

1 **-BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK**
2 **DE BLOUW LLP**

3 Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

4 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

5 Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

6 2255 Calle Clara

7 La Jolla, CA 92037

8 Telephone: (858)551-1223

9 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

10 Email: norm@bamlawca.com

11 Website: www.bamlawca.com

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

14 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF BUTTE**

15 CHRISTIAN LOVGREN and GINA
16 CUNEO, individuals, on behalf of
17 themselves, and on behalf of all persons
18 similarly situated, and on behalf of the
19 State of California, as private attorneys
20 general,

21 Plaintiff,

22 vs.

23 ENLOE MEDICAL CENTER, a
24 California Corporation; and DOES 1
25 through 50, inclusive,

26 Defendants.

CASE No. **24CV00200**

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
SETTLEMENT AND AWARD OF
ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS AND SERVICE
AWARDS (UNOPPOSED)**

Hearing Date: November 12, 2025

Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.

[*Hearing scheduled by Order dated June 25,
2025*]

Judge: Hon. Stephen E. Benson

Dept.: 6

Date Action Filed: January 18, 2024

Trial Date: Not set

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE SETTLEMENT BEFORE THE COURT	1
III.	GENERAL STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO JUDICIAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS.	2
IV.	THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE AND ADEQUATE	3
A.	The Settlement Satisfies the California Test for Fairness	4
1.	The Investigation and Analysis of Documents are Sufficient to Allow Counsel and the Court to Act Intelligently	4
2.	The Settlement was Reached Through Arm's Length Bargaining	4
3.	Class Counsel is Experienced in Similar Litigation	5
4.	There Are No Objections and Only Five (5) Requests for Exclusion	5
5.	The Strength of Plaintiff's Case	6
6.	The Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation.	8
7.	The Amount Offered in Settlement.	9
V.	THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS AND SERVICE AWARD SHOULD BE APPROVED	11
A.	The Attorneys' Fees are Reasonable and Supported by the Percentage of the Fund Method.	11
B.	The Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses	14
C.	The Service Award Is Reasonable and Should be Approved.	14
VI.	CONCLUSION	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:	Page:
<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Fran. v. Southland Corp.</i> , 85 Cal. App. 4 th 1135 (2000).....	2, 3
<i>Alberto v. GMRI, Inc.</i> , 252 F.R.D. 652 (E.D. Cal. Jun 24, 2008)	5
<i>Andrews v. Plains All Am. Pipeline L.P.</i> , 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172183, (C.D. Cal. 2022)	15
<i>Barbosa v. Cargill Meat Solutions Corp.</i> , 297 F.R.D. 431 (E.D. Cal. 2013)	12
<i>Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc.</i> , 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118 (S. D. Cal. 2009).....	8
<i>Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert</i> , 444 U.S. 472 (1980).....	11
<i>Brinker v. Superior Court</i> , 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012)	7
<i>Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc.</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86266 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2007).....	7
<i>Buccellato v. At&T Operations, Inc.</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85699 (N.D. Cal. 2011)	13
<i>Cellphone Termination Fee Cases</i> , 180 Cal. App. 4th 1110 (2009)	3
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> , 162 Cal.App.4th 43 (2008)	14
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794 (1996)	3
<i>Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.</i> , 59 Cal. 4th 1 (2014)	8
<i>Gaskill v. Gordon</i> , 160 F.3d 361 (7th Cir. 1998).....	12
<i>Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476; 15 Wage & Hour Cas. 2d (BNA) 1330 (N.D.Cal. 2007); <i>aff'd</i> 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 10328 (9 th Cir. May 14, 2009)	5, 9, 11, 15
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9 th Cir. 1998)	6
<i>Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.</i> , 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 (N.D. Cal. 2009)	7

1	<i>Huens v. Tatum,</i>	
2	52 Cal. App. 4 th 259 (1997).....	2
3	<i>In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litigation,</i>	
4	80 F. Supp. 2d 164 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).....	6
5	<i>In re Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases,</i>	
6	171 Cal.App.4th 495 (2009)	14
7	<i>Johnson v. Brennan,</i>	
8	2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105775 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	13
9	<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.,</i>	
10	168 Cal. App. 4th 116 (2008)	3
11	<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l,</i>	
12	1 Cal. 5th 480 (2016)	12, 13, 14
13	<i>Laskey v. Int'l Union,</i>	
14	638 F.2d 954 (6th Cir. 1981).....	6
15	<i>Louie v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.,</i>	
16	2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314 (S.D. Cal. 2008).....	8, 15
17	<i>Ma v. Covidien Holding, Inc.,</i>	
18	2014 WL 2472316, (C.D. Cal. 2014)	11
19	<i>Mathein v. Pier 1 Imps.,</i>	
20	2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71386, 168 Lab. Cas. (CCH) P36,620 (E.D. Cal. 2018)	15
21	<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles,</i>	
22	186 Cal. App. 4th 399 (2010).....	3
23	<i>Naranjo v. Spectrum Sec. Servs., Inc.,</i>	
24	2024 Cal. LEXIS 2438 (May 6, 2024).....	7, 11
25	<i>Nordstrom Commission Cases,</i>	
26	186 Cal. App. 4th 576 (2010)	10
27	<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com'n,</i>	
28	688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982).....	3
	<i>Pellegrino v. Robert Half Intern., Inc.,</i>	
	182 Cal.App.4th 278 (2010).....	13
	<i>Reynolds v. Direct Flow Med., Inc.,</i>	
	2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149865, (N.D. Cal. 2019)	15
	<i>Rutti v. Lojack Corp., Inc.,</i>	
	2012 WL 3151077 (C.D. Cal. 2012).....	14
	<i>Serrano v. Priest,</i>	
	20 Cal. 3d 25 (1977).....	11

