Action to have been violated during the Settlement Period based on the facts alleged in the Action

10. “Settlement Period” means September 1, 2022 through the earlier of August 1, 2024 or the date of entry of the Order and Judgment.

TERMS

11. Gross Settlement Amount. In consideration for Plaintiff’s promises and representations described in this Settlement Agreement, and subject to all of the conditions of the Settlement being met, Defendant will pay Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000) (“Gross Settlement Amount”) to settle the Action. The Gross Settlement Amount includes the Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, the Service Award, , Settlement Administration Costs, and payments to Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA for their share of the PAGA Penalties Fund. No portion of the Gross Settlement Amount will be retained by, or revert to, Defendant.

12. PAGA Penalties Fund. The PAGA Penalties Fund will be paid to Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA in full satisfaction of the Settled Claims. Pursuant to PAGA, Seventy-Five Percent (75%) of the PAGA Penalties Fund will be paid to the LWDA, and the remaining Twenty-Five Percent (25%) will be paid to all Aggrieved Employees according to the following formula:

12(a) Defendant will calculate: (i) the total number of pay periods worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the Settlement Period, and (ii) the total number of pay periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the Settlement Period.

12(b) To determine each Aggrieved Employee’s payment from the PAGA Penalties Fund, Defendant will use the following formula: Settlement Payment = 25% of PAGA Penalties Fund × [Pay Periods Worked by Individual Aggrieved Employee During the Settlement Period ÷ Total Pay Periods Worked by All Aggrieved Employees during the Settlement Period].

12(c) Plaintiff has entered into this Settlement based on Defendant’s representation that Aggrieved Employees worked during a combined total of approximately 41,000 pay periods from September 22, 2022 through April 4, 2024. If the actual number of pay periods worked by Aggrieved

1 Employees through April 4, 2024 is greater than 10% of this estimate, then
2 Defendant has the option to either: (i) agree to increase the Gross Settlement
3 Amount on a proportional basis above 10% (i.e., if there is an 11% increase
4 in the number of pay periods from September 22, 2022 through April 4,
5 2042, Defendant would agree to increase the Gross Settlement Amount by
6 1%); or (ii) end the Settlement Period on an earlier date in order to limit the
7 covered pay periods to 10% more than the estimate provided in lieu of
8 paying an increase to the Gross Settlement Amount.

9 13. Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendant agrees not to oppose or impede any application or
10 motion by Plaintiff's Counsel for Attorneys' Fees and Costs of not more than Two Hundred Thirty
11 Three Thousand Three Hundred Thirty Three Dollars (\$233,333), plus the reimbursement of all out-of-
12 pocket costs and expenses associated with Plaintiff's Counsel's litigation and settlement of the Action
13 (including expert/consultant fees, investigations costs, etc.), not to exceed Twenty Thousand Dollars
14 (\$20,000), both of which will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount (the "Attorneys' Fees and
15 Costs"). Any portion of the Attorneys' Fees and Costs not awarded to Plaintiff's Counsel will be added
16 to the PAGA Penalties Fund.

17 14. Service Award. For a general release of all claims Plaintiff may have against Defendant
18 arising out of her employment, and for her service on behalf of the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees,
19 Defendant agrees not to oppose or impede any application or motion by Plaintiff for a service award of
20 up to Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) ("Service Award"). Upon receipt of the Service Award, Plaintiff
21 will be deemed to have fully released and discharged Defendant from any and all claims, demands,
22 obligations, causes of action, rights, or liabilities of any kind or description which have been or could
23 have been asserted against Defendant including but not limited to those arising out of, or relating to,
24 Plaintiff's employment with Defendant or termination thereof and including but not limited to claims for
25 wages, restitution, penalties, retaliation, defamation, discrimination, harassment or wrongful termination
26 of employment. This release specifically includes any and all claims, demands, obligations and/or causes
27 of action of any kind including but not limited to those for damages, restitution, penalties, interest, and
28 attorneys' fees and costs (except provided by the Settlement), whether or not known or suspected to

1 exist, and whether or not specifically or particularly described herein. Specifically, Plaintiff will be
2 deemed to have waived all rights and benefits afforded by California Civil Code Section 1542, which
3 provides:

4 **A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR**
5 **OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR**
6 **HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF**
7 **KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR**
8 **HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.**

9 15. Plaintiff understands and agrees that this Settlement Agreement shall remain in full force
10 and effect even if the full amount or any amount of the Service Award sought by Plaintiff is not
11 ultimately awarded by the Court. Any portion of the Service Award not awarded by the Court will be
12 added to the PAGA Penalty Fund.

13 16. Settlement Administration Costs. The Parties will retain CPT Group, Inc. as the third-
14 party settlement administrator ("Settlement Administrator"). The Settlement Administrator will be
15 responsible for establishing a qualified settlement fund ("QSF") and issuing payments and appropriate
16 tax forms to Aggrieved Employees, the LWDA, Plaintiff, and Plaintiff's Counsel. The Settlement
17 Administration Costs will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Based on the estimate that there
18 are approximately One Thousand Eight Hundred (1,800) Aggrieved Employees as of April 4, 2024,
19 Settlement Administration Costs are estimated at Eleven Thousand Dollars (\$11,000).

20 17. Court Approval of the Settlement and Distribution of Settlement Payments. The Parties
21 will present this Settlement Agreement to the Court and the LWDA. The Parties will request that the
22 Court issue an order and judgment approving and incorporating by reference the terms and conditions of
23 the Settlement Agreement (the "Order and Judgment").

24 18. Funding of the Settlement. Defendant will fund the Gross Settlement Amount in three
25 installments. Within thirty (30) calendar days after entry of the Order and Judgment, Defendant will
26 deposit One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) into a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") to be
27 established by the Settlement Administrator. Within one hundred eighty (180) calendar days after entry
28 of the Order and Judgment, Defendant will deposit Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) into the

1 QSF to be established by the Settlement Administrator. Within three hundred sixty-five (365) calendar
2 days after entry of the Order and Judgment, Defendant will deposit Four Hundred Thousand Dollars
3 (\$400,000) into the QSF to be established by the Settlement Administrator. Within fourteen (14)
4 calendar days of the full funding of the Settlement, the Settlement Administrator will issue payments to:
5 (a) Aggrieved Employees; (b) the Labor and Workforce Development Agency; (c) Plaintiff; (d)
6 Plaintiff's Counsel; and (e) itself. The Settlement Administrator, and not Defendant, will issue the
7 appropriate tax forms for all payments issued under this Settlement.

8 19. List of Aggrieved Employees. Within thirty (30) calendar days after entry of the Order
9 and Judgment, Defendant will provide the Settlement Administrator a complete list of all Aggrieved
10 Employees ("Aggrieved Employee List"). The Aggrieved Employee List will be formatted in Microsoft
11 Office Excel and will include, to the extent known by Defendant, each Aggrieved Employees full name;
12 most recent mailing address and telephone number; Social Security number; the respective number of
13 pay periods during which each Aggrieved Employee worked during the Settlement Period; and any other
14 relevant information needed to calculate settlement payments.

