

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lucy H. Nguyen (SBN 338783)
lucy.nguyen@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

SANDRA YAQUINTO, an individual, on behalf
of herself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNICO ENGINEERING INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23CV009174
Consolidated with Case No.: 24CV013737

*Assigned for All Purposes to:
Hon. Lauri A. Damrell
Dept. 8B*

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION
AND MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA
SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Final Approval Hearing:

Date: September 18, 2026

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 8B

1 **TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on September 18, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter
3 as the matter may be heard in Department 8B of the Superior Court of California, County of
4 Sacramento, located at 500 G Street, Sacramento, CA 95814, Plaintiff Sandra Yaquinto
5 (“Plaintiff”) will and hereby does move this Court for an Order:

- 6 1. Granting final approval of the proposed Settlement Agreement;
- 7 2. Awarding Class Counsel attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$47,500.00 and
8 reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of \$15,671.01;
- 9 3. Awarding Plaintiff a Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of
10 \$10,000.00;
- 11 4. Awarding \$5,950.00 to Apex Class Action Administration (“Apex”) for its
12 settlement administration expenses; and
- 13 5. Approving allocation of \$10,000.00 as civil penalties under the Labor Code
14 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), 75% of which (\$7,500.00) will
15 be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and 25% of
16 which (\$2,500.00) will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees based on the
17 number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period.

18 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion, Memorandum of Points and Authorities,
19 the Declaration of John G. Yslas, the Declaration of Missy Carey on behalf of Apex Class
20 Action, LLC, the Declaration of Sandra Yaquinto, and on all records and documents on file,
21 together with such oral and documentary evidence that may be presented at the hearing on this
22 matter.

23
24 Dated: August 20, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

25 By: 
26 _____
27 Lucy H. Nguyen
28 Attorneys for Plaintiff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	5
II.	THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL.....	6
A.	A Presumption of Fairness Exists	6
B.	The Strength of Plaintiff’s Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial	7
C.	The Amount Offered in Settlement.....	8
D.	The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings	8
E.	The Experience and Views of Counsel	9
F.	The Presence of a Government Participant.....	9
G.	The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement	9
III.	THE REQUESTED FEE AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED	10
A.	The Requested Fee Award is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Percentage-of- Recovery Method.....	10
B.	A Lodestar Cross-Check Confirms the Reasonableness of the Requested Fee	11
C.	Class Counsel’s Rates Are Similar to Those Approved by California Courts in Comparable Cases.....	13
IV.	THE REQUESTED COST AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED	16
V.	THE REQUESTED SERVICE PAYMENT IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED	16
VI.	THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED	17
VII.	CONCLUSION	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> , 85 Cal.App.4th 1135 (2000)	7
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> , 162 Cal. App. 4th 43 (2008)	12
<i>Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC</i> , 175 Cal.App.4th 785 (2009)	17
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 48 Cal.App.4th 1794 (1996)	6
<i>Golba v. Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.</i> , 238 Cal.App.4th 1251 (2015)	17
<i>Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.</i> , 4 Cal.5th 260 (2018)	7, 11
<i>Ketchum v. Moses</i> , 24 Cal.4th 1122 (2001)	11
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l</i> , 231 Cal. App. 4th 860 (2004)	12
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.</i> , 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016)	10, 11
<i>Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc.</i> , 82 Cal.App.4th 19 (2000)	9
<i>Melnik v. Robledo</i> , 64 Cal.App.3d 618 (1976)	11
<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i> , 186 Cal.App.4th 399 (2010)	7
<i>PLCM Group, Inc. v. Drexler</i> , 22 Cal.4th 1084 (2000)	11
<i>Roos v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.</i> , 241 Cal.App.4th 1472 (2015)	11
<i>Serrano v. Priest</i> , 20 Cal. 3d 25 (1977)	11
<i>Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.</i> , No. 08-CV-821-IEG, 2010 WL 2196104 (S.D. Cal. June 1, 2010)	11
<i>Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases</i> , 171 Cal. App. 4th 495 (2009)	12
<i>Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 290 F.3d 1043 (9th Cir. 2002)	12
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> 91 Cal.App.4th 224 (2001)	7, 12
<i>Wren v. RGIS Inventory Specialists</i> , No. C-06-05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011)	11