1	<i>Stanger v. China Elec. Motor, Inc.</i> ,	
2	812 F.3d 734 (9th Cir. 2016).....	13
3	<i>Stetson v. Grissom</i> ,	
4	821 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2016).....	13, 14
5	<i>Stoetzner v. U.S. Steel Corp.</i> ,	
6	897 F.2d 115 (3d. Cir. 1990).....	6
7	<i>Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.</i> ,	
8	2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78671 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	11
9	<i>Swedish Hospital v. Shalala</i> ,	
10	1 F.3d 1261 (D.C. Cir. 1993)	12
11	<i>Taylor v. Fedex Freight, Inc.</i> ,	
12	2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142202 (E.D. Cal. 2016)	14
13	<i>Viceral v. Mistras Grp., Inc.</i> ,	
14	2016 WL 5907869 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....	11
15	<i>Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.</i> ,	
16	557 F.2d 759 (9th Cir. 1997).....	11
17	<i>Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	
18	290 F.3d 1043 (9th Cir. 2002).....	13
19	<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer</i> ,	
20	91 Cal. App. 4 th 224 (2001).....	3, 11, 14
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 The parties to this action have reached a Settlement and the Court preliminarily approved the
3 Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (the “Agreement”), a true and correct copy of which is
4 attached as Exhibit #2 to the Declaration of Norman Blumenthal (“Blumenthal Decl.”).¹ In accordance
5 with the Preliminary Approval Order dated June 25, 2025 (“Preliminary Approval Order”), the
6 approved Class Notice has been disseminated to the Class.²

7 The purpose of this hearing is to determine whether the proposed settlement of the litigation
8 should be finally approved. Plaintiffs Christian Lovgren and Gina Cuneo (“Plaintiffs”) respectfully move
9 for final approval, including attorneys’ fees, costs and the service awards, and the proposed entry of the
10 Final Approval Order and Judgment, submitted herewith. The settlement represents an excellent result
11 for the Class and avoids the delays, risks, and costs of further litigation. After disseminating the notice
12 to the 4,773 members of the Class, there were **no objections and only five (5) requests for exclusion**,
13 which means that nearly the entire Class (99.9%) has elected to participate in the Settlement.
14 Blumenthal Decl. ¶4. This is a positive response from the Class evidencing their collective approval of
15 the settlement. As a result, Plaintiffs respectfully submit that the class settlement should be finally
16 approved for the same reasons that the Court preliminarily approved the settlement as fair, reasonable,
17 and adequate.

18 **II. THE SETTLEMENT BEFORE THE COURT**

19 As consideration for this Settlement, the Gross Settlement Amount to be paid by Defendant
20 Enloe Medical Center (“Defendant”) is Two Million Four Hundred Seventy Thousand Dollars
21 (\$2,470,000) (the “Gross Settlement Amount”). (Agreement at ¶¶ 1.22 and 3.1.) Under the Settlement,
22 the Gross Settlement Amount consists of the following elements: (1) payment of the Individual Class
23 Payments to the Participating Class Members; (2) Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel
24

25 ¹ Capitalized terms are defined in the Agreement.

26 ² The “Class” is defined as “all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendant in
27 California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.” (Preliminary
28 Approval Order at ¶ 5.) The “Class Period” is defined as “October 1, 2022, through April 30, 2025.”
Id.

1 Litigation Expenses Payment; (3) Administration Expenses Payment; (4) the Class Representative
2 Service Payments to the Plaintiffs; and (5) the PAGA Penalties payment. (Agreement at ¶ 1.22.)
3 Blumenthal Decl. ¶3(a). The Gross Settlement Amount does not include Defendant's share of payroll
4 taxes. (Agreement at ¶ 3.1.) The Gross Settlement Amount shall be all-in with no reversion to
5 Defendant. (Agreement at ¶ 3.1.) Blumenthal Decl. ¶3(b). The following is a table of the key financial
6 terms of the Settlement and the proposed deductions:

7 **\$2,470,000 (Gross Settlement Amount)**

- 8 - \$20,000 (Plaintiffs' proposed service awards - not to exceed amount)
- 9 - \$40,000 (Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment - not to exceed amount)
- 10 - \$823,333 (Class Counsel Fees Payment - not to exceed 1/3 of settlement)
- 11 - \$50,000 (PAGA Payment - 75% to LWDA / 25% to Aggrieved Employees)
- 12 - \$22,950 (Administration Expenses Payment)

13 **\$1,513,717 (Net Settlement Amount)**

14 The specific details of the Settlement were discussed in the Motion for Preliminary Approval and are set
15 forth again in the Declaration of Blumenthal at ¶¶ 3(c)-3(i).