15 20. Settlement Payments to Aggrieved Employees. The Settlement Administrator will issue
16 each Aggrieved Employee one check for his or her share of the PAGA Penalties Fund along with an
17 explanatory letter, attached as Exhibit A. Prior to mailing, the Settlement Administrator will perform a
18 search based on the National Change of Address Database for information to update and correct for any
19 known or identifiable address changes. Any checks returned as non-deliverable on or before the check
20 cashing deadline will be sent promptly via regular First-Class U.S. Mail to the forwarding address
21 affixed thereto. If no forwarding address is provided, the Settlement Administrator will promptly attempt
22 to determine the correct address using a skip-trace, or other search using the name, address or Social
23 Security number of the Aggrieved Employee involved, and will then perform a single re-mailing.
24 Checks will remain negotiable for 180 days. Those funds represented by un-cashed checks which remain
25 outstanding 180 days after the mailing of the Settlement checks by the Settlement Administrator will be
26 tendered to The Justice Gap Fund maintained by The State Bar of California or such other cy pres fund
27 as may be suggested and approved by the Court. All settlement payments to Aggrieved Employees will
28 be treated as miscellaneous income for which a 1099 will be issued.

21. Settled Claims. Upon entry of the Order and Judgment, Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees will be forever barred from pursuing against Defendant any and all Settled Claims during the Settlement Period. Aggrieved Employees, other than Plaintiff, will not be deemed to have released any individual non-PAGA wage and hour claims by virtue of this Settlement.

22. No Right to Exclusion or Objections by Representative Action Members. Because this settlement resolves claims and actions brought pursuant to PAGA by Plaintiff acting as a proxy and as a Private Attorney General of, and for, the State of California and the LWDA, the Parties agree that no Aggrieved Employee has the right to exclude himself or herself from the Settlement. Each Aggrieved Employee will be bound by the terms of the Settlement Agreement, upon its approval by the Court, regardless of whether he or she cashes any payment received as a result of this Settlement. The Parties also agree that no Aggrieved Employee has the right to object to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

23. No Credit Toward Benefit Plans. Payments to Aggrieved Employees as referenced herein will not be utilized to calculate any additional benefits under any benefit plans to which any Aggrieved Employee may be eligible, including, but not limited to profit-sharing plans, bonus plans, 401(k) plans, stock purchase plans, vacation plans, sick leave plans, PTO plans, and any other benefit plan. Rather, it is the Parties' intention that this Settlement Agreement will not affect any rights, contributions, or amounts to which any Aggrieved Employee may be entitled under any benefit plans.

24. No Prior Assignments. The Parties and their counsel represent, covenant, and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity any portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action or right herein released and discharged.

25. Nullification of Settlement Agreement. In the event that: (i) the Court does not approve the Settlement as provided herein; or (ii) the Settlement does not become final for any other reason, then this Settlement Agreement, and any documents generated to bring it into effect, will be null and void, and the Parties will be returned to their original respective positions.

26. Judgment and Continued Jurisdiction. After entry of the Order and Judgment, the Court will have continuing jurisdiction solely for purposes of addressing: (i) the interpretation and enforcement of the terms of the Settlement, (ii) settlement administration matters, and (iii) such post-Judgment matters

as may be appropriate under court rules or as set forth in this Settlement.

27. Entire Agreement. This Settlement Agreement constitutes the entirety of the Parties' settlement terms. No other prior or contemporaneous written or oral agreements may be deemed binding on the Parties.

28. Amendment or Modification. This Settlement Agreement may be amended or modified only by a written instrument, signed by either the Parties or their successors-in-interest or counsel for all Parties, and approved by the Court.

29. Authorization to Enter Into Settlement Agreement. Counsel for all Parties warrant and represent they are expressly authorized by the Parties whom they represent to negotiate this Settlement Agreement and to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Settlement Agreement to effectuate its terms and to execute any other documents required to effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts to affect the implementation of the Settlement. If the Parties are unable to reach agreement on the form or content of any document needed to implement the Settlement, or on any supplemental provisions that may become necessary to effectuate the terms of this Settlement, the Parties may seek the assistance of the Court to resolve such disagreement.

30. Binding on Successors and Assigns. This Settlement Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors or assigns of the Parties hereto, as previously defined.

31. California Law Governs. All terms of this Settlement Agreement will be governed by and interpreted according to the substantive laws of the State of California as applied without application of its conflict of laws provisions.

32. Execution and Counterparts. This Settlement Agreement is subject only to the execution of all Parties. The Settlement Agreement may be signed by electronic means. However, the Settlement Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts. All executed counterparts and each of them, including electronic signatures (e.g., DocuSign), facsimiles, and scanned copies of the signature pages, will be deemed to be one and the same instrument.

33. Acknowledgement that the Settlement is Fair and Reasonable. The Parties believe this Settlement Agreement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of the Action and have arrived at this

1 Settlement after arm's-length negotiations by experienced counsel.

2 34. Waiver of Certain Appeals. The Parties agree to waive appeals; except, however, that
3 Plaintiff may appeal any reduction to the Attorneys' Fees and Costs below the amount they request from
4 the Court, and either Party may appeal any court order that materially alters the Settlement's terms.
5 While Plaintiff may appeal any reduction to the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, any such reduction or appeal
6 shall not affect the validity or enforceability of this Agreement.

7 35. Invalidity of Any Provision. Before declaring any provision of this Settlement
8 Agreement invalid, the Court will first attempt to construe the provision as valid to the fullest extent
9 possible consistent with the Parties' intentions and applicable precedents so as to define all provisions of
10 this Settlement Agreement valid and enforceable.

11 36. Captions. The captions and section numbers in this Settlement Agreement are inserted
12 for the reader's convenience, and in no way define, limit, construe or describe the scope or intent of the
13 provisions of this Settlement Agreement.

14 37. Waiver. No waiver of any condition or covenant contained in this Settlement Agreement
15 or failure to exercise a right or remedy by any of the Parties hereto will be considered to imply or
16 constitute a further waiver by such party of the same or any other condition, covenant, right or remedy.
17 No provision of this Agreement may be waived except by written confirmation by the Party making the
18 waiver.

19 38. Mutual Preparation. The Parties have had a full opportunity to negotiate the terms and
20 conditions of this Settlement Agreement. Accordingly, this Settlement Agreement will not be construed
21 more strictly against one Party merely by virtue of the fact that it may have been prepared by counsel for
22 one of the Parties, it being recognized that, because of the arm's-length negotiations between the Parties,
23 all Parties have contributed to the preparation of this Settlement Agreement.

24 39. Representation By Counsel. The Parties acknowledge that they have been represented
25 by counsel throughout all negotiations that preceded the execution of this Settlement Agreement, and
26 that this Settlement Agreement has been executed with the consent and advice of counsel, and reviewed
27 in full.

28 40. Cooperation and Execution of Necessary Documents. All Parties will cooperate in good

1 faith and execute all documents to the extent reasonably necessary to effectuate the terms of this
2 Settlement Agreement.

3 41. Binding Agreement. The Parties warrant that they understand and have full authority to
4 enter into this Settlement, and further intend that this Settlement Agreement will be fully enforceable and
5 binding on all parties, and agree that it will be admissible and subject to disclosure in any proceeding to
6 enforce its terms, notwithstanding any mediation confidentiality provisions that otherwise might apply
7 under federal or state law.