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Plaintiff Sandra Yaquinto (“Plaintiff”) seeks final approval of a non-reversionary Gross
3 Settlement Amount of \$142,500.00. The Settlement Agreement (“Settlement”) provides that the
4 deductions will be made from the Gross Settlement Amount as follows:

- 5 1. Attorneys’ fees up to one third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount;
- 6 2. Litigation costs in the amount of \$15,671.01;
- 7 3. A Class Representative Service Payment up to \$10,000.00;
- 8 4. Settlement administration expenses up to \$5,950.00; and
- 9 5. Civil penalties in the amount of \$10,000.00 for claims under the Labor Code
10 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), 75% of which (\$7,500.00) will be paid to the
11 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), and 25% of which
12 (\$2,500.00) will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees based on the number of pay periods
13 worked during the PAGA Period. *See* Settlement §§ 3.2.5, 3.2.5.1; *see also* Declaration of Missy
14 Carey (“Carey Decl.”) at ¶ 17.

15 After all deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount will be distributed to 159
16 Class Members as of the filing of this Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA
17 Settlement (the “Motion”) (“Participating Class Members” or “Settlement Class Member”)
18 based on the number of weeks worked during the Class Period. Carey Decl. at ¶¶ 14–15.

19 The proposed Settlement is a product of diligent efforts, litigation, arm’s length
20 negotiations, and informal discovery that resulted in the best possible outcome for the Class. By
21 resolving this matter now, Class Members will receive a guaranteed recovery without risk of
22 nonpayment, delay, or an adverse judgment at trial.

23 As of the filing of this Motion, there have been no objections to the Settlement, no
24 disputes, and two requests for exclusion. Carey Decl. at ¶¶ 11–13. Participating Class Members
25 will receive an estimated average Individual Class Payment of \$335.72, with the highest
26 estimated Individual Class Payment being \$1,300.93. Carey Decl. at ¶ 16. Aggrieved Employees
27 will receive an estimated average Individual PAGA Payment of \$19.69, with the highest
28 estimated average Individual PAGA Payment being \$48.45. Carey Decl. at ¶ 18. In light of the

1 favorable response from the Class, and the facts and law set forth below as well as in the motion
2 for preliminary approval, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court now enter an Order: (1)
3 granting final approval of the Settlement; (2) entering final judgment; (3) requiring distribution
4 of individual settlement shares to participating Class Members; and (4) approving payments for
5 Class Counsel Fees, Class Counsel Expenses, the Class Representative Service Payment, the
6 Settlement Administrator's costs, and civil penalties under PAGA.

7 **II. THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL**

8 In deciding whether to grant final approval of a class action settlement, California courts
9 consider whether the settlement is "fair, adequate, and reasonable." *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*,
10 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996). In evaluating whether a settlement is fair, adequate, and
11 reasonable, courts evaluate the following factors: (1) the strength of the plaintiff's case; (2) the
12 risk, expense, complexity and duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class
13 action status through trial; (4) the amount offered in settlement; (5) the extent of discovery
14 completed and the stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7) the
15 presence of a governmental participant; and (8) the reaction of class members to the proposed
16 settlement. *Id.*

17 **A. A Presumption of Fairness Exists**

18 While the burden is on the proponent to demonstrate that a proposed settlement is fair,
19 adequate, and reasonable, "a presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached
20 through arm's length bargaining; (2) investigation is sufficient to allow counsel and the court
21 to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of
22 objectors is small." *Id.* at 1802.