16 The Settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable to the class and should be finally approved for
17 the same reasons the Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement, agreeing that the settlement
18 is "fair, adequate, and reasonable." (Preliminary Approval Order at ¶ 3.) In sum, the Settlement valued
19 at \$2,470,000 is an excellent result for the Class. This result is particularly favorable in light of the fact
20 that liability and class certification in this case were far from certain in light of the defenses asserted by
21 Defendant. Given the complexities of this case, the defenses asserted, the uncertainty of class
22 certification, along with the uncertainties of proof at trial and appeal, the proposed settlement is fair,
23 reasonable and adequate, and should be finally approved. Blumenthal Decl. ¶3(j).

24 **III. GENERAL STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO JUDICIAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**
25 **OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS**

26 Settlements of disputed claims are favored by the courts. *Huens v. Tatum*, 52 Cal.App.4th 259,
27 265 (1997). In evaluating settlements, the courts have long recognized that compromise is particularly
28 appropriate since such litigation is difficult and notoriously uncertain. *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Fran.*
v. Southland Corp., 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1151 (2000) ("[V]oluntary conciliation and settlement are the
preferred means of dispute resolution. This is especially true in complex class action litigation.")

The court must decide whether the proposed settlement falls within the range of reasonable

1 settlements, taking into account that settlements are compromises between the parties reflecting
2 subjective, unquantifiable judgments concerning the risks and possible outcomes of litigation. *See*
3 *Wershba v. Apple Computer*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 224, 246 (2001) (“The proposed settlement is not to be
4 judged against a hypothetical or speculative measure of what might have been achieved had plaintiffs
5 prevailed at trial.”) In *Wershba*, the Court explained that “the merits of the underlying class claims are
6 not a basis for upsetting the settlement of a class action.” *Id.*; *see also 7-Eleven, supra*, at 1150.

7 In these cases, courts have repeatedly emphasized that there is a strong initial presumption that
8 the compromise is fair and reasonable. *Wershba*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 245. Courts should not substitute
9 their judgment for that of the parties who negotiated the settlement. *Id.* at 246. The presumption of
10 fairness exists where: (1) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act
11 intelligently; (2) the settlement is reached through arm's-length bargaining; (3) counsel is experienced
12 in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48
13 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996). Here, the facts and circumstances compel the conclusion that the
14 proposed settlement satisfies that standard and the presumption applies.

15 **IV. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE AND ADEQUATE**

16 The Court must determine whether the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable. *Dunk v. Ford*
17 *Motor Co.*, 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996); *see also Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com'n*, 688
18 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982). The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether the settlement
19 is fair. *Cellphone Termination Fee Cases*, 180 Cal.App.4th 1110, 1117 (2009). “The well-recognized
20 factors that the trial court should consider in evaluating the reasonableness of a class action settlement
21 agreement include 'the strength of plaintiffs' case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of
22 further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in
23 settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and views
24 of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the
25 proposed settlement.” *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 128 (2008); *see also*
26 *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of L. A.*, 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408 (2010).

27 The list of factors is not exhaustive and should be tailored to each case. *Dunk, supra*, at 1801.
28 Due regard should be given to what is otherwise a private consensual agreement between the parties.

1 *Id.* The inquiry “must be limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment that the
2 agreement is not the product of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion between, the negotiating parties,
3 and that the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned.” *Id.*
4 “Ultimately, the [trial] court's determination is nothing more than 'an amalgam of delicate balancing,
5 gross approximations and rough justice.' [Citation omitted.]” *Id.*

6 These factors are analyzed seriatim below, and all support final approval of the class action
7 settlement before this Court, consistent with this Court’s Preliminary Approval Order.

8 **A. The Settlement Satisfies the California Test for Fairness**

9 1. The Investigation and Analysis of Documents are Sufficient to Allow Counsel
10 and the Court to Act Intelligently

11 Over the course of more than a year of litigation, the Parties engaged in the investigation of the
12 claims, including the production of documents, class data, and other information, allowing for the full
13 and complete analysis of liabilities and defenses to the claims in this Action. The procedural history and
14 investigation performed was detailed at length in support of the motion for preliminary approval. The
15 Settlement was the product of one arms-length mediation and contentious negotiations, both during and
16 after mediation, presided over by mediator Steve Serratore, Esq. The details of the litigation are set forth
17 in the Blumenthal Decl. at ¶¶ 6(a)-6(g).

18 2. The Settlement was Reached Through Arm’s Length Bargaining

19 This settlement is the result of extensive and hard-fought litigation as well as negotiations before
20 an experienced and well-respected mediator. Defendant has expressly denied and continues to deny any
21 wrongdoing or legal liability arising out of the conduct alleged in the Action. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel
22 have determined that it is desirable and beneficial to the Class to resolve the Released Class Claims of
23 the Class in accordance with this Settlement, based upon the experience of Class Counsel who has
24 previously litigated similar claims against other employers. Blumenthal Decl. ¶7(a).

25 The Parties attended an arms-length mediation session with Steve Serratore, Esq., a respected
26 and experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions, in order to reach this Settlement. In
27 preparation for the mediation, Defendant provided Plaintiffs and Class Counsel with payroll and
28 employment data and other information regarding the Class Members, various internal documents, and

1 other compensation and employment-related materials. Class Counsel analyzed the data with the
2 assistance of damages expert Berger Consulting and prepared and submitted a mediation brief to the
3 mediator. Following the all-day mediation session, with after arms' length negotiations both during and
4 after the mediation, the Parties agreed to this Settlement based upon a mediator's proposal. Blumenthal
5 Decl. ¶7(b).