8 42. Denial of Liability. The Parties expressly recognize that the making of this agreement
9 does not in any way constitute an admission or concession of wrongdoing on the part of Defendant.
10 Defendant specifically denies all claims in the Action and any all wrongdoing of any kind. Nothing in
11 this Settlement, nor any action taken in implementation thereof, nor any statements, discussions or
12 communications, nor any materials prepared, exchanged, issued or used during the pendency of the
13 Action, is intended by the Parties to, nor will any of the foregoing be introduced, be used or be
14 admissible in any way in any other judicial, arbitral, administrative, investigative or other forum or
15 proceeding, as evidence of any violation of any federal, state, or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation,
16 rule or executive order, or any obligation or duty at law or in equity. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this
17 Settlement Agreement may be used in any proceeding in the Court that has as its purpose the
18 interpretation, implementation, or enforcement of the Settlement or any orders or judgments of the Court
19 entered into in connection therewith.

20 **READ CAREFULLY BEFORE SIGNING**

21 **PLAINTIFF**

22 Dated: 5/13/2024

23 Rose Watson

DocuSigned by:

Rose Watson

DF636FAA37D84D9...

24 **DEFENDANT**

25 Dated: _____

26 Name of Authorized Signatory
27 Pressed Juicery, Inc.
28

1 faith and execute all documents to the extent reasonably necessary to effectuate the terms of this
2 Settlement Agreement.

3 41. Binding Agreement. The Parties warrant that they understand and have full authority to
4 enter into this Settlement, and further intend that this Settlement Agreement will be fully enforceable and
5 binding on all parties, and agree that it will be admissible and subject to disclosure in any proceeding to
6 enforce its terms, notwithstanding any mediation confidentiality provisions that otherwise might apply
7 under federal or state law.

8 42. Denial of Liability. The Parties expressly recognize that the making of this agreement
9 does not in any way constitute an admission or concession of wrongdoing on the part of Defendant.
10 Defendant specifically denies all claims in the Action and any all wrongdoing of any kind. Nothing in
11 this Settlement, nor any action taken in implementation thereof, nor any statements, discussions or
12 communications, nor any materials prepared, exchanged, issued or used during the pendency of the
13 Action, is intended by the Parties to, nor will any of the foregoing be introduced, be used or be
14 admissible in any way in any other judicial, arbitral, administrative, investigative or other forum or
15 proceeding, as evidence of any violation of any federal, state, or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation,
16 rule or executive order, or any obligation or duty at law or in equity. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this
17 Settlement Agreement may be used in any proceeding in the Court that has as its purpose the
18 interpretation, implementation, or enforcement of the Settlement or any orders or judgments of the Court
19 entered into in connection therewith.

20 **READ CAREFULLY BEFORE SIGNING**

21 **PLAINTIFF**

22 Dated: _____

23 _____
Rose Watson

24 **DEFENDANT**

DocuSigned by:

25 Dated: 5/15/2024 _____

26 *Deborah Moroz* _____


27 _____
28 Name of Authorized Signatory
Pressed Juicery, Inc.

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM

CAPSTONE LAW APC

Dated: 5/13/2024


Raul Perez

MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP

Dated: _____

Kevin Gaut

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM

CAPSTONE LAW APC

Dated: _____

Raul Perez

Dated: 5/15/2024

MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP
DocuSigned by:
Kevin Gaut
4A0FCB410F5747A...

Kevin Gaut

Exhibit A

<<DATE>>

<<FIRST_NAME>> <<LAST_NAME>>

<<ADDRESS 1>>

<<ADDRESS 2>>

**Re: Payment From *Watson v. Pressed Juicery, Inc.*,
No. 23CV011127 (Sacramento County Superior Court)**

Dear <<FIRST_NAME>> <<LAST_NAME>>:

Enclosed you will find a check made payable to you. This is your payment from the settlement of the lawsuit entitled *Watson v. Pressed Juicery, Inc.*, No. 23CV011127 (Sacramento County Superior Court) (the “Action”).

The Action was filed against Defendant Pressed Juicery, Inc. (“Defendant”) pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 *et seq.* (called “PAGA”). The Action was brought by a former employee of Defendant on behalf of the State of California and all allegedly “aggrieved employees” of Defendant. You have been identified as one of the employees on whose behalf the case was brought.

The Plaintiff in the Action claimed that Defendant owed civil penalties recoverable under PAGA for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and California Wage Orders. Defendant denies that it violated the Labor Code or California Wage Orders. Moreover, in agreeing to this settlement, Defendant does not admit that it is liable in any way for any penalties.

The Court has not ruled on the merits of the Action but it has approved the settlement of PAGA civil penalties, of which 75% will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and the remaining 25% will be paid to aggrieved employees. Pursuant to the settlement, enclosed is a check for your share of a portion of the civil penalties.

Aggrieved employees, other than Plaintiff, will not be deemed to have released any individual non-PAGA wage and hour claims based on alleged violations of the Labor Code or of a California Wage Order, for which they have a private right of action, by virtue of the Settlement.

You are not a party to this lawsuit, but you and the government will be bound by the settlement in this matter as to PAGA civil penalties and you will not be able to bring PAGA claims within the scope of the Settlement. If you have any questions, you can contact the settlement administrator (whose contact information is at the top of this letter).

Very Truly Yours,

[Administrator]

Exhibit 2

FIRM PROFILE

Capstone Law APC is one of California's largest plaintiff-only labor and consumer law firms. Since its founding in 2012, Capstone has emerged as a major force in aggregate litigation, making law on cutting-edge issues and obtaining over two hundred million dollars in recovery for employees and consumers:

- In February, 2015, Capstone attorneys Raul Perez and Ryan H. Wu were honored with the *California Lawyer* Attorney of the Year (CLAY) award in labor and employment for their work in the landmark case *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014), which preserved the right of California workers to bring representative actions under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") notwithstanding a representative action waiver in an arbitration agreement.
- Recognized as a leading firm in the prosecution of PAGA enforcement actions, Capstone is responsible for some of the most important decisions in this area. In *Williams v. Superior Court (Marshall's of Calif.)*, 3 Cal.5th 531 (2017), Capstone attorneys achieved a watershed decision before the California Supreme Court as to the broad scope of discovery in PAGA actions. In *Baumann v. Chase Inv. Servs. Corp.*, 747 F.3d 1117 (9th Cir. 2014), a case of first impression, Capstone successfully argued that PAGA actions are state enforcement actions not covered by the Class Action Fairness Act.
- Capstone has made important contributions to consumer protection law. In *McGill v. Citibank N.A.*, 2 Cal. 5th 945 (2017), Capstone represented plaintiffs in a major decision holding that the right to seek public injunctive relief under the state's consumer protection laws cannot be waived and that consumers need not satisfy class certification requirements to enjoin unfair business practices on behalf of the public. In *Nguyen v. Nissan N.A.*, 726 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2019), Capstone attorneys reversed a denial of class certification, making law that clarified the use of "benefit of the bargain" damages models in consumer class actions.
- Capstone served as class counsel in a number of significant wage and hour settlements, including \$12 million on behalf of a nationwide class of in *Hightower v. JPMorgan Chase Bank*, Case No. 11-01802 (C.D. Cal.), over \$10 million on behalf of non-exempt hourly workers in *Zamora v. Balboa Life & Casualty LLC*, Case No. BC360026 (L.A. Super. Ct.); and \$9 million on behalf of pharmacists in *Dittmar v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 14-1156 (S.D. Cal.). In *Vorise v. 24 Hour Fitness USA, Inc.*, No. C 15-02051 (Contra Costa Super. Ct.), Capstone and co-counsel negotiated an \$11 million PAGA settlement on behalf of over 36,000 employees for Labor Code violations.
- Capstone has an established practice in automotive defect class actions and is currently appointed sole class counsel, following contested class certification, in *Victorino v. FCA US, LLC*, No. 16-1617-GPC, 2019 WL 5268670 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2019) and *Salas v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.*, No. 15-8629-FMO, 2019 WL 1940619 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2019).

