

D.LAW, INC.

Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
Alvin B. Lindsay (SBN 220236)
a.lindsay@d.law
Rose Sorial (SBN 271382)
r.sorial@d.law
Enoch J. Kim (SBN 261146)
e.kim@d.law
Antonia McKee (SBN 344511)
a.bliznets@d.law
450 N. Brand Blvd. Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff CHANEL VICK
on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

CHANEL VICK an individual, on behalf of
herself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MONTCLAIR MANOR CARE CENTER,
LLC, a California limited liability company;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CIVSB2329280

CLASS ACTION

Assigned for All Purposes To:
Hon. Kory Mathewson

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA
SETTLEMENT UNDER CALIFORNIA LABOR
CODE §§ 2698 et seq.; MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

[filed concurrently with Declaration of Enoch J.
Kim; and [Proposed] Order]

Hearing Date: April 28, 2025
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept: R12

1 **TO THE COURT AND DEFENDANT AND ITS ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on April 28, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. in Department R12 of the
3 above-entitled Court, located at 247 W 3rd Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415. Plaintiff Chanel
4 Vick (“Plaintiff” or “PAGA Representative”), on behalf of herself, the State of California, and all
5 aggrieved employees (the “Aggrieved Employees”), will and hereby does move this Court
6 pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 et seq. for an order approving the settlement agreement
7 between Plaintiff and Defendant Montclair Manor Care Center, LLC (“Defendant”) which will
8 accomplish the following: approve the representative action settlement embodied in the PAGA
9 Settlement Agreement; approve PAGA Counsel’s application for attorney’s fees and litigation
10 costs and costs for the Administrator; and enter judgment approving the PAGA Settlement
11 Agreement (the “Motion”).

12 The grounds for this Motion, as set forth in the attached Memorandum of Points and
13 Authorities and supporting Declaration, are that this is a fair and reasonable settlement that benefits
14 the Aggrieved Employees and was the product of informed, non-collusive negotiations by the
15 parties who were represented by experienced and able counsel. *See Wershba v. Apple Computer,*
16 *Inc.*, 91 Cal. App 4th 224, 244-45 (1996); *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1802
17 (1996); Manual for Complex Litigation, (Second), § 30.44 (1985).

18 Defendant does not oppose this Motion. Plaintiff bases this Motion on this Notice and the
19 accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Enoch J. Kim (“Kim
20 Decl.”), the complete pleadings, records and files in the case, and such other further oral and
21 documentary evidence which may be submitted at or before the hearing on this Motion.

22
23 DATED: April 4, 2025

D.LAW, INC.


24
25 By: 
26 Enoch J. Kim
27 Attorney for Chanel Vick on behalf of herself
28 and Aggrieved Employees