23 At preliminary approval, Plaintiff presented evidence that this Settlement is entitled to a
24 presumption of fairness because: (1) it was reached through arm's length bargaining with the
25 assistance of an experienced mediator; (2) Plaintiff conducted a thorough investigation through
26 informal discovery and an analysis of Class Members' time data and payroll records and policy
27 documents pertaining to Plaintiff's claims; and (3) Class Counsel is experienced in similar
28 litigation. *See* Declaration of John G. Yslas in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of

1 Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Yslas MPA Decl.”) filed April 2, 2026, at ¶¶ 5, 8, 19-33.
2 As of the filing of this Motion, only two Class Members have requested exclusion, no Class
3 Members have objected to the Settlement, and no Class Members have submitted disputes.
4 Accordingly, 159 of the 161 Class Members, or approximately 98.76% of the Settlement Class,
5 are Participating Class Members. See Carey Decl. at ¶¶ 11-14. Therefore, the overwhelmingly
6 favorable reaction of the Class further supports the presumption of fairness.

7 **B. The Strength of Plaintiff’s Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and**
8 **Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial**

9 Courts are not required to ensure that a settlement maximizes the value of released claims
10 with mathematical precision. “[T]he test is not the maximum amount plaintiffs might have
11 obtained at trial on the complaint, but rather whether the settlement is reasonable under all of
12 the circumstances.” *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 250 (2001),
13 disapproved of on other grounds by *Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.*, 4 Cal.5th 260,
14 269-270 (2018); *see also 7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.*, 85
15 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1150 (2000) (“the merits of the underlying class claims are not a basis for
16 upsetting the settlement of a class action; the operative word is ‘settlement.’”). The relevant
17 circumstances include the strengths and weaknesses of plaintiffs’ claims and the risks they faced
18 in litigation. *7-Eleven*, 85 Cal.App.4th at 1146.

19 Here, Plaintiff presented sufficient information at preliminary approval regarding the
20 number of Class Members and an estimate of the maximum value of each of the claims alleged.
21 *See Yslas MPA Decl.* at ¶¶ 9, 12-17. Plaintiff has also described in detail the risks the Class
22 faced in litigation and the strengths and weaknesses of each of the claims. *See id.* Defendant
23 denied Plaintiff’s allegations, and Plaintiff noted potential difficulties in obtaining class
24 certification and succeeding on the merits at trial. *See id.* The factual record here is sufficiently
25 developed to allow the Court to independently satisfy itself “that the consideration being
26 received for the release of the class members’ claims is reasonable in light of the strengths and
27 weaknesses of the claims and the risks of the particular litigation.” *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola*
28 *Bottling Co. of Los Angeles*, 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 410 (2010).

1 **C. The Amount Offered in Settlement**

2 The Settlement provides for a \$142,500.00 Gross Settlement Amount (“GSA”) to be
3 distributed among the 159 Participating Class Members who did not opt out as of the date of
4 this filing. Carey Decl. at ¶ 14. The GSA will be used to pay Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees
5 and litigation costs, Plaintiff’s Class Representative Service Payment, and the fees and expenses
6 of Apex Class Administration (“Apex”) for its administration of the Class Notice and settlement
7 funds. *Id.* at ¶¶ 15, 19. The Settlement also allocates \$10,000.00 from the GSA to civil penalties
8 under PAGA. *See* Settlement Agreement at § 3.2.5; *see also* Carey Decl. at ¶ 17. After all
9 deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount available to Participating Class Members for
10 their Individual Class Payments is estimated to be \$53,378.99, which will be distributed to
11 Participating Class Members according to the number of Workweeks they worked for Defendant
12 during the Class Period. *See* Carey Decl. at ¶ 15; Settlement Agreement at § 3.2.4.

13 The Settlement Administrator has calculated a total of 10,422 Workweeks in the Class
14 Period. Carey Decl. at ¶ 15. As a result, the estimated average Individual Class Payment for
15 Participating Class Members is \$335.72, and the highest estimated average Individual Class
16 Payment for Participating Class Members is \$1,300.93. *Id.* at ¶16. Weighing the potential value
17 of the class claims against the risk and expense of trial, the Settlement provides substantial relief
18 in light of the potential risks associated with seeking a class judgment.