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT SETTLEMENTS

Since its founding, Capstone has settled over 100 high-stakes class and representative actions totaling well over \$200 million dollars. Capstone's settlements have directly compensated hundreds of thousands of California workers and consumers. Capstone's actions have also forced employers to modify their policies for the benefit of employees, including changing the compensation structure for commissioned employees and changing practices to ensure that workers will be able to take timely rest and meal breaks. A leader in prosecuting PAGA enforcement actions, Capstone has secured millions of dollars in civil penalties for the State of California.

The following is a representative sample of Capstone's settlements:

- *Hightower et al v. Washington Mutual Bank*, No. 2:11-cv-01802-PSG-PLA (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$12 million on behalf of approximately 150,000 personal bankers, tellers, sales associates, and assistant branch manager trainees for wage and hour violations;
- *Vargas v. Ford Motor Co.*, 12-08388-AB (C.D. Cal.): providing cash payments and unique buyback program for nearly 2 million consumers;
- *Moore v. Petsmart, Inc.*, No. 5:12-cv-03577-EJD (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$10 million on behalf of over 19,000 non-exempt PetSmart employees for wage and hour violations;
- *Dittmar v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 14-1156 (S.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$9 million on behalf of approximately 1,200 pharmacists for wage and hour violations;
- *Perrin v. Nabors Well Services Co.*, No. 56-2007-00288718 (Ventura Super. Ct.): gross settlement of over \$6.5 million on behalf of oil rig workers for sleep time and other wage violations;
- *Cook v. United Insurance Co.*, No. C 10-00425 (Contra Costa Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$5.7 million on behalf of approximately 650 sales representatives;
- *Alvarez v. MAC Cosmetics, Inc.*, No. CIVDS1513177 (San Bernardino Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$5.5 million for approximately 5,500 non-exempt employees.
- *Aceves v. AutoZone, Inc.*, No. 14-2032 (C.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$5.4 million in a case alleging FCRA violations;
- *Berry v. Urban Outfitters Wholesale, Inc.*, No. 13-02628 (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$5 million on behalf of over 12,000 nonexempt employees;
- *The Children's Place Retail Stores Wage & Hour Cases*, No. JCCP 4790: gross settlement of \$5 million on behalf of 15,000 nonexempt employees;
- *York v. Starbucks Corp.*, Case No. 08-07919 (C.D. Cal.): gross settlement of nearly \$5 million on behalf of over 100,000 non-exempt workers for meal break and wage statement claims;
- *Rodriguez v. Swissport USA*, No. BC 441173 (Los Angeles Super. Ct.): gross settlement of nearly \$5 million on behalf of 2,700 non-exempt employees following contested certification;
- *Asghari v. Volkswagen Group of North America*, Case No. 13-02529 (C.D. Cal.): Settlement providing complementary repairs of oil consumption defect, reimbursement for repairs, and extended warranty coverage of certain Audi vehicles valued at over \$20 million;
- *Klee v. Nissan of North America*, Case No. 12-08238 (C.D. Cal.): Settlement providing complimentary electric vehicle charging cards and extending warranty coverage for the electric battery on the Nissan Leaf valued at over \$10 million.

PROFESSIONAL BIOGRAPHIES

Partners

Rebecca Labat. Rebecca Labat is co-managing partner of Capstone Law APC, supervising the litigation for all of the firm's cases. She also manages the firm's co-counsel relationships and assists the firm's other partners and senior counsel with case management and litigation strategy. Under Ms. Labat's leadership, Capstone has successfully settled over 100 cases, delivering hundreds millions of dollars to California employees and consumers while earning statewide recognition for its cutting-edge work in developing new law.

Ms. Labat's career accomplishments representing consumers and employees in class actions include the certification of a class of approximately 3,200 current and former automobile technicians and shop employees for the miscalculation of the regular rate for purposes of paying premiums for missed meal and rest breaks.

Before her work representing plaintiffs in class and representative actions, Ms. Labat was an attorney with Wilson Elser and represented life, health, and disability insurers in litigation throughout California in both state and federal courts. She graduated from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 2002, where she was a member of the Hastings Civil Justice Clinic, served as a mediator in Small Claims Court for the City and County of San Francisco, and received the CALI Award for Excellence in Alternative Dispute Resolution. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of California, Los Angeles. Ms. Labat is a member of the National Employment Lawyers Association (NELA), the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles (CAALA), and the Beverly Hills Bar Association.

Raul Perez. Raul Perez is co-managing partner at Capstone, and has focused exclusively on wage and hour and consumer class litigation since 2011. Mr. Perez is the lead negotiator on numerous large settlements that have resulted in hundreds of millions to low-wage workers across California, including many of the most valuable settlements reached by Capstone.

During his career, Mr. Perez has successfully certified by way of contested motion and/or been appointed Lead Counsel or Interim Lead Counsel in several cases, including: *Lopes v. Kohl's Department Stores, Inc.*, Case No. RG08380189 (Alameda Super. Ct.); *Hightower v. JPMorgan Chase Bank*, Case No. 11-01802 (C.D. Cal.); *Tameifuna v. Sunrise Senior Living Managements, Inc.*, Case No. 13-02171 (C.D. Cal.) (certified class of over 10,000 hourly-paid employees); and *Berry v. Urban Outfitters Wholesale, Inc.*, Case No. 13-02628 (N.D. Cal.) (appointed lead counsel in a class action involving over 10,000 non-exempt employees). As the lead trial attorney in *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles*, 59 Cal. 4th 348 (2014), Mr. Perez, along with Mr. Wu, received the 2015 CLAY Award in labor and employment.

Mr. Perez received both his undergraduate degree and his law degree from Harvard University and was admitted to the California Bar in December 1994. Earlier in his career, Mr. Perez handled a variety of complex litigation matters, including wrongful termination and other employment related actions, for corporate clients while employed by some of the more established law firms in the State of California, including Morgan, Lewis & Bockius; Manatt Phelps & Phillips; and Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld. Before Capstone, Mr. Perez was a partner at another large plaintiff's firm, helping to deliver millions of dollars in relief to California workers.

Melissa Grant. Melissa Grant is a partner at Capstone. Ms. Grant is responsible for litigating many of the firm's most contentious and high-stakes class actions. The author of numerous successful motions for class

certification, Ms. Grant is the lead or co-lead attorney on multiplied certified class actions currently on track for trial, representing over 140,000 California employees in pursuing their wage and hour claims. She is also at the forefront in developing the law on PAGA, including administrative exhaustion, standing, the nature of PAGA violations, the scope of discovery, and trials.