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	RELEVANT BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....	2
	A. Litigation Overview and Procedural History	2
	B. Mediation and Settlement	3
III.	PAGA ACTIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS.....	4
	A. The PAGA Statutory Scheme	4
	B. The Court Has Discretion When Awarding the Amount of Penalties.	5
	C. PAGA Authorizes the Payment of PAGA Counsel’s Fees and Costs	5
IV.	THE SETTLEMENT.....	5
V.	ARGUMENT.....	6
	A. The Court Should Approve the Settlement Agreement.	6
	B. The Risks of Moving Forward with Plaintiff’s PAGA Claim	7
	C. Trial of Plaintiff’s PAGA Claims Would Have Presented Many Hurdles.	7
	D. The Court May Have Exercised Its Discretion to Reduce Civil Penalties.	8
VI.	THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS.....	8
	A. The Court Should Approve the Requested Attorneys’ Fees and Costs	8
	1) PAGA Counsel Are Entitled to Fees from the Civil Penalties Recovered	9
	2) The Attorneys’ Fees Request Is Within the Range of Reasonable Fees	10
	3) PAGA Counsel’s Fee Request Is Reasonable Under the Lodestar Crosscheck.	10
	4) The Court Should Approve the Reimbursement of PAGA Counsel’s Costs.	11
VII.	THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION.....	11
VIII.	CONCLUSION	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 993.....	5
<i>Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2</i> (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157	5, 8
<i>Arias v. Super. Ct.</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969.....	5, 6, 7
<i>Brown v. Ralphs Grocery Co.</i> (2011) 197 Cal. App. 4th 489.....	4
<i>Brown v. Ralphs Grocery Co.</i> (2011) 197 Cal. App. 4th 489, 501.....	4
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794	10
<i>Folsom v. Butte County Ass’n of Gov’ts</i> (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 668.....	6
<i>Iskanian v. CLS Transp. Los Angeles, LLC</i> (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348.....	4, 9
<i>Ketchum v. Moses</i> (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122	11
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.</i> (2016) 205 Cal.Rptr.3d 555	9, 10
<i>Lealao v. Beneficial Calif., Inc.</i> (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 19	10
<i>Medina v. Vander Poel</i> (E.D. Cal. 2015) 523 B.R. 820.....	5
<i>Montano v. The Wet Seal Retail, Inc.</i> (2015) 232 Cal. App. 4th 1214	5
<i>Moreno v. Autozone, Inc.</i> (N.D. Cal. June 5, 2007) No. C05-04432 MJJ, 2007 WL 1650942	8
<i>Reyes v. Macy’s, Inc.</i> (2011) 202 Cal. App. 4th 1119	4
<i>Santisas v. Goodin</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 599	6
<i>Securitas Sec. Servs. USA, Inc. v. Sup. Ct. of San Diego Cnty.</i> (2015) 234 Cal. App. 4th 1109	4, 5
<i>Serrano v. Priest</i> (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25	10, 11
<i>Thayer v. Wells Fargo Bank</i> (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 819	11
<i>Thurman v. Bayshore</i> (2012) 203 Cal. App. 4th 1112.....	9
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 224.....	10

FEDERAL CASES

Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.....	6
Labor Code § 2698, <i>et seq</i>	1
Labor Code § 2699(a)	5, 9
Labor Code § 2699(e)(2)	5, 9
Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)	5
Labor Code § 2699(g)(1)	6, 9
Labor Code § 2699(l).....	7
Labor Code § 2699(l)(2)	1

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 Through this Motion, Plaintiff Chanel Vick (“Plaintiff”) requests that the Court grant approval
4 of the PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Settlement” or “Settlement Agreement”) reached between the
5 parties to resolve claims brought exclusively under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor
6 Code § 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) seeking civil penalties for various violations of the California Labor
7 Code and Industrial Wage Commission’s Wage Orders. Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendant
8 Montclair Manor Care Center, LLC (“Defendant”) will pay the Gross Settlement Amount of
9 \$155,000.00. (Declaration of Enoch J. Kim (“Kim Decl.”), Exhibit 1, ¶ 3.1.)

10 For purposes of the Settlement, the group of aggrieved employees included in the Settlement
11 is defined as all current and former hourly-paid, employees employed by Montclair Manor Care
12 Center, LLC throughout California any time during the PAGA Period, which is November 8, 2022,
13 through October 17, 2024 (“Aggrieved Employees”). (Kim Decl., Exhibit 1, ¶¶ 1.4 and 1.22.) Based
14 on its records, Defendant estimates that there are approximately 123 Aggrieved Employees who
15 collectively worked a total of 3,010 pay periods during the PAGA Period. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11.)

16 As further explained below, Plaintiff and her counsel believe that the Settlement is fair,
17 reasonable, and in the best interests of the Aggrieved Employees and the State. Accordingly, Plaintiff
18 requests that the Court “review and approve” the Settlement pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(1)(2). If
19 the Court deems the Settlement fair and acceptable, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter an order
20 approving the Settlement in the form lodged herewith ordering the parties and Administrator to carry
21 out the terms of the Settlement Agreement and enter a Final Judgment thereon.¹

22
23
24
25
26 ¹ Plaintiff has submitted the Settlement Agreement and this Motion to the LWDA by uploading it
27 on the LWDA’s website concurrently with the filing of this Motion as required by Labor Code §
28 2699(1)(2). (Declaration of Enoch J. Kim (“Kim Decl.”) ¶ 47, Exhibit 3.)

II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A. Litigation Overview and Procedural History

On November 8, 2023, Plaintiff filed a class-action complaint in the San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2329280, against Defendant alleging claims under the California Labor Code (the “Labor Code”) for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay wages and overtime, failure to provide meal-periods, failure to provide rest periods, failure to provide accurate, itemized wage statements, unlawfully deducting wages, failure to timely pay wages, failure to pay all wages due at time of termination or resignation, failure to reimburse for necessary business expenses, and unlawful business practices under California’s Business and Professions Code (the “Action”). (Kim Decl., ¶ 4.)