19 **D. The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings**

20 Class Counsel sufficiently investigated the alleged claims, applicable law, and potential
21 defenses. *See* Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 8. Specifically, Class Counsel assessed the value of the
22 claims using data and documents provided by Defendant in informal discovery, which included
23 policy documents and timekeeping and payroll records. *Id.* Following a complete analysis of
24 this information, the Parties attended an all-day mediation on July 30, 2025, with experienced
25 mediator Russ J. Wunderli, Esq. *Id.* at ¶ 5. The Parties negotiated the terms of the Settlement
26 over the next several months and finalized the terms of the Settlement in November 2025. *Id.* at
27 ¶ 6.
28

1 **E. The Experience and Views of Counsel**

2 Plaintiff is represented by Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. Declaration of John G. Yslas in
3 Support of Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Yslas MFA
4 Decl.”) at ¶ 3. Class Counsel prosecutes wage and hour cases, including class and representative
5 actions. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4, 5. Class Counsel has litigated many wage and hour cases and has successfully
6 resolved cases involving similar issues presented in this matter. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4-18. Class Counsel
7 has negotiated a settlement here that they believe is fair, reasonable, and adequate based on
8 Class Counsel’s prior experience litigating these types of cases. *Id.* at ¶ 24.

9 **F. The Presence of a Government Participant**

10 The LWDA has received the required notice of this Settlement. On November 15, 2023,
11 Plaintiff provided notice to the LWDA of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to
12 have been violated, including the facts and theories in support. Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 4. The
13 Settlement provides for the payment of \$10,000.00 in civil penalties, 75% of which (\$7,500.00)
14 will be paid to the LWDA, and 25% of which (\$2,500.00) will be paid to Aggrieved Employees
15 based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. *See* Carey Decl. at ¶ 17;
16 *see also* Settlement Agreement at §§ 3.2.5, 3.2.5.1. Plaintiff submitted a copy of the Settlement
17 Agreement to the LWDA on April 2, 2026. Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 7, Exhibit 2. The LWDA has
18 not responded to or objected to the Settlement. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶ 25.

19 **G. The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement**

20 Class Members’ reaction to the Settlement has been favorable. A court may properly
21 infer that a class action settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate when few class members
22 object to or opt out of it. *Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc.*, 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 51 (2000).

23 When the Court granted preliminary approval, it also approved the method of providing
24 notice to Class Members. Following a search of the National Change of Address database, Apex
25 mailed the Class Notice to all 161 Class Members on June 2, 2026. Carey Decl. at ¶¶ 6-7. The
26 Class Notice informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, the amount of their
27 individual settlements and how those amounts were calculated, their right to either participate
28 in the Settlement, opt out of it, object to it, or dispute the amount of their individual settlement

1 payment, the procedures and deadlines to submit an opt out, objection, or dispute, and the date,
2 time, and place of the hearing on Plaintiff’s Motion for Final Approval and instructions to be
3 heard at the hearing. *Id.* at ¶ 7, Exhibit A. In response to the Class Notice, Apex received two
4 requests for exclusion, no objections, and no disputes as of the date of the filing of this Motion.
5 *Id.* at ¶¶ 11-13. Accordingly, 159 of the 161 Class Members, or approximately 98.76% of the
6 Settlement Class, are Participating Class Members. *Id.* at ¶ 14. Class Members’ overwhelmingly
7 favorable response to the Settlement further supports final approval.,

8 **III. THE REQUESTED FEE AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE**
9 **APPROVED**

10 There are two (2) primary methods of determining a reasonable attorney fee in the
11 context of class action litigation. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 489 (2016).
12 The percentage-of-recovery method calculates the fee as a percentage of a common fund
13 recovered on behalf of the class. *Id.* The lodestar method calculates the fee by multiplying the
14 number of hours reasonably expended by counsel by a reasonable hourly rate, which amount
15 then may be adjusted based on other factors. *Id.* In *Laffitte*, the California Supreme Court held
16 that trial courts have the discretion to choose between the two (2) calculation methods. *Id.* at
17 504. Trial courts also have the discretion to blend the two (2) fee calculation methods, using
18 one method to “cross-check” the reasonableness of the other’s result, but a cross-check is not
19 required. *Id.* at 506.