6 The fact that the settlement was negotiated with the assistance of an experienced mediator
7 supports approval. *Alberto v. GMRI, Inc.*, 252 F.R.D. 652, 666 (E.D. Cal. Jun 24, 2008); *Glass v. UBS*
8 *Fin. Servs.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476; 15 Wage & Hour Cas. 2d (BNA) 1330, at *15 (N.D. Cal.
9 2007) ("The settlement was negotiated and approved by experienced counsel on both sides of the
10 litigation, with the assistance of a well-respected mediator with substantial experience in employment
11 litigation[, and] this factor supports approval of the settlement").

12 From February 2025 to May 2025, the settlement agreement and exhibits thereto were finalized
13 and executed. On June 25, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval, and
14 entered an Order approving the settlement as fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class that same date.
15 Blumenthal Decl. ¶7(c).

16 3. Class Counsel is Experienced in Similar Litigation

17 Class Counsel in this matter has extensive class action experience and has represented thousands
18 of persons in class actions including employment litigation, wage and hour class actions, and complex
19 litigation. Class Counsel has previously litigated wage and hour class actions involving employees and
20 claims similar to this case and have been approved as experienced class counsel during contested motions
21 in state and federal courts throughout California. The experience of counsel and class action cases
22 managed and settled by the Class Counsel in this action is provided to the Court in the Blumenthal Decl.
23 at Exhibit #1. Class Counsel have participated in every aspect of the settlement discussions and have
24 concluded the settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class.
25 Blumenthal Decl. ¶ 3(j).

26 4. There Are No Objections and Only Five (5) Requests for Exclusion

27 The reaction of the Class unequivocally supports approval of the Settlement. On July 24, 2025,
28 the Administrator mailed the Court-approved Class Notice to the Class Members, which provided each

1 class member with the terms of the Settlement, including notice of the claims at issue and the financial
2 terms of the settlement, including the attorneys' fees, costs, and service award that were being sought,
3 how individual settlement awards would be calculated, and the specific, estimated payment amount to
4 that individual. *See Declaration of Cassandra Polites* ("Polites Decl.") ¶ 7, Exh. A. In disseminating
5 the notice, the Administrator followed the notice procedures authorized by the Court in its Preliminary
6 Approval Order. Significantly, there have been **no objections and only five (5) requests for exclusion**.
7 Polites Decl. ¶¶ 11-12. As such, nearly the entire Class (99.9%) will participate in the Settlement and
8 will be sent a settlement check. *See Polites Decl.* at ¶¶ 11-12, 16; *Blumenthal Decl.* ¶4.

9 The absence of any objector strongly supports the fairness, reasonableness and adequacy of the
10 Settlement. *See In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litigation*, 80 F.Supp.2d 164, 175 (S.D.N.Y.
11 2000) ("If only a small number of objections are received, that fact can be viewed as indicative of the
12 adequacy of the settlement."); *Stoetznner v. U.S. Steel Corp.*, 897 F.2d 115, 118-119 (3d. Cir. 1990) (29
13 objections out of 281 member class "strongly favors settlement"); *Laskey v. Int'l Union*, 638 F.2d 954
14 (6th Cir. 1981) (The fact that 7 out of 109 class members objected to the proposed settlement should
15 be considered when determining fairness of settlement). Here, where there are no objections, the
16 approval of the class is evident.

17 5. The Strength of Plaintiffs' Case

18 The Action generally alleges that Plaintiffs and other Class Members were not properly paid all
19 overtime wages for hours worked and at the correct rate of pay, were not provided meal and rest periods
20 or paid premiums at the correct rate of pay in lieu thereof, were not timely paid earned wages, were not
21 provided reimbursement for required expenses, were not paid accrued and used sick pay at the correct
22 rate of pay, were not provided accurate itemized wage statements, and were not paid all wages at the
23 time of termination. The Action seeks unpaid wages, penalties, attorney fees, litigation costs, and any
24 other equitable or legal relief allegedly due and owing to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members by virtue
25 of the foregoing claims. *Blumenthal Decl.* ¶5.

26 Where both sides face significant uncertainty, the attendant risks favor settlement. *Hanlon v.*
27 *Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1026 (9th Cir. 1998). Here, a number of defenses asserted by Defendant
28 present serious threats to the claims of the Plaintiffs and the other Class Members. Defendant asserted

1 that Defendant's practices complied with all applicable Labor laws. Defendant argued that approximately
2 two-thirds of the Class Members do not have a statutory claim for unpaid overtime by virtue of and
3 exception for employees subject to qualifying collective bargaining agreements found in Labor Code
4 section 514. Defendant argued that Class Members were paid for all time worked and that work time
5 was properly recorded. Defendant contends that its meal and rest period policies fully complied with
6 California law and that Defendant did not fail to provide the opportunity for legally required meal and
7 rest breaks and that most of the meal periods were subject to health care worker meal waivers under
8 *Gerard v. Orange Coast Mem'l Med. Ctr.*, 6 Cal. 5th 443 (2018). Defendant could argue that its
9 payment of significant meal and rest period premiums is evidence of its lawful practices. Defendant
10 contends that there was no failure to pay for business expenses and any cell phone usage was merely
11 convenient and voluntary such that reimbursement was not legally required. Finally, Defendant has an
12 argument that the Supreme Court decision in *Brinker v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012),
13 weakened Plaintiffs' claims, on liability, value, and class certifiability as to the meal and rest period
14 claims. Defendant also argues that based on its facially lawful practices, Defendant acted in good faith
15 and without willfulness, which if accepted would negate the claims for waiting time penalties and/or
16 inaccurate wage statements. See e.g. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 15 Cal. 5th 1056, 1065
17 (2024) ("if an employer reasonably and in good faith believed it was providing a complete and accurate
18 wage statement in compliance with the requirements of section 226, then it has not knowingly and
19 intentionally failed to comply with the wage statement law.") If successful, Defendant's defenses could
20 eliminate or substantially reduce any recovery to the Class. While Plaintiffs believe that these defenses
21 could be overcome, Defendant maintains these defenses have merit and therefore present a serious risk
22 to recovery by the Class. Blumenthal Decl. ¶8(a).