On or about November 8, 2023, Plaintiff submitted her PAGA letter to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendant, alleging that Defendant committed various wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code and were entitled to civil penalties under PAGA. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.)

On or about January 1, 2024, Plaintiff filed her First Amended Complaint, adding a cause of action for civil penalties under PAGA against Defendant alleging claims for (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime under Labor Code Section 510; (3) Meal Period Liability under Labor Code Section 226.7; (4) Rest Break Liability under Labor Code Section 226.7; (5) Violation of Labor Code Section 226; (6) Violation of Labor Code Section 221; (7) Violation of Labor Code Section 204; (8) Violation of Labor Code Section 203; (9) Failure to Maintain Records Required under Labor Code Sections 1174 and 1174.5; (10) Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses under Labor Code Section 2802; (“Operative Complaint”). (*Id.* at ¶ 6.) On April 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a request for dismissal of the Class Action claims without prejudice. (*Id.*)

On October 17, 2024, the Parties attended an all-day mediation with experienced mediator Lisa Klerman, Esq. and subsequently settled the Action. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.) The Settlement Agreement reached between the parties does not constitute, is not intended to constitute, and will not be deemed

to constitute, an admission of liability by Defendant as to the merits, validity, or accuracy of any of the allegations or claims made against Defendant in the Action. (Kim Decl., Exhibit 1, ¶ 10.1.) Defendant denies all liability in the Action. (*Id.*)

B. Mediation and Settlement

Prior to mediation, Plaintiff conducted extensive informal discovery and Defendant provided data, numbers, and documents, including electronic payroll and timekeeping data for all alleged Aggrieved Employees, information and documentation regarding Defendant's wage and hour policies, expense report data and information, and meal period information. (Kim Decl., ¶ 8.) The information and data exchanged by Plaintiff and Defendant prior to and during mediation and settlement negotiations were sufficient to reliably assess the merits of the parties' respective positions, to compromise the issues on a fair and equitable basis, and to devise a formula for distribution of civil penalties among the Aggrieved Employees that took into consideration the strength of the PAGA claims. (*Id.*)

With the assistance of a highly respected wage and hour mediator, the parties agreed to a global settlement of the Action. (Kim Decl., ¶ 9.) The general terms for settling this Action were first memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding, fully executed on January 16, 2025, and thereafter in the long-form Settlement Agreement now before the Court for approval, which was fully executed on April 2, 2025. (*Id.*)

The parties believe and agree that the Settlement provides for a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the Action and have arrived at the Settlement in extensive, arm's length negotiations, considering all relevant factors, present and potential. (Kim Decl., ¶ 10.) PAGA Counsel believes that the Settlement confers real benefits upon Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees and that an independent review of the Settlement by the Court in the approval process will confirm this conclusion. (*Id.*)

1 **III. PAGA ACTIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS**

2 **A. The PAGA Statutory Scheme**

3 PAGA creates a means of “deputizing” citizens as private attorney generals to enforce the
4 Labor Code on behalf of the LWDA. *Brown v. Ralphs Grocery Co.* (2011) 197 Cal. App. 4th 489,
5 501, *review den.* (Oct. 19, 2011, No. S195850), *cert. denied* 132 S.Ct. 1910 (Apr. 16, 2012). A
6 plaintiff may not — and Plaintiff here does not — bring a PAGA claim simply on his or her own
7 behalf as an individual claim, but “as the proxy or agent of the state’s labor law enforcement
8 agencies.” *Id.*, at 986; *see also Reyes v. Macy’s, Inc.* (2011) 202 Cal. App. 4th 1119, 1123-1124;
9 *Iskanian v. CLS Transp. Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348, 380. When an aggrieved employee
10 brings a PAGA claim, “the government is always the real party in interest.” *Securitas Sec. Servs.*
11 *USA, Inc. v. Sup. Ct. of San Diego Cnty.* (2015) 234 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 1119; *Montano v. The Wet*
12 *Seal Retail, Inc.* (2015) 232 Cal. App. 4th 1214, 1222 (“[A] PAGA action is a dispute between an
13 employer and the State agency.”). Accordingly, a plaintiff that brings a PAGA claim represents “the
14 same legal right and interest as state labor law enforcement agencies,” in that the plaintiff seeks to
15 recover those civil penalties that the LWDA otherwise would assess and collect. *Arias v. Super. Ct.*
16 (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, 986; Labor Code § 2699(a) & (f); *Securitas, supra*, 234 Cal. App. 4th at 1119;
17 *see also Medina v. Vander Poel* (E.D. Cal. 2015) 523 B.R. 820, 825 (holding “PAGA plaintiffs do
18 not have property rights in their cases.”), and *Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v.*
19 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 993, 1003.