20 **A. The Requested Fee Award is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Percentage-**
21 **of-Recovery Method**

22 The ultimate purpose of the percentage-of-recovery method is to “spread the attorney fee
23 among all the beneficiaries of the fund.” *Id.* at 503. The California Supreme Court recognized
24 that the percentage-of-recovery method has many advantages, “including relative ease of
25 calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better approximation of
26 market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement it provides counsel to seek an
27 early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging the litigation [citation] . . .” *Id.*

28 ///

1 The requested fee award of one third (1/3) of the GSA is consistent with the average fee
2 award in class actions. *See, e.g., Roos v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.*, 241 Cal.App.4th 1472 (2015)
3 (fee award of 37.5% was not an abuse of discretion), disapproved of on other grounds by
4 *Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.*, 4 Cal.5th 260, 287 (2018); *Wren v. RGIS Inventory*
5 *Specialists*, No. C-06-05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826, at *29 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011) (approving
6 fee award of 42%); *Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.*, No. 08-CV-821-IEG, 2010 WL
7 2196104, at *8 (S.D. Cal. June 1, 2010) (approving fee award of one-third and noting that the
8 typical fees awarded in wage and hour class action cases ranges from 33.33% to 40%).
9 Therefore, the percentage-of-recovery method should be utilized to approve the requested fee.

10 **B. A Lodestar Cross-Check Confirms the Reasonableness of the Requested Fee**

11 Although *Laffitte* makes clear that a lodestar cross-check is not required, Class Counsel's
12 lodestar supports the reasonableness of the requested fee. The lodestar is determined by
13 multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by the reasonable hourly rate. *PLCM*
14 *Group, Inc. v. Drexler*, 22 Cal.4th 1084, 1095 (2000). The lodestar figure may then be adjusted,
15 based on consideration of factors specific to the case, in order to fix the fee at the fair market
16 value for the legal services provided. *Id.* The factors that can be considered include "the nature
17 of the litigation, its difficulty, the amount involved, the skill required in its handling, the skill
18 employed, the attention given, the success or failure, and other circumstances in the case."
19 *Melnyk v. Robledo*, 64 Cal.App.3d 618, 623-624 (1976) (citations omitted). Additionally, Courts
20 utilize "multipliers" to account for the risk of taking on cases where there is no guarantee of
21 recovery, uncertainties as to the amount that will be recovered, uncertainty as to the cost of
22 litigating the case (both in effort and expenses), and uncertainty about how much time will pass
23 before the recovery is obtained. *Ketchum v. Moses*, 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-33 (2001); *see also*
24 *Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal. 3d 25, 48-49 (1977) (approving the adjustment of the lodestar figure
25 based on factors specific to the case to ensure fair market value for legal services provided on
26 a contingency basis). Application of that rule is particularly appropriate where the case is
27 brought to redress important rights of vulnerable persons. *Ketchum*, 24 Cal.4th at 1133.

28 ///

1 Generally, “[m]ultipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even higher.” *Wershba v. Apple*
2 *Computers, Inc.*, 91 Cal.App.4th at p. 255 (2001); *see also Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing*
3 *Cases*, 171 Cal. App. 4th 495, 512 (2009) (applying a 2.52 multiplier on a cross-check in an
4 antitrust class action); *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal. App. 4th 43, 60 (2008) (applying a 2.5
5 multiplier on a lodestar cross-check); *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043, 1051 n.6 (9th
6 Cir. 2002) (“most” common fund cases apply a multiplier of 1.0-4.0); *Laffitte v. Robert Half*
7 *Int’l*, 231 Cal. App. 4th 860, 881-82 (2004) (affirming a 2.13 multiplier after finding that “2 to
8 4” is a reasonable range for multipliers on a cross-check).

