Neil M. Larsen, Esq. (SBN 276490)
neil@abramsonlabor.com
Jennifer Rivera, Esq. (SBN 353268)
jennifer.r@abramsonlabor.com
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP
1700 W. Burbank Blvd.
Burbank, California 91506
Tel: (213) 493-6300
Fax: (213) 723-2522

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

ETHELA MIRAMONTES, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, vs. GOLDEN BUFFET POMONA, LLC, a California limited liability company; POMONA GC, LLC, a California limited liability company, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No.: 23STCV29769 **CLASS ACTION** *[Assigned for all purposes to Hon. William F. Highberger, Dept. SSC-10]* **PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT** Date: December 10, 2025 Time: 10:30 a.m. Dept.: SSC-10 Action Filed: December 5, 2023 Trial Date: None Set

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court, on December 10, 2025 at 10:30 a.m., in Department SSC-10 of the above-entitled Court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, Plaintiff Esthela Miramontes ("Plaintiff") will, and hereby does, move this Court for:

1. Preliminary approval of the proposed Settlement Agreement ("Settlement") between Plaintiff and Defendants Golden Buffet Pomona, LLC and Pomona GC, LLC. ("Golden Buffet" or "Defendants");
2. Pursuant to Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, provisional certification, for settlement purposes only, of the following Settlement Class:

   All non-exempt employees who have worked, or continue to work for Defendants in California at any time from December 5, 2019 to December 7, 2024 (the "Class Period").

3. Preliminary appointment of Plaintiff as Class Representative;
4. Preliminary appointment of Neil M. Larsen and Jennifer Rivera of Abramson Labor Group as Class Counsel;
5. Preliminary appointment of Phoenix Settlement Administrators as the Settlement Administrator;
6. Approval of the proposed Class Notice and Notice of Estimated Settlement Award (together, the "Notice Packet"), and an order that the Notice Packet be disseminated to the Settlement Class as provided in the Settlement; and
7. The scheduling of a hearing to consider whether the Settlement should be finally approved and to award a Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff, and attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel.

This motion is based on this notice of motion; the attached memorandum of points and authorities; the declaration of Neil M. Larsen and exhibits attached thereto; the declaration of Jodey Lawrence and exhibits attached thereto; the declaration of Plaintiff; the pleadings and other papers filed in this action; and any further evidence or argument presented at the time of hearing.

Dated: September 11, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

____
Neil M. Larsen
Attorneys for Plaintiff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Esthela Miramontes ("Plaintiff") seeks preliminary approval of a class action settlement agreement ("Settlement") with Defendants Golden Buffet Pomona, LLC and Pomona GC, LLC, ("Golden Buffet" or "Defendants") (together with Plaintiff, the "Parties"). The Settlement resolves a Class and PAGA Representative Action pending before this Court (the "Action"), in which Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to authorize and permit rest periods, failed to issue accurate wage statements, and failed to timely pay wages. Plaintiff further alleges that as a result of these violations, Defendants are liable for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA").

Plaintiff now respectfully requests that this Court preliminarily approve this non-reversionary, common-fund class action Settlement,[1] in which Defendants have agreed to pay $295,000.00 to the following Settlement Class, which is estimated to consist of 253 individuals:

> All non-exempt employees who have worked, or continue to work for Defendants in California at any time from December 5, 2019 through December 7, 2024 (the "Class Period").

The Settlement was reached after the parties engaged in mediation with Monique Ngo-Bonnici, Esq., a highly regarded and experience wage and hour class action mediator. In connection with mediation, Defendants provided Plaintiff with extensive informal discovery, including a sampling of timekeeping and payroll records; a detailed class list that included each Settlement Class members' hire date, termination date (if applicable), and rates of pay; relevant written policies; and additional relevant data and information.