20 Therefore, when a plaintiff brings a PAGA claim, he or she is properly viewed as a private
21 attorney general prosecuting violations of California’s labor laws on behalf of the state. An employee
22 may commence a PAGA action by fulfilling the requirements of California Labor Code §
23 2699.3(a)(1), which simply states: “The aggrieved employee or representative shall give written
24 notice by certified mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and the employer of the
25 specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
26 support the alleged violation.” Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1). As explained above, Plaintiff complied
27 with the notice requirements and properly pled a PAGA claim. (Kim Decl. ¶¶ 5-6.)

B. The Court Has Discretion When Awarding the Amount of Penalties.

The Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2699 *et seq.*, provides for penalties in the amount of \$100 for each violation per aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and \$200 for each violation per aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation. Labor Code § 2699(f)(2). “PAGA penalties...are mandatory, not discretionary” and must be awarded upon a showing that Defendants violated the Labor Code. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1213. However, the Private Attorneys General Act provides the Court with discretion when it finds liability and awards these penalties as part of a judgment. Labor Code § 2699(e)(2) states that “a court may award a lesser amount than the maximum civil penalty amount specified by this part if, based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory.”

C. PAGA Authorizes the Payment of PAGA Counsel's Fees and Costs

The Private Attorneys General Act provides for the recovery of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs. Labor Code § 2699(g)(1) (“Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs, including any filing fee paid...”). The monetary settlement and programmatic relief make Plaintiff a “prevailing party.” *Folsom v. Butte County Ass’n of Gov’ts* (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 668,671; *Santisas v. Goodin* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 599, 621. Even if Labor Code § 2699(g)(1) did not authorize fees, Plaintiff would be entitled to fees as a Private Attorney General under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 because Plaintiff brought this action to, and the action does, benefit the public. *Arias*, 46 Cal.4th at 985–986.

IV. THE SETTLEMENT

Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will pay the Gross Settlement Amount of \$155,000.00 in full and final settlement of the PAGA claim alleged in the Action. (Kim Decl., Exhibit 1, ¶ 3.1).

Pending Court approval, the Gross Settlement Amount will be allocated as follows: (1) attorneys' fees of 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount which is **\$54,250.00** ("PAGA Counsel Fees Payment") (Kim Decl., ¶ 12.); (2) actual litigation costs incurred in this matter in the amount of

1 **\$18,463.94** (“PAGA Counsel Costs Payment”) (*Id.*); (3) settlement administration costs of up to
2 **\$3,295.00** to be paid to the Settlement Administrator, Phoenix, for sending notices and for calculating
3 settlement shares and preparing all checks and mailings (“Administration Expenses Payment”) (*Id.*);
4 and (4) PAGA Penalties in the amount of **\$78,991.06**, with 75% (\$59,243.30) allocated to the LWDA
5 (“LWDA PAGA Payment”) and 25% (\$19,747.76) allocated to the Aggrieved Employees
6 (“Individual PAGA Payments”). (*Id.*) The Individual PAGA Payments will be calculated based on
7 the number of pay periods the Aggrieved Employee worked during the PAGA Period of November
8 8, 2022, through October 17, 2024 (“PAGA Pay Periods”). (Kim Decl., Exhibit 1, ¶ 3.3.1.)