Prior to joining Capstone, Ms. Grant worked at the Securities and Exchange Commission as a staff attorney in the Enforcement Division, investigating ongoing violations of federal securities regulations and statutes and for Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, where she was an associate on the trial team that prosecuted the *Mattel v. Bratz* case. Ms. Grant began her legal career as a law clerk to the Honorable Harry Pregerson, Justice of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals before joining Sidley & Austin as an associate. She graduated from Southwestern Law School in 1999, where she served as editor-in-chief of the Law Review, and graduated *summa cum laude* and first in her class. Ms. Grant earned her undergraduate degree from Cornell University, where she received the JFK Public Service Award and the Outstanding Senior Award. Her published articles include: *Battling for ERISA Benefits in the Ninth Circuit: Overcoming Abuse of Discretion Review*, 28 Sw. U. L. Rev. 93 (1998), and CLE Class Actions Conference (SF) CAFA: *Early Decisions on Commencement and Removal of Actions* (2006).

Ryan H. Wu. Ryan H. Wu is a partner at Capstone and is primarily responsible for complex motion work and supervising court approval of class action settlements. Mr. Wu handles many of the most challenging legal issues facing Capstone's clients, including the scope and operation of PAGA, contested attorneys' fees motions, responding to objectors, and high-impact appeals. Mr. Wu is responsible for the merits briefing in *McGill v. Citibank, N.A.*, 2 Cal. 5th 945 (2017), where the California Supreme Court unanimously held that consumers' right to pursue public injunctive relief cannot be impeded by a contractual waiver or class certification requirements. He briefed the closely-watched *Williams v. Superior Court (Marshalls of CA LLC)*, 3 Cal.5th 531(2017), an important pro-employee ruling that broadened the scope of discovery in PAGA actions and resolved a longstanding conflict regarding third-party constitutional privacy rights. He also authored the briefs in *Baumann v. Chase Inv. Servs. Corp.*, 747 F.3d 1117 (9th Cir. 2014), where, on an issue of first impression, the Ninth Circuit sided with Plaintiffs in holding that PAGA actions are state enforcement actions not covered by the CAFA. In February 2015, Mr. Wu, along with Mr. Perez, received the prestigious CLAY award for his successful appellate work, including briefing to the California Supreme Court, in *Iskanian*. Mr. Wu recently achieved an important consumer victory in *Nguyen v. Nissan N.A.*, 932 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2019), which clarified the use of "benefit of the bargain" damages models in consumer class actions.

Mr. Wu graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 2001, where he was an associate editor of the *Michigan Journal of Law Reform* and contributor to the law school newspaper. He received his undergraduate degree in political science with honors from the University of California, Berkeley. He began his career litigating international commercial disputes and commercial actions governed by the Uniform Commercial Code. Mr. Wu is co-author of "*Williams v. Superior Court: Employees' Perspective*" and "*Iskanian v. CLS Transportation: Employees' Perspective*," both published in the *California Labor & Employment Law Review*.

Robert Drexler. Robert Drexler is a partner with Capstone Law where he leads one of the firm's litigation teams prosecuting wage-and-hour class actions. He has more than 25 years of experience representing clients in wage-and-hour and consumer rights class actions and other complex litigation in state and federal courts. Over the course of his career, Mr. Drexler has successfully certified dozens of employee classes for claims such as misclassification, meal and rest breaks, and off-the-clock work, ultimately resulting in multi-million

dollar settlements. He has also arbitrated and tried wage-and-hour and complex insurance cases. Mr. Drexler has been selected as one of Southern California's "Super Lawyers" every year from 2009 through 2020.

Before joining Capstone, Mr. Drexler was head of the Class Action Work Group at Khorrami Boucher, LLP and led the class action team at The Quisenberry Law Firm. Mr. Drexler graduated from Case Western Reserve University School of Law, where he served as Managing Editor of the Case Western Reserve Law Review and authored Defective Prosthetic Devices: Strict Tort Liability for the Hospital? 32 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 929 (1982). He received his undergraduate degree in Finance at Ohio State University where he graduated *cum laude*. Mr. Drexler is a member of Consumer Attorneys of California (CAOC) and Consumer Attorneys of Los Angeles (CAALA). He has been a featured speaker at class action and employment litigation seminars, and has published articles in CAOC's Forum Magazine and The Daily Journal.

Jamie Greene. Jamie Greene is a partner with Capstone Law, where she leads the firm's business development and case generation team. Ms. Greene is responsible for evaluating all potential new cases and referrals, developing new claims, and managing the firm's client and cocounseling relationships. She also supervises the pre-litigation phase for all cases, including investigation, analysis, and client consultation.

Before joining Capstone, Ms. Greene began her legal career at Makarem & Associates representing clients in a wide array of cases ranging from wrongful death, insurance bad faith, employment, personal injury, construction defect, consumer protection, and privacy law. Ms. Greene is a graduate of the University of Southern California Gould School of Law and earned her bachelor's degree from Scripps College in Claremont, California.

Bevin Allen Pike. Bevin Allen Pike is a partner with Capstone Law, where she focuses primarily on wage-and-hour class actions. Ms. Pike has spent her entire legal career representing employees and consumers in wage-and-hour and consumer rights class actions. Over the course of her career, Ms. Pike has successfully certified dozens of employee and consumer classes for claims such as meal and rest breaks, unpaid overtime, off-the-clock work, and false advertising.

Before joining Capstone, Ms. Pike's experience included class and representative action work on behalf of employees and consumers at some of the leading plaintiffs' firms in California. Ms. Pike graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, where she was an Editor for the International and Comparative Law Review. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of Southern California. Ms. Pike has been selected as one of Southern California's "Super Lawyers – Rising Stars" every year from 2012 through 2015.

Senior Counsel

Theresa Carroll. Theresa Carroll is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. Her practice is devoted to the Appeals & Complex Motions team, working on various settlement and approval projects.

Prior to joining Capstone, Ms. Carroll was an associate with Parker Stanbury, LLP, advising small business owners on various employment matters and worked as an associate attorney for O'Donnell & Mandell litigating employment discrimination and sexual harassment cases. In 1995, she graduated from Southwestern University School of Law where she was on the trial advocacy team and was awarded the prestigious Trial Advocate of the Year award sponsored by the American Board of Trial Advocates (ABOTA) for Southwestern University School of Law. Ms. Carroll received her Bachelor of Science degree in speech with an emphasis in theatre from Iowa State University.

Liana Carter. Liana Carter is a senior counsel with Capstone Law APC, specializing in complex motions, writs, and appeals. Her work on recent appeals has included reversing a denial of class certification decision in *Brown v. Cinemark USA, Inc.*, No. 16-15377, 2017 WL 6047613 (9th Cir. Dec. 7, 2017), affirming a denial of a motion to compel arbitration in *Jacoby v. Islands Rests., L.P.*, 2014 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 4366 (2014) and reversal of a dismissal of class claims in *Rivers v. Cedars-Sinai Med. Care Found.*, 2015 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 287 (Jan. 13, 2015). Ms. Carter was responsible for drafting the successful petition for review in *McGill v. Citibank N.A.*, as well as the petition for review and briefing on the merits in *Williams v. Superior Court*, 2017 WL 2980258. Ms. Carter also has extensive prior experience in overseeing settlement negotiations and obtaining court approval of class action settlements.

Ms. Carter was admitted to the California bar in 1999 after graduating from the University of Southern California Gould School of Law, where she was an Articles Editor on the board of the *Southern California Law Review*. She received her undergraduate degree with honors from the University of California, Irvine.