23 In a similar wage and hour case, the federal district court in *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.*, 2009
24 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 (N.D. Cal. 2009), explained in approving an overtime class action settlement:

25 Plaintiffs may have a strong case, but the risks inherent in continued litigation are great.
26 Defendants strongly deny liability for Plaintiffs' principal claim... [T]he gross settlement
27 amount and the Class Members' expected net recovery, after fees and other costs are
28 deducted, appear to be a reasonable compromise, in light of the risks of litigation.

2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 at *19-20 (N.D. Cal. 2009); see also *Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, 2007

1 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86266, at *30 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (“In considering the strength of Plaintiff’s case, legal
2 uncertainties at the time of settlement - particularly those which go to fundamental legal issues - favor
3 approval.”). As recognized in a federal decision approving settlement of an overtime wage class action:

4 The potential complexity and possible duration of trial also weigh in favor of granting
5 final approval. Plaintiffs acknowledge the difficulties of proving damages, recognize the
6 uncertainty of outcome, and believe defendant would appeal in the event of adverse
7 judgment. A post-judgment appeal would require many years to resolve and delay
8 payment to class members. Plaintiffs believe the benefits of a guaranteed recovery today
9 outweigh an uncertain future result. Accordingly, plaintiffs argue, and the Court agrees,
10 the actual recovery confers substantial benefits on the class that outweigh the potential
11 recovery through full adjudication.

12 *Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118, *9 (S.D. Cal. 2009); *see also Louie v.*
13 *Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314, *14 (S.D. Cal. 2008).

14 There was also a significant risk that, if the Action was not settled, Plaintiffs would be unable to
15 obtain a certified class and maintain the certified class through trial, and thereby not recover on behalf
16 of any employees other than themselves. At the time of the mediation, Defendant forcefully opposed
17 the propriety of class certification, arguing that individual issues precluded class certification. Further,
18 as demonstrated by the California Supreme Court decision in *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.*, 59
19 Cal. 4th 1 (2014), there are significant hurdles to overcome for a class-wide recovery even where the
20 class has been certified. While other cases have approved class certification in wage and hour claims,
21 class certification in this action was hotly disputed and the maintenance of a certified class through trial
22 was by no means a foregone conclusion. Blumenthal Decl. ¶8(b).

23 In sum, the Settlement is a fair and reasonable result, and provides the Class with a significant
24 recovery, particularly when viewed in light of the fact that the Defendant asserted serious and substantial
25 defenses both to liability and to class certification. The maximum and average class member allocation
26 (in addition to their Individual PAGA Payment) are \$542.98 and \$317.47, respectively. *See* Polites Decl.
27 at ¶17. Given the complexities of this case, the defenses, along with the uncertainties of proof and
28 appeal, the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and should be finally approved.
Blumenthal Decl. at ¶8(e).

6. The Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation

As demonstrated by the decision in *Duran*, the complexities and duration of further litigation

1 cannot be overstated. There is little doubt that Defendant would post a bond and appeal in the event of
2 an adverse judgment. A post-judgment appeal by Defendant would have required many more years to
3 resolve, assuming the judgment was affirmed. If the judgment was not affirmed in total, then the case
4 could have dragged on for years after the appeal. The benefits of a guaranteed recovery today outweigh
5 an uncertain result three or more years in the future. Blumenthal Decl. ¶8(c).

6 Plaintiffs and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of a trial against Defendant through
7 possible appeals which could take at least another two or three years. Class Counsel also have taken into
8 account the uncertain outcome, the risk of litigation, especially in complex actions such as this one. Class
9 Counsel are also mindful of and recognize the inherent problems of proof under, and alleged defenses
10 to, the claims asserted in the Action. Moreover, post-trial motions and appeals would have been
11 inevitable. Costs would have mounted and recovery would have been delayed if not denied, thereby
12 reducing the benefits of an ultimate victory. The Settlement confers substantial benefits upon the Class.
13 Based upon their evaluation, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have determined that the Settlement set forth
14 in the Agreement is in the best interest of the Class. Blumenthal Decl. ¶8(c).

15 Although Plaintiffs and Class Counsel believe that their case has merit, which Defendant continue
16 to vigorously deny, they recognized the potential risks both sides would face if litigation of the Action
17 continued. As the federal court held in *Glass*, where the parties faced uncertainties similar to those in
18 this litigation:

19 In light of the above-referenced uncertainty in the law, the risk, expense, complexity, and
20 likely duration of further litigation likewise favors the settlement. Regardless of how this
21 Court might have ruled on the merits of the legal issues, the losing party likely would
22 have appealed, and the parties would have faced the expense and uncertainty of litigating
23 an appeal. "The expense and possible duration of the litigation should be considered in
24 evaluating the reasonableness of [a] settlement."