9 Based on its records, Defendant estimates that there are approximately 123 Aggrieved
10 Employees who collectively worked 3,010 PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 11.)
11 If the total number of PAGA Pay Periods in the PAGA Period increases by more than 10% (i.e., an
12 increase of 301 or more), then Defendant will increase the Gross Settlement Amount in proportion to
13 the number of PAGA Pay Periods in excess of 10%. (Kim Decl., Exhibit 1, ¶ 8.) For example, if the
14 number of PAGA Pay Periods increases by 15% over 3,010 PAGA Pay Periods, then the Gross
15 Settlement Amount will increase by 5%. (*Id.*)

16 Based on this information, and using a straight average, Plaintiff estimates that each
17 Aggrieved Employee will receive a payment of approximately \$160.55 (\$19,747.76 divided by 123
18 Aggrieved Employees). (Kim Decl., ¶¶ 11, 12.)

19 **V. ARGUMENT**

20 **A. The Court Should Approve the Settlement Agreement.**

21 Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(l), the parties must obtain Court approval of a settlement of a
22 PAGA action on a representative basis. However, as explained in *Arias v. Superior Ct.* (2009) 46
23 Cal.4th 969, the parties need not follow the class action procedural rules in PAGA cases and therefore
24 need not obtain approval of the PAGA settlement through a motion for preliminary or final approval.
25 Nonetheless, to comply with the requirements of Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff submits this
26 Motion and the Settlement Agreement for Court approval.

B. The Risks of Moving Forward with Plaintiff's PAGA Claim

To help the Court evaluate the fairness of the Settlement, below is a discussion of the risk evaluation made by Plaintiff and PAGA Counsel. Plaintiff and PAGA Counsel considered the arguments and defenses asserted by Defendant at mediation, assessed the risks of moving forward to trial and what this Court could do in awarding penalties even if Plaintiff prevailed at trial.

Plaintiff estimated that the maximum potential exposure on the PAGA claim is \$301,000.00, calculated by multiplying the total number of PAGA Pay Periods (3,010) by \$100 per violation. (Kim Decl., ¶ 18.) Plaintiff’s calculation of the total potential exposure on the PAGA claim was based on one PAGA penalty per Pay Period (i.e., Plaintiff did not stack the PAGA penalties in her damages calculation). (*Id.*) Case law supports the notion that it is inappropriate to “stack” penalties for multiple violations, particularly when those violations all stem from the same alleged “injury.” (*Id.* at ¶ 18.)

The Gross Settlement Amount of \$155,000.00 is approximately 51.50% of the maximum potential exposure of \$301,000.00. (*Id.* at ¶ 21.) The Gross Settlement Amount therefore represents a strong value at approximately \$51.50 per Pay Period. (*Id.*) From PAGA Counsel’s review of the facts, strengths, and weaknesses of the case, the risks and delays posed by further litigation, PAGA Counsel believes that the recovery for each Aggrieved Employee is fair and reasonable. (*Id.*)

C. Trial of Plaintiff's PAGA Claims Would Have Presented Many Hurdles.

Defendant denied and continues to deny all of the claims made by Plaintiff in this Action and contend that it acted at all relevant times in conformance with the law. (*Id.* at ¶ 16.) Defendant contends that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid for all hours worked, that Defendant prohibited Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees from working beyond their scheduled shifts, and that any “off-the-clock” work was performed without Defendant’s knowledge and de minimis; that Defendant provided lawfully compliant meal and rest periods (and in fact provided longer breaks than required by law) and that any deviations were at the voluntary election of Plaintiff and/or the Aggrieved Employees and not at the request of Defendant or due to work requirements; that Defendant paid all wages due on a timely basis; that Defendant paid all wages due on a timely basis and using Labor Code compliant instruments; that Defendant’s wage statements complied with the

1 law; and that neither Plaintiff nor any Aggrieved Employees incurred reasonable business related
2 expenses for which they were not reimbursed. (*Id.*) As a result, PAGA Counsel had to appropriately
3 discount the amount recoverable from Defendant in a settlement. (*Id.*)