9 The total hours expended on this action by Class Counsel were reasonable and in line
10 with comparable cases. While it is not necessary to substantiate the fee award with a lodestar in
11 this Action, it should be noted that Class Counsel spent approximately 197.7 hours prosecuting
12 this action, which were divided among the attorneys working on this case according to skill
13 level. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶ 21. Multiplying the total hours expended by Class Counsel by their
14 reasonable hourly rates yields a lodestar of \$165,500.00. *Id.* This amount substantially surpasses
15 the requested fee award of \$47,500.00, which represents approximately 29% of Class Counsel’s
16 \$165,500.00 lodestar and therefore results in a negative lodestar multiplier of approximately
17 0.29. *Id.* at ¶ 22. This amount does not include the time Class Counsel will spend at the Final
18 Approval Hearing and assisting the Settlement Administrator following final approval. *Id.* Class
19 Counsel dedicated significant resources to this case by dividing the tasks required according to
20 skill level. *Id.* The hours expended by each attorney were not duplicative and reflect the
21 extensive investigation and analysis that was required to achieve this Settlement. This time
22 could have been spent on other potentially lucrative cases. *Id.* Class Counsel’s lodestar reflects
23 the efficiencies achieved by attorneys experienced in this field. *Id.* Moreover, Class Counsel
24 has singularly assumed the risk and costs of litigation purely on a contingency basis. *Id.* And,
25 while Plaintiff is confident in the merits of her claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each
26 cause of action, posing an actual risk that Plaintiff may not succeed at class certification and/or
27 trial. *Id.* Any of these obstacles could have prevented recovery completely, meaning Class
28 Counsel would have been left with no compensation for all the time and money invested in

litigating this case. *Id.* Despite these risks, Class Counsel took this case on a contingency basis so that Class Members (a particularly vulnerable group of hourly paid workers) could be compensated for their unpaid wages. *Id.* Consequently, Class Counsel was precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases which could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain. *Id.*

C. Class Counsel's Rates Are Similar to Those Approved by California Courts in Comparable Cases.

Class Counsel's hourly rates are comparable to those charged by other class action plaintiffs' counsel and the firms defending class actions. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶16. Class Counsel's rates are well within the range of hourly rates that the Northern California legal marketplace would compensate counsel for similar services accomplishing similar results. *Id.* For example, in *Bronshteyn v. State of California*, Los Angeles County Superior Ct. No. 19SMCV00057, Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Statutory Attorneys' Fees and Costs filed March 30, 2023, an employment action brought by two small law firms (Levy, Vinick, Burrell & Hyams LLP and Law Offices of Wendy Musell), the court found that counsel's 2022 hourly rates of \$1,100 and \$1,000 per hour were reasonable for the plaintiff's five senior attorneys, including \$1,000 per hour for the plaintiff's 23-year lead counsel and \$850 per hour for a senior associate. *Id.* These rates were then augmented by a 1.75 lodestar multiplier and affirmed by the California Court of Appeals. *Id.* The rates requested here are well in line with those found reasonable in *Bronshteyn*. In *Tran v. Golden State FC LLC, et al.* (LASC Case No. BC699931), Fee Order filed 4/8/2022, the court found hourly rates of \$1,300 per hour reasonable for plaintiff's 32-year attorney and \$1,000 per hour reasonable for a 14-year attorney. *Id.*

Class Counsel has also been approved as class counsel by courts in California. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶ 17. *See, e.g., Matthew Veliz v. DrinkPak, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV37384, *Ismael Villegas-Sanchez v. COE Orchard Equipment, Inc.*, Sutter County Superior Court, Case No. CVCS22-0002261; *Jessica Bronsal v. PTI Technologies Inc.*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 202200570361CUOE; *Miguel A. Vigil Ruiz v. The De Ruosi Group, LLC*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2022-8780;