25 *Id.* at *12.

26 7. The Amount Offered in Settlement

27 The Settlement in this case is fair, reasonable and adequate considering Defendant's defenses to
28 Plaintiffs' claims. As set forth in the Declaration of Nordrehaug in support of preliminary approval
which discussed the value of the class claims in detail, the Gross Settlement Amount compares favorably
to the value of the claims. Based upon 4,768 Class Members who collectively worked an estimated

370,777 workweeks, the Gross Settlement Amount provides an average value of \$518.04 per Class Member and \$6.66 per workweek and, after deductions, the Net Settlement Amount provides an average recovery of \$317.47 per Class Member and a recovery of \$4.08 per workweek. Blumenthal Decl. at ¶8(d).

The calculations to compensate for the amount due for the Class at the time of the mediation were calculated by Berger Consulting, Plaintiffs' damage expert. As to the Class whose claims are at issue in this Action, Plaintiffs used the expert to analyze the data and determine the potential unpaid wages for the employees. The maximum potential damages were calculated to be \$4,050,927 for the alleged unpaid wages for off-the-clock work at ten minutes per week, \$7,419,414 for alleged meal period damages based upon a 34% potential violation rate for all shifts worked observed in the time records, after deducting for meal premiums already paid by Defendant, and after a reduction of 50% of the violations which were subject to health care worker meal waivers under *Gerard v. Orange Coast Mem'l Med. Ctr.*, 6 Cal. 5th 443 (2018), \$3,761,268 for alleged rest period damages after deducting for rest period premiums already paid by Defendant, \$428,475 for alleged unreimbursed cell-phone expenses at \$5 per month. As a result, the total damage valuation was calculated such that Defendant was subject to a maximum damage claim in the amount of \$15,660,084. As to potential penalties, Plaintiffs calculated that potential waiting time penalties were a maximum of \$6,558,484, and potential maximum wage statement penalties were \$16,327,150.³ Defendant vigorously disputed Plaintiffs' calculations and exposure theories. Blumenthal Decl. ¶8(d).

Consequently, the Gross Settlement Amount of \$2,470,000 represents more than 15.7% of the maximum value of the alleged damages at issue in this case at the time this Settlement was negotiated.⁴

³ While Plaintiffs alleged claims for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code Sections 203 and 226, at mediation these claims are subject to additional, separate defenses asserted by Defendant, including, a good faith dispute defense as to whether any wages were owed given Defendant's position that Plaintiffs and Class Members were properly compensated. *See Nordstrom Commission Cases*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 576, 584 (2010) ("There is no willful failure to pay wages if the employer and employee have a good faith dispute as to whether and when the wages were due.").

⁴ Because the PAGA claim is not a class claim and primarily is paid to the State of California, Plaintiffs did not include the PAGA claim in this discussion of the value of the class claims. The PAGA claim was addressed in the Declaration of Kyle Nordrehaug at ¶33 filed in support of Plaintiffs' Motion

1 Importantly, the recent decision that good faith belief of compliance by the employer in *Naranjo v.*
2 *Spectrum Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 15 Cal. 5th 1056, 1065 (2024), could completely negate the claims for
3 waiting time and wage statement penalties, even if wages were owed to the Class. The above maximum
4 calculations should then be realistically risk-adjusted in consideration for both the risk of class
5 certification and the risk of establishing class-wide liability on all claims. Given the amount of the
6 settlement as compared to the potential value of claims in this case and the defenses asserted by
7 Defendant, this settlement is fair and reasonable.⁵ Clearly, the goal of this litigation has been met.
8 Blumenthal Decl. ¶8(d).

9 **V. THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS AND SERVICE AWARD**
10 **SHOULD BE APPROVED**

11 **A. The Attorneys' Fees are Reasonable and Supported by the Percentage of the**
12 **Fund Method**

13 Class Counsel seeks a fee award calculated at one-third (1/3) of the total value of the settlement
14 for the successful prosecution and resolution of this action. California state and federal courts have
15 recognized that an appropriate method for determining award of attorneys' fees is based on a percentage
16 of the total value of benefits to class members by the settlement. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91
17 Cal.App.4th 224, 254 (2001); *Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal.3d 25, 34 (1977); *Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert*,
18 444 U.S. 472, 478 (1980); *Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.*, 557 F.2d 759, 769 (9th Cir. 1997). The
19 purpose of this equitable doctrine is to avoid unjust enrichment to the Class and to "spread litigation
20 costs proportionally among all the beneficiaries so that the active beneficiary does not bear the entire
21 burden alone." *Vincent*, 557 F.2d at 769.

22 _____
23 for Preliminary Approval.

24 ⁵ See *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (approving a
25 settlement where the settlement amount constituted approximately 25% of the estimated overtime
26 damages for the class); *Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78671, at *12
27 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (granting final approval where "the proposed Total Settlement Amount represents
28 approximately 10% of what class might have been awarded had they succeeded at trial."); *Viceral v.*
Mistras Grp., Inc., 2016 WL 5907869 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (approving wage and hour class action
settlement amounting to 8.1% of full value); *Ma v. Covidien Holding, Inc.*, 2014 WL 2472316, (C.D.
Cal. 2014) (approving wage and hour class action settlement worth "somewhere between 9% and 18%"
of maximum valuation).