4 **D. The Court May Have Exercised Its Discretion to Reduce Civil Penalties.**

5 “PAGA penalties...are mandatory, not discretionary” and the Court must award penalties
6 upon a showing that Defendant violated the Labor Code. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163
7 Cal. App. 4th 1157, 1213; *Moreno v. Autozone, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. June 5, 2007) No. C05-04432 MJJ,
8 2007 WL 1650942, at *3. However, PAGA does provide the Court with discretion when it awards
9 these penalties. In departing from the \$100/pay period calculation to arrive at the \$155,000.00 Gross
10 Settlement Amount in this case, Plaintiff considered various reasons why the Court may reduce any
11 eventual recovery at its discretion and considered that PAGA penalties are not mandatory but
12 permissive. (Kim Decl., at ¶ 20.) Labor Code § 2699(e)(2) states that “a court may award a lesser
13 amount than the maximum civil penalty amount specified by this part if, based on the facts and
14 circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary
15 and oppressive, or confiscatory.” (*See also Thurman v. Bayshore* (2012) 203 Cal. App. 4th 1112
16 (reducing PAGA penalties by 30% under this provision).

17 **VI. THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS**

18 **A. The Court Should Approve the Requested Attorneys’ Fees and Costs**

19 Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, PAGA Counsel is requesting an award of attorneys’
20 fees in the amount of **\$54,250.00** and an award of litigation costs to PAGA Counsel of **\$18,463.94**.
21 (Kim Decl., at ¶ 22.)

22 Prior to enactment of PAGA, when the State had the resources to seek civil penalties on behalf
23 of the public, it paid its employees (including their attorneys) their salaries and benefits for pursuing
24 such penalties. The Legislature enacted PAGA because the Labor Commissioner and other agencies
25 were hampered in their enforcement of civil penalties by inadequate funding and staffing constraints.
26 *Iskanian, supra*, 59 Cal.4th at 379. To facilitate broader enforcement, the Legislature enacted PAGA,
27 authorizing “aggrieved employees” to pursue civil penalties on the state’s behalf. Labor Code §

2699(a). In creating PAGA, the Legislature expressly provided that the private counsel retained by the Plaintiff to represent the public’s interest can recover fees if the Plaintiff is the prevailing party. Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

1) PAGA Counsel Are Entitled to Fees from the Civil Penalties Recovered

As previously indicated, this is *not* a class action. However, like a class action, it is a representative action where instead of a class, the Plaintiff represents the State and the public. As a matter of law and substance, counsel’s client is the public at large and the State of California. The Plaintiff is simply a “proxy” for the State. On August 11, 2016, the California Supreme Court decided *Laffitte v. Robert Half International*, which addressed, in a class action context, the correct methodology for awarding fees in a representative action settlement. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.* (2016) 205 Cal.Rptr.3d 555, 573. The *Laffitte* Court approved awarding fees as a percentage of the settlement fund.:

We join the overwhelming majority of federal and state courts in holding that when class action litigation establishes a monetary fund for the benefit of the class members, and the trial court in its equitable powers awards Class Counsel a fee out of that fund, the court may determine the amount of a reasonable fee by choosing an appropriate percentage of the fund created.

Id. at p. 573. Here, the \$155,000.00 common fund created for the benefit of the public is, with Plaintiff as a proxy for the State, not unlike the fund created in class action settlements, with the public the equivalent of the class referenced in *Laffitte*.

The Court, in *Laffitte*, pointed out several reasons why the percentage-of-the-fund method is preferred over the alternative lodestar-multiplier approach in California courts:

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

Id. at 573.

An award of one-third of the civil penalties realized in the Settlement is appropriate here under the “substantial benefit” theory. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1810;

Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc. (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 224, 254. That theory permits a litigant who has sued in a representative capacity to recover fees from the beneficiaries of that representation. Courts exercise their inherent equitable powers to assess attorneys' fees against the entire fund, thereby spreading the cost of those fees among the public who benefits from PAGA actions. *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 35 (*Serrano III*). As this approach "better approximates the workings of the marketplace than the lodestar approach," there is "a greater judicial willingness to evaluate a fee award as a percentage of the recovery." *Lealao v. Beneficial Calif., Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 19, 31, 48.

2) The Attorneys' Fees Request Is Within the Range of Reasonable Fees

PAGA Counsel at D.Law, Inc. are experienced employment attorneys with expertise in wage and hour class and representative actions. (Kim Decl., ¶¶ 32-42.) Throughout this case, PAGA Counsel have borne, and continue to bear, the entire risk and cost of litigation associated with this Action on a purely contingency basis. (Kim Decl., ¶ 24.) As a result, PAGA Counsel have yet to receive any compensation for the amount of time and money invested in the case to date. (*Id.*) Moreover, courts in this county and others have approved attorneys' fees awards in other PAGA settlements on a common fund basis at higher percentages than the 35% Plaintiff is requesting here. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 26-27.)