Anthony Castillo. Anthony Castillo is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. His practice focuses on analyzing and developing pre-litigation wage-and-hour and consumer claims, including PAGA representative actions and class actions for failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, meal and rest period violations, and claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agency Act. Prior to joining Capstone, he was an associate at a California bankruptcy practice, where he represented individual and business debtors in liquidations and re-organizations as well as various debt and foreclosure defense-related issues.

Mr. Castillo graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles in 2009, where he volunteered with the Disability Rights Legal Center. He attended Stanford University for his undergraduate degree, majoring in Political Science and minoring in History. Anthony is admitted to practice law in California and Washington and before the United States District Court for the Central and Southern Districts of California.

Molly DeSario. Molly DeSario is a senior counsel with Capstone Law, specializing in employment class action litigation. Ms. DeSario's practice focuses primarily on wage-and-hour class action and Private Attorneys General Act litigation on behalf of employees for failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, provide meal and rest breaks, and provide compensation for off-the-clock work. She has experience briefing and arguing a multitude of dispositive motions in state and federal court and has successfully certified and settled numerous classes for claims such as exempt misclassifications, unpaid wages, missed meal and rest breaks, and unreimbursed business expenses.

Ms. DeSario began her career as a general practice litigation associate with Sandler & Mercer in Rockville, Maryland, handling a wide range of civil and criminal matters. Since 2005, she has primarily litigated class action cases and, for the last seven years, has focused on representing employees and consumers in class and collective actions across California and the nation, helping them recover millions of dollars in unpaid wages, restitution, and penalties. Molly graduated from Northeastern University School of Law in 2002. During law school, she interned for the U.S. Attorney's Office in Boston, Massachusetts, and the Honorable Paul L. Friedman at the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. She received her undergraduate degree in Marketing and International Business from the University of Cincinnati, where she graduated summa cum laude.

Helga Hakimi. Helga Hakimi is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. Her practice primarily involves employment law class action litigation, namely wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA litigation on behalf of

employees for failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, provide meal and rest breaks, and provide compensation for off-the-clock work, and related employer violations under the Fair Labor Standards Act and California Labor Code.

Prior to joining Capstone, Ms. Hakimi was a partner at a civil litigation firm in West Los Angeles, where she handled mainly real estate litigation, business litigation, and defense of some employment law matters; prior to that, she worked as a civil litigation attorney handling complex personal injury litigation. Ms. Hakimi's interest in advocating for employee rights began in law school, where she volunteered for the Workers' Rights Clinic and assisted low-income community members in Northern California's greater Bay Area region with employment-related legal issues. Upon graduating from law school, Ms. Hakimi worked as an associate for a municipal law firm, and thereafter at the local City Attorney's Office, where she advised municipalities and cities in civil matters involving land use, environmental law, development issues, Constitutional law, and First Amendment rights. Ms. Hakimi graduated from Berkeley Law (Boalt Hall School of Law), where she earned her Juris Doctorate and was awarded the Prosser Award in Remedies. Ms. Hakimi received her Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science with a minor in Education Studies from the University of California, Los Angeles, and graduated summa cum laude and with Departmental Highest Honors.

Daniel Jonathan. Daniel Jonathan is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. His practice primarily involves wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA litigation on behalf of employees for the failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and other California Labor Code violations.

Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Jonathan began his career as an associate at Kirkland & Ellis representing Fortune 500 clients in high-stakes litigation in various matters, including class action defense and plaintiff's actions for accounting fraud. Following that, he was a senior counsel at a boutique litigation firm where he successfully first-chaired several trials. Mr. Jonathan graduated from the Northwestern University School of Law. He received his undergraduate degree in Accounting from the University of Southern California, where he graduated cum laude. He has passed the CPA examination and worked as an auditor at Deloitte before attending law school.

Jonathan Lee. A senior counsel with Capstone, Jonathan Lee primarily litigates employment class actions. At Capstone, Mr. Lee has worked on several major successful class certification motions, and his work has contributed to multi-million dollar class settlements against various employers, including restaurant chains, retail stores, airport staffing companies, and hospitals. Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Lee defended employers and insurance companies in workers' compensation actions throughout California.

Mr. Lee graduated in 2009 from Pepperdine University School of Law, where he served as an editor for the Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and the Law; he received his undergraduate degree from UCLA.

Cody Padgett. Cody Padgett is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. Mr. Padgett prosecutes automotive defect and other consumer class action lawsuits during all stages of litigation. His work has been integral to achieving contested class certification in several automotive defect cases, including *Falco v. Nissan N. Am. Inc.*, No. 13-00686 (C.D. Cal.) (certifying a class of owners/lessees of Nissan vehicles), *Salas v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.*, No. 15-08629 (C.D. Cal.) (certifying a class of owners/lessees of Toyota vehicles), and *Victorino v. FCA US, LLC*, No. 16-01617 (S.D. Cal.) (certifying a class of owners/lessees of Dodge Dart vehicles). Mr. Padgett's efforts have also contributed to major settlements of automotive defect and consumer cases, providing substantial monetary relief to millions of class members, valued in the hundreds of millions of

dollars. See, e.g., *Weckwerth v. Nissan North America, Inc.*, No. 18-00588 (M.D. Tenn.) (providing a \$407 to \$547 million-dollar benefit to a class of nearly 3 million consumers).

Prior to joining Capstone Law, Mr. Padgett assisted with the defense of major felony cases at the San Diego County Public Defender's Office. During law school, Mr. Padgett served as a judicial extern to the Honorable C. Leroy Hansen, United States District Court for the District of New Mexico. He graduated from California Western School of Law in the top 10% of his class and received his undergraduate degree from the University of Southern California, where he graduated *cum laude*. Mr. Padgett is admitted to practice in California, before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and before United States District Court for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Eduardo Santos. Eduardo Santos is a senior counsel at Capstone Law, and concentrates his practice on managing and obtaining court approval of many of Capstone's wage-and-hour, consumer, and PAGA settlements, from the initial contract drafting phase to motion practice, including contested motion practice on attorneys' fees. Over the course of his career, Mr. Santos has helped to secure court approval of over one hundred high-stakes class and representative action settlements totaling over \$100 million.

Before joining Capstone, Mr. Santos began his career at a prominent plaintiff's firm in Los Angeles specializing in mass torts litigation, with a focus on complex pharmaceutical cases. Most notably, he was involved in the national Vioxx settlement, which secured a total of \$4.85 billion for thousands of individuals with claims of injuries caused by taking Vioxx. Mr. Santos graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, where he was a recipient of a full-tuition scholarship awarded in recognition of academic excellence. While in law school, Mr. Santos served as an extern for the Honorable Thomas L. Willhite, Jr. of the California Court of Appeal. He graduated magna cum laude from UCLA and was a recipient of the Ralph J. Bunche Scholarship for academic achievement.

Mao Shiokura. Mao Shiokura is a senior counsel with Capstone. Her practice focuses on identifying, evaluating, and developing new claims, including PAGA representative actions and class actions for wage-and-hour violations and consumer actions under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, False Advertising Law, Unfair Competition Law, and other consumer protection statutes. Prior to joining Capstone, Ms. Shiokura was an associate at a California lemon law firm, where she represented consumers in Song-Beverly, Magnuson-Moss, and fraud actions against automobile manufacturers and dealerships.

Ms. Shiokura graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles in 2009, where she served as a staff member of Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review. She earned her undergraduate degree from the University of Southern California, where she was a Presidential Scholar and majored in Business Administration, with an emphasis in Cinema-Television and Finance.