1 The California Supreme Court has provided guidance regarding the award of attorneys' fees in
2 wage and hour class action settlements. Under California law, the award of attorneys' fees in common
3 fund wage and hour class action settlements should start with the percentage method. *See Laffitte v.*
4 *Robert Half Int'l*, 1 Cal. 5th 480, 503 (2016) ("We join the overwhelming majority of federal and state
5 courts in holding that when class action litigation establishes a monetary fund for the benefit of the class
6 members, and the trial court in its equitable powers awards class counsel a fee out of that fund, the court
7 may determine the amount of a reasonable fee by choosing an appropriate percentage of the fund
8 created"). Under the percentage of the fund method, a court's objective remains to "mimic the market"
9 in fixing a reasonable fee. *See Gaskill v. Gordon*, 160 F.3d 361, 363 (7th Cir. 1998).

10 First, the fee award representing one-third of the fund clearly falls within that range and is
11 consistent with other rulings of other courts and comprehensive surveys of class action settlements and
12 fee awards. Attorneys' fees awards of one-third of the fund are within the expected range in the market
13 in legal services. *See Fitzpatrick, An Empirical Study of Class Action Settlements and Their Fee Award*,
14 7 J. Empirical Leg. Stud. 811, 833 (2010) (analyzing 444 cases between 2006-2007 and concluding that
15 "[m]ost fee awards were between 25 percent and 35 percent"). In *Laffitte*, the Court expressly approved
16 of a one-third fee award. Such similar awards by other Courts are set forth in the Blumenthal Decl. ¶11.

17 Second, the results delivered by Class Counsel also support the requested percentage of the fund.
18 Here, Plaintiffs and their counsel secured a \$2,470,000 settlement for the benefit of the Class, and not
19 one Class Member objected. The Settlement was possible because Defendant recognized the risks that
20 Plaintiffs could potentially prevail on any or all of the contested issues regarding liability, and obtain class
21 certification. Blumenthal Decl. ¶10(f). In successfully navigating these hurdles Class Counsel displayed
22 the necessary skills in both wage and hour and class action litigation. Moreover, as discussed above,
23 there were significant risks to the contingent litigation. *See Barbosa v. Cargill Meat Solutions Corp.*,
24 297 F.R.D. 431, 449 (E.D. Cal. 2013) ("**Like this case, where recovery is uncertain, an award of**
25 **one-third of the common fund as attorneys' fees has been found to be appropriate.**")

26 Third, "the response of the class members to attorneys' fee notice, though not decisive, is
27 relevant to the ... reasonable determination" regarding fees. *Swedish Hospital v. Shalala*, 1 F.3d 1261,
28 1272 (D.C. Cir. 1993). A positive response rate tends to suggest that the court's "approximation of the

1 market” for fees is well supported. *Id.* at 1269. Here, the Class Notice specifically notified the Class that
2 Class Counsel would be seeking a one-third fee award. Again, there were no objections.

3 Fourth, it is recognized that one of the primary factors justifying an enhanced attorney’s fees
4 reward is the attendant risks inherent in the litigation. Here, it is clear that a settlement fund of
5 \$2,470,000 has been created. For Class Counsel, the fees here were wholly contingent in nature and the
6 case presented far more risk than the usual contingent fee case. Among the risks was the cost inherent
7 in class action litigation, as well as a long battle with a corporate Defendant who had retained a premier
8 and highly experienced defense firm. **Counsel retained on a contingency fee basis, whether in private
9 matters or in class action litigation, is entitled to a premium above their hourly rate in order to
10 compensate for both the risks and the delay in payment.** *See e.g. Stanger v. China Elec. Motor,*
11 *Inc.*, 812 F.3d 734, 741 (9th Cir. 2016) (courts "must" apply a risk enhancement); *Stetson v. Grissom,*
12 821 F.3d 1157, 1166 (9th Cir. 2016) (abuse of discretion not to apply risk multiplier).

13 Fifth, the requested fee award is supported by the lodestar cross-check. The reasonableness of
14 the requested attorneys’ fee of one-third equal to \$823,333 is also established by reference to Class
15 Counsel’s lodestar in this matter. **The contemporaneous billing records for Class Counsel evidence
16 that through October 16, 2025, Class Counsel’s total lodestar is \$230,690.00, with significant
17 additional fees still to be incurred to complete final approval and the settlement process.**
18 Blumenthal Decl. at ¶12 and Exhibit #3. The requested fee award is therefore currently equivalent to
19 Class Counsel’s total lodestar with a reasonable multiplier cross-check of less than 3.6, and there will
20 be additional lodestar incurred by Class Counsel to complete the settlement process and manage the
21 settlement distribution and reports. Blumenthal Decl. at ¶12. In *Buccellato v. At&T Operations, Inc.*,
22 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85699, at *4 (N.D. Cal. 2011), the Court explained that a multiplier of 4.3 is
23 reasonable in such a contingent class action. Here, the multiplier cross-check is within the range of
24 reasonable multipliers approved in other cases.⁶ As noted in *Laffitte*, the lodestar multiplier cross-

25
26 ⁶ See *Johnson v. Brennan*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105775 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (“Courts regularly
27 award lodestar multipliers from two to six times lodestar”); *Buccellato v. At&T Operations, Inc.*, 2011
28 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85699, at *4 (N.D. Cal. 2011) (4.3 multiplier is reasonable); *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal.
5th at 487 (approving 1/3 fee award with multiplier of 2.13); *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d
1043, 1051 (9th Cir. 2002) (3.65 multiplier approved); *Pellegrino v. Robert Half Intern., Inc.*, 182

1 check “does not override the trial court's primary determination of the fee as a percentage of the
2 common fund” and Courts may only consider adjustment when the “cross-check is extraordinarily high
3 or low”. *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal. 5th at 505. For such reasons, Class Counsel’s request for attorneys’ fees
4 in the amount of one-third of the common fund is fair and reasonable, and should be approved.