For these reasons, PAGA Counsel's requested fee of 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount is well within the range of reasonableness and is fair compensation for undertaking this complex and risky litigation on a contingent basis.

3) PAGA Counsel's Fee Request Is Reasonable Under the Lodestar Crosscheck.

PAGA Counsel’s fee request is reasonable when calculated using the lodestar method. Under the lodestar method, a base fee amount is calculated from a compilation of time reasonably spent on the case and the reasonable hourly compensation of the attorney. *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 48. The court then may enhance this lodestar figure by a “multiplier” to account for a range of factors, such as the novelty and difficulty of the case, its contingent nature, and the degree of success achieved. *Id.* at 49; *see also Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-36; *Thayer v. Wells*

1 *Fargo Bank* (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 819, 834, (“[t]here is no...rule limiting the factors that may
2 justify an exercise of judicial discretion to [adjust the] lodestar”).

3 Here, the lodestar cross check establishes that the fees requested are significantly less than the
4 amount warranted by lodestar analysis; therefore, the factors warranting positive multipliers do not
5 come into play, even though they were apparent in this case.

6 PAGA Counsel worked at least 123.28 hours on this matter and calculated the base lodestar
7 at \$81,844.00 at rates reflecting those currently earned in the marketplace. Attorney Alvin Lindsay’s
8 records indicate at least 24 hours on this matter with an hourly rate of \$900. (Kim Decl. ¶ 29.)
9 Attorney Rose Sorial’s records indicate at least 11.68 hours on this matter with an hourly rate of \$650.
10 (*Id.*) Attorney Enoch Kim’s records indicate at least 10.2 hours on this matter with an hourly rate of
11 \$750. (*Id.*) Attorney Tania Fonseca’s records indicate at least 47.6 hours on this matter with an hourly
12 rate of \$695. (*Id.*) Attorney Antonia McKee’s records indicate at least 29.8 hours on this matter with
13 an hourly rate of \$400. (*Id.*)

14 Thus, consideration of the lodestar method as a cross-check to the percentage figure sought
15 strongly supports the reasonableness of the requested fee award. PAGA Counsel respectfully request
16 the Court grant its request for \$54,250.00 in fees, which requires **no multiplier**.

17 4) The Court Should Approve the Reimbursement of PAGA Counsel’s Costs.

18 The litigation expenses incurred by PAGA Counsel in this Action are also to be reimbursed
19 under the Settlement Agreement. PAGA Counsel seek \$18,463.94 in reimbursement for litigation
20 costs (Kim Decl., ¶ 22.) The lion’s share of these costs were incurred in connection with mediation,
21 and the others listed were all reasonably incurred and necessary to the prosecution of this Action.
22 Thus, PAGA Counsel respectfully request the Court approve their request for reimbursement in the
23 amount of \$18,463.94.

24 **VII. THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION**

25 The parties agreed to use Phoenix Settlement Administrators (“Phoenix”) as the third-party
26 settlement administrator in this case. (Kim Decl., ¶ 13.) Phoenix will be responsible for updating the
27 addresses for the Aggrieved Employees, mailing the Notice of Settlement (which is attached as

Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement) and calculating and distributing the settlement checks, among other duties. (*Id.*) Phoenix capped its fees at \$3,295.00 for administering the Settlement, and based on PAGA Counsel's experience in other class and PAGA settlements, Phoenix's costs for administering this Settlement are fair and reasonable. (*Id.*)


VIII. CONCLUSION

Plaintiff and PAGA Counsel submit that the proposed Settlement as documented in the Settlement Agreement is fair, adequate, reasonable, and in the best interest of Plaintiff, Defendant, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court approve the Settlement and order the Parties to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the Settlement Agreement and enter the concurrently filed [Proposed] Order Granting Approval and Judgment to that end.

DATED: April 4, 2025

D.LAW, INC

By



Emil Davtyan

David Yeremian

Alvin B. Lindsay

Rose Sorial

Enoch J. Kim

Antonia McKee

Attorney for Plaintiff Chanel Vick on behalf
of herself and Aggrieved Employees