John Stobart. John Stobart is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. He focuses on appellate issues in state and federal courts and contributes to the firm's amicus curiae efforts to protect and expand the legal rights of California employees and consumers. Mr. Stobart has significant appellate experience having drafted over two dozen writs, appeals and petitions, and having argued before the Second, Fourth, and Fifth Districts of the California Court of Appeal.

Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Stobart was a law and motion attorney who defended against civil liability in catastrophic injury and wrongful death cases brought against his clients, which included the railroad, public schools, small businesses, and commercial and residential landowners. He has drafted and argued scores of

dispositive motions at the trial court level and had success in upholding judgments and verdicts on appeal. He graduated cum laude from Thomas Jefferson School of Law where he was on the mock trial competition team and earned his undergraduate degree from the Ohio State University.

Roxanna Tabatabaepour. Roxanna Tabatabaepour is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. Her practice primarily involves representing employees in class actions and representative actions for various violations of the California Labor Code.

Before joining Capstone, Ms. Tabatabaepour's experience included representing workers in single-plaintiff and class/representative action lawsuits regarding wage-and-hour violations, as well as individual claims for discrimination, retaliation, failure to accommodate, harassment, and wrongful termination, under both California and federal laws. Ms. Tabatabaepour received her undergraduate degrees from the University of California San Diego. She subsequently graduated from the American University, Washington College of Law, where she was a Marshall-Brennan Constitutional Literacy Fellow and taught Constitutional Literacy to teens in marginalized communities.

Ryan Tish. Ryan Tish is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. His practice primarily involves wage-and-hour class actions and Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") representative actions on behalf of employees for the failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, failure to reimburse necessary business expenses, and other claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act and California Labor Code.

Before joining Capstone, Mr. Tish was an associate at a civil litigation firm in Los Angeles, handling a variety of matters, including commercial contracts, real estate, and employment law. Mr. Tish has represented both employers and employees in actions ranging from individual claims of discrimination, harassment, retaliation, and wrongful termination, to class and representative actions for wage-and-hour and privacy law violations. Mr. Tish is a graduate of the University of Southern California Gould School of Law and earned his bachelor's degree in civil and environmental engineering from the University of California, Los Angeles. Mr. Tish is admitted to practice law in California and before the United States District Court for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Orlando Villalba. Orlando Villalba is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. His practice primarily involves wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA litigation on behalf of employees for the failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and other California Labor Code violations.

Mr. Villalba began his career at Kirkland & Ellis where he handled a wide range of business litigation matters, including transnational contract disputes, insurance-related tort claims, developer litigation, and civil rights actions. He also has extensive plaintiff-side experience representing government agencies and note-holders in the pursuit of mortgage and other fraud losses. Mr. Villalba graduated from Stanford Law School, where he served as an articles editor on the Stanford Journal of Law, Business & Finance. After law school, he clerked for the Honorable Warren Matthews of the Alaska Supreme Court. Orlando received his bachelor's degree in International Business from the University of Southern California.

Tarek Zohdy. A senior counsel with Capstone Law, Tarek Zohdy develops, investigates and litigates automotive defect class actions, along with other consumer class actions for breach of warranty and consumer fraud. At Capstone, he has worked on several large-scale automotive class actions from

investigation through settlements that have provided significant relief to millions of defrauded car owners. Before joining Capstone, Mr. Zohdy spent several years representing individual consumers in their actions against automobile manufacturers and dealerships for breaches of express and implied warranties pursuant to the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act and the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, commonly referred to together as “Lemon Law.” He also handled fraudulent misrepresentation and omission cases pursuant to the Consumers Legal Remedies Act. Mr. Zohdy graduated from Louisiana State University *magna cum laude* in 2003, and Boston University School of Law in 2006, where he was a member of the criminal clinic representing underprivileged criminal defendants.

Associates

Tyler Anderson. Tyler Anderson is an associate with Capstone Law. His practice focuses on complex motions, writs, and appeals. Before joining Capstone, Mr. Anderson was Co-Director of the Los Angeles Center for Community Law and Action (“LACCLA”), a nonprofit law firm that represents tenant unions and union organizers. While there, Mr. Anderson tried a disparate impact federal Fair Housing Act case that resulted in a jury verdict of over \$1,000,000. He also frequently used California Anti-SLAPP laws to block attempts to silence tenant union organizers. Prior to working at LACCLA, Mr. Anderson clerked for the Honorable Martha Vazquez, a federal district court judge for the District of New Mexico who, at the time, sat on the Executive Committee of the Federal Judiciary. Before that, Mr. Anderson was a litigation associate at the international law firm Jenner & Block LLP. Mr. Anderson graduated from Harvard Law School, where he was the Executive Articles Editor of the Harvard Journal on Legislation as well as President of one of the largest student-run pro bono organizations at Harvard University, Project No One Leaves. He graduated with several “Dean’s Scholar” prizes for receiving top grades in his constitutional law courses.

Sairah Budhwani. Sairah Budhwani is an associate with Capstone Law. Her practice focuses on evaluating and analyzing pre-litigation wage-and-hour claims, including claims for violations of overtime and minimum wage law, meal and rest period requirements, and off-the-clock work violations. Previously, Ms. Budhwani litigated employment discrimination, harassment, and retaliation claims, and also represented incarcerated individuals contesting the conditions of their confinement. Ms. Budhwani graduated from UCLA School of Law in 2019 and received an undergraduate degree in Urban Studies from University of California, Irvine in 2012. Ms. Budhwani is admitted to practice law in California. She is fluent in Urdu.

Laura Goolsby. Laura Goolsby is an associate with Capstone Law. Her practice focuses on prosecuting automotive defect and other consumer class action cases in state and federal court. Prior to joining Capstone Law, Ms. Goolsby was an associate at a California civil litigation practice representing individuals in toxic tort disputes. Previous to that, Ms. Goolsby was a trial attorney in a California lemon law firm, trying cases against automobile manufacturers in state and federal court. Ms. Goolsby is published in the University of Pennsylvania Journal of Law and Change law review and served as a judicial intern to the U.S. Department of Justice Immigration Court while in law school. Ms. Goolsby graduated from California Western School of Law, where she was a member of the award-winning Philip C. Jessup International Moot Court team and spent multiple trimesters on the Dean’s List. She graduated with several Academic Excellence Awards for receiving top grades in various international law, civil rights law, and legal skills courses.

Ninel Kocharyan. Ninel Kocharyan is an associate with Capstone Law. Her practice focuses on evaluating and analyzing pre-litigation wage-and-hour claims, including claims for violation of overtime and minimum

wage law, meal and rest period requirements, and off-the-clock work violations. Ms. Kocharyan began her career in entertainment law reviewing, drafting, and negotiating contracts for talent and ensuring FTC compliance. She immigrated to the United States from Russia at the age of 15 with a passion to pursue a career in law. Ms. Kocharyan graduated from Thomas Jefferson School of Law in 2014 and received her undergraduate degree from University of California, Los Angeles where she majored in Political Science. Ms. Kocharyan is admitted to practice law in California.