1 *Gutierrez v. Top Drawer Merch, LLC et al*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
2 23STCV04299; *Wing v. Road Machinery, LLC et al*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-
3 22-102896; *Hernandez v. SGPS Showrig Los Angeles, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court,
4 Case No. 22STCV28155; *Azevedo v. Tulare Nursing & Rehabilitation Hospital, Inc.*, Tulare
5 County Superior Court, Case No. VCU293325; *Haser v. Universal Chain of California, Inc.*,
6 Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00332268; *Caldera v. Performance Online,*
7 *Inc. et al*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2306013; *Goosby v. CiminoCare, Inc.*,
8 Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00329033; *Rooks v. Hot Cakes Restaurant*
9 *Group, Inc.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2022-11056; *Garcia v.*
10 *Compassionate Heart*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2022-01294409-CU-OE-
11 CXC; *Parra v. Citrus Valley Management Services, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case
12 No. CVRI2301768; *Torres v. HomeShield Pest Control Inc.*, Placer County Superior Court, Case
13 No. S-CV-0049525; *Cabrera v. Creekside Auto Group*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case
14 No. 23CV415661; *Simpson v. Arcos*, Riverside Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2303337; *Payne v.*
15 *Planned Parenthood: Shasta-Diablo, Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-
16 23-607359. *Id.* The total hours expended on this action are reasonable and in line with those
17 expended in comparable cases. *Id.*

18 Class Counsel's rates are also supported by objective market-rate data. The 2025 Real Rate
19 Report reflects third-quartile litigation rates of \$1,378 for partners and \$875 for associates in San
20 Francisco, and \$1,250 for partners and \$1,030 for associates in San Jose. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶
21 19(a), Exhibit 1. The Report's employment-and-labor litigation data similarly reflects a third-
22 quartile partner rate of \$1,252 and associate rate of \$564. *Id.* at ¶ 19(b). These market benchmarks
23 further support the reasonableness of Class Counsel's requested rates.

24 In cases in which Class Counsel has been approved as class counsel, California courts have
25 approved rates similar to those requested by Class Counsel in the instant case. Yslas MFA Decl. at
26 ¶18. *See, e.g., Rodolfo Ponce v. Youbar, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
27 22STCV37519 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A.
28 Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bills (\$850.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00),

1 and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Sabrina N. Batres v. Wish Automotive II, Inc. dba Infiniti of Van*
2 *Nuys*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV19968 (WLF's rates were approved as
3 follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Lisa B.
4 Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Diandrea Correa et al. v. CareMeridian,*
5 *LLC, et. al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV10707 (WLF's rates were
6 approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils
7 (\$850.00), Fawn F. Bekam (\$800.00), Diego Aviles (\$800.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Harry
8 Erganyan (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Carlos Santos*
9 *Granados v. Sunny Hills Management Co., Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
10 23STCV02109 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A.
11 Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Diego Aviles (\$750.00), Courtney M. Miller (\$650.00),
12 Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Harry Erganyan (\$600.00), Mariam Nazaretyan (\$550.00), Lisa B.
13 Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Kayla Kurses v. Khanna Enterprises, Ltd.*
14 *dba Sheraton Agoura Hills*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV01590 (WLF's
15 rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Aram
16 Boyadjian (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Thora Magney*
17 *et al. v. Levi Strauss & Co., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV02320
18 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A. Smith (\$1,000.00),
19 Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Fawn F. Bekam (\$800.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga
20 (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Armando Muniz, et al. v. Lot LLC, dba Lot*
21 *Management LLC (fka Red Cow, Inc.) et. al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
22 22STCV32901 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A.
23 Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Diego Aviles (\$750.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00),
24 Harry Erganyan (\$600.00), Mariam Nazaretyan (\$550.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew
25 Sandoval (\$500.00)); *George Munoz v. Century West, LLC dba Century West BMW*, Los Angeles
26 County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV04247 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G.
27 Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Aram Boyadjian
28 (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Ivan S. Martinez II et. al.*

1 *v. The Haar Company, et. al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV21651 (WLF's
2 rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey
3 C. Bils (\$850.00), Diego Aviles (\$750.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Harry Erganyan (\$600.00),
4 Mariam Nazaretyan (\$550.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)). *Id.*

5 Likewise, Class Counsel's hourly rates are reasonable when compared to rates charged within
6 the relevant legal marketplace. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶ 19, **Exhibit 1**. In light of the foregoing, and
7 considered against the risks of continued litigation, and the importance of advocating for employment
8 rights and a speedy recovery, the relief provided under the Settlement represents a very strong result
9 for the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees. Class Counsel's fee request is fair and reasonable
10 and should be approved. Accordingly, Class Counsel respectfully requests the Court approve their
11 \$47,500.00 fee request.