After extensive research and investigation, including a detailed analysis of Defendants' potential exposure made with the assistance of an expert data analyst (EconOne), the mediation session was held with Ms. Ngo-Bonnici on October 7, 2024. The Parties reached a settlement in principle at mediation. Over the following months, the Parties negotiated the finer terms of the settlement, ultimately resulting in the Settlement.

///

[1] The Settlement is attached as Exhibit 1 to the Larsen Declaration. The Class Notice and Notice of Estimated Settlement Award are attached as Exhibits A and B to the Settlement.

Notably, Settlement Class members need not submit a claim to receive a payment ("Settlement Award"). After deductions for proposed settlement administration costs, attorneys' fees and costs, Plaintiff's Class Representative Service Payment, and the LWDA's share of PAGA civil penalties, the average Settlement Award is estimated to be at least **$527.37**. For the reasons discussed herein, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant preliminary approval of the Settlement.

II. SUMMARY OF THE LITIGATION

A. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Defendants operate a restaurant located in Pomona, California. *See* Declaration of Neil M. Larsen ("Larsen Decl."), ¶ 7. Plaintiff is a former non-exempt employee who worked for Defendants in California from approximately April 2023 to approximately June 2023. *Id*.

On December 5, 2023, Plaintiff filed this Action, alleging class action claims for: (1) rest periods violations; (2) wage statement violations; (3) waiting time penalties; and (4) unfair business practices. Larsen Decl., ¶ 8.

Also, on December 5, 2023, Plaintiff provided written notice to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendants of her intent to pursue PAGA civil penalties for alleged violations of the California Labor Code, as required by Labor Code §2699.3. *Id*., ¶ 9, Exhibits 2-3.

On February 9, 2024, Plaintiff filed the operative First Amended Complaint ("FAC"), which added a claim for PAGA civil penalties. *Id*, ¶ 10. On February 12, 2024, Plaintiff electronically submitted a copy of the FAC to the LWDA. *Id*., Exhibit 4.

B. PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS' DEFENSES

1. Rest Period Claim

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to authorize and permit legally compliant 10-minute rest periods. Larsen Decl., ¶ 11; *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct*., 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1028-32 (2012) (discussing rest period requirements). Defendants argues that they have always maintained legally compliant rest period policies, and that, in practice, they have always authorized and permitted all required rest periods to non-exempt employees; that it informs employees of their right to rest periods; and that any failure to take a rest period is the result of employee choice rather than any policy or practice of Defendants. Larsen Decl., ¶ 11. Defendants further argue this claim is not amenable to class treatment as individualized inquiries would be required to determine whether individual employees in different job positions and under different supervisors were in fact authorized and permitted to take rest periods on any given shift, under various supervisors and time periods, thus precluding class certification. *Id*. These manageability concerns are particularly present with respect to rest periods, Defendants contend, since rest periods are not (and need not be) recorded. *Id*.

2. Claim for Failure to Issue Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to provide her and other non-exempt employees complete and accurate wage statements as required under Cal. Labor Coder § 226. Larsen Decl., ¶ 12. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants issued facially deficient wage statements to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees, in that the wage statements failed to list the name of the employing legal entity and therefore, failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a)(8). *Id.* Specifically, for at least a portion of the Class Period the wage statements issued by Defendants contained the name "Golden Corral Pomona LLC" an entity that does not exist rather than listing the correct employing legal entity, Golden Buffet Pomona, LLC and/or Golden Buffet GC, LLC. Defendants contends that Plaintiff cannot show she or other employees "suffer[ed] injury" due to alleged wage statement violations, as required by Lab. Code § 226(e); that employee wage statements always accurately reflected the employing legal entity and that the incorrect name of the employing legal entity on wage statements was a clerical mistake that was corrected within the Class Period. Larsen Decl., ¶ 12. Defendants also contends that any alleged wage statement violations were not "knowing and intentional," particularly given its good-faith defenses. *Id.*