5 **B. The Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses**

6 The Agreement provides at paragraph 3.2(b), that Class Counsel may seek a “Class Counsel
7 Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than \$40,000.” Class Counsel requests reimbursement for
8 incurred litigation expenses and costs in the amount of \$29,866.48 based upon counsel’s billing records,
9 which is less than the “not to exceed” amount. These litigation expenses include filing fees, mediation
10 expenses, expert expenses (Berger Consulting), attorney service charges (OneLegal, Knox), CourtCall
11 charges, FedEx) delivery charges, and research charges (LexisNexis), all of which are costs normally
12 billed to the client.⁷ The details of the litigation expenses incurred are set forth the Blumenthal Decl. at
13 ¶13 and Exhibit #3. These costs were reasonably incurred in the prosecution of the Action. Blumenthal
14 Decl. at ¶13. Because these incurred expenses were necessary to the successful prosecution of these
15 claims, the request should be granted.

16 **C. The Service Award Is Reasonable and Should be Approved**

17 Plaintiffs respectfully submit that for their service as the only class representatives, Plaintiffs
18 should be awarded the agreed service award of \$10,000 each, in accordance with the Agreement for
19 their time, risk and effort expended on behalf of the Class as the class representatives. (Agreement at ¶
20 3.2(a).) Defendant has agreed to these payments and there have been no objections to the requested
21

22 _____
23 Cal.App.4th 278 (2010) (in class actions reasonable multipliers of 2.0 to 4.0 are often applied); *Wershba*,
24 91 Cal. App. 4th at 255 ("multipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even higher."); *In re Sutter Health*
25 *Uninsured Pricing Cases*, 171 Cal.App.4th 495, 512 (2009) (affirming multiplier of 2.52 as “fair and
reasonable”); *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 (2008) (affirming multiplier of 2.53);
Taylor v. Fedex Freight, Inc., 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142202 (E.D. Cal. 2016) (2.26 multiplier).

26 ⁷ Nontaxable costs are properly awarded where authorized by the parties’ agreement. *Stetson*, 821
27 F.3d at 1165. Accordingly, “[e]xpenses such as reimbursement for travel, meals, lodging, photocopying,
28 long-distance telephone calls, computer legal research, postage, courier service, mediation, exhibits,
documents scanning, and visual equipment are typically recoverable.” *Rutti v. Lojack Corp., Inc.*, 2012
WL 3151077, at *12 (C.D. Cal. 2012).

1 service awards. The Blumenthal Decl., at ¶14, provides a long list of equivalent service awards approved
2 in California in similar cases, which further supports the request in this case. Plaintiffs' Declarations in
3 support of this request are attached as Exhibits #5 and #6 to the Blumenthal Decl.

4 As the representatives of the Class, Plaintiffs performed their duties to the Class admirably and
5 without exception. Plaintiffs worked extensively with Class Counsel during the course of the litigation,
6 responding to numerous requests, searching for documents, working with counsel, and reviewing the
7 settlement documentation. Blumenthal Decl. at ¶ 14. Plaintiffs' Declarations detail the involvement,
8 stress and risks they undertook as a result of this Action. Plaintiffs also assumed the serious risk that they
9 might possibly be liable for costs and fees to Defendant, as well as the reputational risk of being
10 "blacklisted" by other future employers for having filed a class action on behalf of employees.
11 Blumenthal Decl. at ¶15. Without Plaintiffs' participation, cooperation and information, no other
12 employees would be receiving any benefit. Blumenthal Decl. at ¶¶ 15-16.

13 The payment of service awards to successful class representatives is appropriate and the amount
14 of \$10,000 each is well within the currently awarded range for similar settlements. *See, e.g., Andrews*
15 *v. Plains All Am. Pipeline L.P.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172183, at *11 (C.D. Cal. 2022) (finding that
16 the requested service awards of \$15,000 each are appropriate); *Reynolds v. Direct Flow Med., Inc.*,
17 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149865, at *19 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (granting request for \$12,500 service award);
18 *Mathein v. Pier 1 Imps. (U.S.), Inc.*, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71386 (E.D. Cal. 2018) (awarding \$12,500
19 where average class member payment was \$351); *Louie v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.*, 2008
20 WL 4473183, *7 (S.D. Cal. 2008) (awarding \$25,000 service award to each of six plaintiffs in overtime
21 class action); *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*, 2007 WL 221862, *16-17 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (awarding \$25,000
22 service award in overtime class action).

23 **VI. CONCLUSION**

24 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the settlement be finally approved as fair, reasonable and
25 adequate and requests entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment, submitted herewith.

26 Respectfully submitted,

27 Dated: October 16, 2025

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: /s/ Kyle Nordrehaug

Kyle R. Nordrehaug, Attorneys for Plaintiff