Alexander Lima. Alexander Lima is an associate with Capstone Law. His practice focuses on evaluating pre-litigation wage-and-hour claims, including potential violations of overtime and minimum wage law, meal and rest period requirements, and off-the-clock work issues, as well as consumer protection claims. Previously, Mr. Lima was an associate at a California civil litigation practice representing individuals and entities in real estate disputes. Mr. Lima graduated from Santa Clara University, School of Law in 2018, where he served as an Executive Board Member of the Honors Moot Court and was selected as a regional finalist for the American Bar Association Negotiation Competition. He received his undergraduate degree from the University of California, Riverside in 2014.

Trisha Monesi. Trisha Monesi is an associate with Capstone. Her practice focuses on prosecuting consumer class actions in state and federal court. Ms. Monesi graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles in 2014, where she served as an editor of the Loyola of Los Angeles Entertainment Law Review and was a certified law clerk at the Center for Juvenile Law and Policy. She earned her undergraduate degree from Boston University in 2011, where she majored in Political Science and International Relations. She is an active member of the Women Lawyers Association of Los Angeles, and the Los Angeles County and Beverly Hills Bar Associations.

Joey Parsons. Joey Parsons is an associate with Capstone. His practice primarily involves wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA representative actions. Previously, Joey was an associate at a boutique firm where he represented California employees in all facets of employment law, including claims brought under the FEHA, Title VII, and the California Labor Code. Joey is a graduate of the University of Alabama School of Law, where he competed on the Labor and Employment Moot Court team and served as the Executive Articles Editor for the Alabama Law & Psychology Review. Joey received his bachelor's degree in history from Virginia Tech.

Jezette Ron. Jezette Ron is an associate with Capstone Law. Her practice focuses on analyzing pre-litigation wage-and-hour and consumer claims, including claims for overtime wages, meal and rest periods, and off-the-clock work violations. She began her career as in-house counsel for a private entity reviewing and drafting company policies. During this time, she actively supported the company with human resource and workers compensation matters. Additionally, she ensured company compliance with California Labor Codes and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. She also implemented an Illness Injury Prevention Program, which included a COVID-19 Exposure Control and Response procedure in compliance with OSHA. Ms. Ron graduated from Whittier Law in 2017, where she served as a board member of the Student Bar Association. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of California, Riverside in 2012 where she majored in Business Management and Public Policy. Ms. Ron is admitted to practice law in California and takes pride in being an advocate for creating a work friendly environment for all employees.

Alexander Wallin. Alexander Wallin is an associate at Capstone Law. He is a passionate litigator who has successfully represented employees against corporate injustice. Mr. Wallin has recovered millions of dollars in



numerous wage-and-hour class actions, PAGA actions, and individual discrimination lawsuits. He has a particular interest in representing economically disadvantaged employees who cannot afford legal representation on a retainer-fee basis. Mr. Wallin is a member of the Los Angeles County Bar Association's Employment Law Section and stays up-to-date with the rapidly evolving areas of wage-and-hour protections. He graduated from Loyola Law School in 2017 and is admitted to practice law in California, as well as before the United States District Court for Central and Northern Districts of California. He has been selected as a Southern California "Super Lawyers – Rising Star" in 2022 and 2023.

OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

To increase public awareness about the issues affecting class action and other representative litigation in the consumer and employment areas, Capstone publishes the Impact Litigation Journal (www.impactlitigation.com). Readers have access to news bulletins, op-ed pieces, and legal resources. By taking advantage of social media, Capstone hopes to spread the word about consumer protection and employee rights to a larger audience than has typically been reached by traditional print sources, and to thereby contribute to the enforcement of California's consumer and workplace protection laws.

Exhibit 3

LAFFEY MATRIX

[History](#)
[Case Law](#)
[See the Matrix](#)
[Contact us](#)
[Home](#)

			Years Out of Law School *				
Year	Adjustmt Factor**	Paralegal/ Law Clerk	1-3	4-7	8-10	11-19	20 +
6/01/21- 5/31/22	1.006053	\$208	\$381	\$468	\$676	\$764	\$919
6/01/20- 5/31/21	1.015894	\$206	\$378	\$465	\$672	\$759	\$914
6/01/19- 5/31/20	1.0049	\$203	\$372	\$458	\$661	\$747	\$899
6/01/18- 5/31/19	1.0350	\$202	\$371	\$455	\$658	\$742	\$894
6/01/17- 5/31/18	1.0463	\$196	\$359	\$440	\$636	\$717	\$864
6/01/16- 5/31/17	1.0369	\$187	\$343	\$421	\$608	\$685	\$826
6/01/15- 5/31/16	1.0089	\$180	\$331	\$406	\$586	\$661	\$796
6/01/14- 5/31/15	1.0235	\$179	\$328	\$402	\$581	\$655	\$789
6/01/13- 5/31/14	1.0244	\$175	\$320	\$393	\$567	\$640	\$771
6/01/12- 5/31/13	1.0258	\$170	\$312	\$383	\$554	\$625	\$753
6/01/11- 5/31/12	1.0352	\$166	\$305	\$374	\$540	\$609	\$734
6/01/10- 5/31/11	1.0337	\$161	\$294	\$361	\$522	\$589	\$709
6/01/09- 5/31/10	1.0220	\$155	\$285	\$349	\$505	\$569	\$686
6/01/08- 5/31/09	1.0399	\$152	\$279	\$342	\$494	\$557	\$671
6/01/07-5/31/08	1.0516	\$146	\$268	\$329	\$475	\$536	\$645
6/01/06-5/31/07	1.0256	\$139	\$255	\$313	\$452	\$509	\$614
6/1/05-5/31/06	1.0427	\$136	\$249	\$305	\$441	\$497	\$598
6/1/04-5/31/05	1.0455	\$130	\$239	\$293	\$423	\$476	\$574
6/1/03-6/1/04	1.0507	\$124	\$228	\$280	\$405	\$456	\$549
6/1/02-5/31/03	1.0727	\$118	\$217	\$267	\$385	\$434	\$522
6/1/01-5/31/02	1.0407	\$110	\$203	\$249	\$359	\$404	\$487
6/1/00-5/31/01	1.0529	\$106	\$195	\$239	\$345	\$388	\$468
6/1/99-5/31/00	1.0491	\$101	\$185	\$227	\$328	\$369	\$444
6/1/98-5/31/99	1.0439	\$96	\$176	\$216	\$312	\$352	\$424
6/1/97-5/31/98	1.0419	\$92	\$169	\$207	\$299	\$337	\$406
6/1/96-5/31/97	1.0396	\$88	\$162	\$198	\$287	\$323	\$389
6/1/95-5/31/96	1.032	\$85	\$155	\$191	\$276	\$311	\$375
6/1/94-5/31/95	1.0237	\$82	\$151	\$185	\$267	\$301	\$363

The methodology of calculation and benchmarking for this Updated Laffey Matrix has been approved in a number of cases. See, e.g., *DL v. District of Columbia*, 267 F.Supp.3d 55, 69 (D.D.C. 2017)

* “Years Out of Law School” is calculated from June 1 of each year, when most law students graduate. “1-3” includes an attorney in his 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of practice, measured from date of graduation (June 1). “4-7” applies to attorneys in their 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th years of practice. An attorney who graduated in May 1996 would be in tier “1-3” from June 1, 1996 until May 31, 1999, would move into tier “4-7” on June 1, 1999, and tier “8-10” on June 1, 2003.

** The Adjustment Factor refers to the nation-wide Legal Services Component of the Consumer Price Index produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.