12 **IV. THE REQUESTED LITIGATION EXPENSES PAYMENT IS REASONABLE**
13 **AND SHOULD BE APPROVED**

14 The Settlement permits Class Counsel to seek reimbursement of litigation costs in an
15 amount up to \$20,000.00. The actual costs incurred are \$15,371.01. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶ 23,
16 **Exhibit 2**. Class Counsel additionally anticipates incurring \$300.00 in future filing and service
17 costs and therefore seeks reimbursement of \$15,671.01 in total litigation expenses. *Id.* Because
18 Class Counsel's costs do not reach the \$20,000.00 maximum, the remaining \$4,328.99 will
19 revert to and increase the Net Settlement Amount. *Id.* These costs were reasonable and necessary
20 to prosecute this case and obtain the results achieved. *Id.*

21 **V. THE REQUESTED CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE PAYMENT IS**
22 **REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED**

23 Plaintiff also requests that she be awarded a Class Representative Service Payment of
24 \$10,000.00 for her role in obtaining this Settlement. In evaluating a service payment, the Court
25 may consider: "(1) the risk, both financial and otherwise, the class representative faced in
26 bringing the suit; (2) the notoriety and personal difficulties encountered by the class
27 representative; (3) the amount of time and effort spent by the class representative; (4) the
28 duration of the litigation; and (5) the personal benefit received by the class representative as a

1 result of the litigation.” *Golba v. Dick’s Sporting Goods, Inc.*, 238 Cal.App.4th 1251, 1272
2 (2015); *Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC*, 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804 (2009).

3 Here, Plaintiff provided a declaration in support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary
4 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and a declaration in support of Plaintiff’s
5 Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement detailing the risk she faced
6 in bringing the suit, the notoriety and personal difficulties she encountered, the amount of time
7 and effort she spent on this litigation, the duration of this litigation, and the personal benefit she
8 will receive as a result of the litigation. *See generally* Declaration of Sandra Yaquinto in Support
9 of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed on
10 April 2, 2026 and Declaration of Plaintiff Sandra Yaquinto in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for
11 Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed concurrently herewith. Plaintiff
12 should be adequately compensated for her role in obtaining in this Settlement.

13 Additionally, no Class Members objected to the amount of additional compensation
14 sought by Plaintiff. As such, the award is reasonable in light of the substantial benefits Plaintiff
15 conferred upon the settlement class.

16 **VI. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND**
17 **SHOULD BE APPROVED**

18 The Parties agreed to hire Apex as the Settlement Administrator in this case and the
19 Court approved this choice at preliminary approval. The Settlement Administrator was
20 responsible for (a) printing and mailing the *Court Approved Notice of Class Action and PAGA*
21 *Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval*, (collectively referred to as “Class
22 Notice”); (b) receiving and processing requests for exclusion; (c) resolving Class Members’
23 disputes over the number of workweeks Defendant has record of them working during the Class
24 Period, which was pre-printed on their individualized Class Notice; (d) calculating individual
25 settlement award amounts; (e) processing and mailing settlement award checks; (f) handling tax
26 withholdings as required by the Settlement and the law; (g) preparing, issuing and filing tax
27 returns and other applicable tax forms; (h) handling the distribution of any unclaimed funds
28 pursuant to the terms of the Settlement; and (i) performing other tasks as the Parties mutually

1 agree to and/or the Court orders Apex to perform. Carey Decl. at ¶3. The requested amount of
2 \$5,950.00 for services rendered and to be rendered is therefore fair and reasonable. *Id.* at ¶19.

3 **VII. CONCLUSION**

4 Based on the foregoing, Class Counsel respectfully requests that the Court grant final
5 approval of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement, approve Class Counsel's attorneys' fees in
6 the amount of \$47,500.00 and reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of \$15,671.01,
7 the Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of \$10,000.00, civil penalties under
8 PAGA in the amount of \$10,000.00, and settlement administration costs for Apex in the amount
9 of \$5,950.00.

10
11 Dated: August 20, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

12 By: 
13 _____
14 Lucy H. Nguyen
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28