3. Failure to Timely Pay Wages

Plaintiff next alleges that Defendants failed to timely pay employees wages, as it paid employees bi-weekly but paid them 9 days after the end of the pay period. Larsen Decl., ¶ 13. Defendants contends that they have always paid employees timely, as it paid them bi-weekly, "on a regular day designated by the employer in advance of the rendition of services as the regular payday" (see Labor Code § 204(b)), and that Labor Code § 204 therefore does not apply. Larsen Decl., ¶ 13. Defendants further contend that even if the Court were to find Defendants in violation of the payment timing requirements, only PAGA penalties are available for such violations of the payment timing requirements, and that the Court would utilize its discretion under the PAGA to reduce penalties drastically. *Id.* This is particularly true Defendants argues, in light of Defendants' good-faith attempts to comply with the law and given that no employees were underpaid as a result of the alleged violations. *Id.; see also* Lab. Code § 2699(e)(2) (authorizing reduction in PAGA penalties in court's discretion); *Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Mgmt., Inc.*, 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1135 (2012) (affirming reduction of PAGA penalties because, inter alia, "the evidence showed… defendants took their obligations…seriously and attempted to comply with the law"); *Fleming v. Covidien, Inc.*, No. ED-CV-10-1487-RGK (OPx), 2011 WL 7563047 at *4 (C.D. Cal. 2011) (reducing PAGA penalties by over 82% in part because employer was "not aware" of violations); *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.,* 30 Cal.App.5th 504, 529 (2018) (affirming PAGA penalty of just $5 per pay period where employer made "good faith attempts" to comply with the law).

4. Claims Under Lab. Code §§ 203, 226, and the PAGA

As a result of its alleged failure to authorize and permit rest periods, Plaintiff asserts that Defendants failed to comply with their final payment and wage statement obligations, in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 203 and 226, respectively. Larsen Decl., ¶ 14. Finally, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties under the PAGA based on the aforementioned claims. *Id*.

Defendants argue that Plaintiff's derivative claims fail for the same reasons her underlying claims fail. Defendants further assert they have strong, good-faith defenses to Plaintiff's underlying claims, precluding waiting time penalties. Larsen Decl., ¶ 15; *see also* 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 13520 (a "good faith dispute that any wages are due will preclude imposition of waiting time penalties"); *Kao v. Joy Holiday*, 12 Cal.App.5th 947, 963 (2017) (holding "good faith dispute" precluded imposition of waiting time penalties); *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Srvcs., Inc.*, 15 Cal.5th 1056, 1091 (2024) (holding that an employee's "good faith" belief that it is not violating Labor Code Section 226 precludes a finding of a knowing and intentional violation).

Finally, Defendants contend Plaintiff's PAGA claim fails because the underlying claims fail. *See, e.g., Price v. Starbucks Corp.*, 192 Cal.App.4th 1136, 1147 (2011) ("Because the underlying causes of action fail, the derivative UCL and PAGA claims also fail."). Defendants further maintain that given its strong defenses and its good-faith attempts to comply with the law, the Court would substantially reduce PAGA penalties even if it were to find in Plaintiff's favor on her underlying claims. Larsen Decl., ¶ 15; *see also* Lab. Code § 2699(e)(2) (authorizing discretionary reduction in PAGA penalties); *Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Mgmt., Inc.*, 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1135 (2012) (affirming reduction of PAGA penalties because, *inter alia*, "the evidence showed…defendants took their obligations…seriously and attempted to comply with the law"); *Fleming v. Covidien, Inc.*, No. ED-CV-10-1487-RGK (OPx), 2011 WL 7563047 at *4 (C.D. Cal. 2011) (reducing PAGA penalties by over 82% in part because employer was "not aware" of violations); *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*, 30 Cal.App.5th 504, 529 (2018) (affirming PAGA penalty of just $5 per pay period where employer made "good faith attempts" to comply with the law).

C. DISCOVERY AND MEDIATION

In preparation for mediation, the Parties engaged in extensive informal discovery. Defendants produced a sampling of timekeeping and payroll records for putative class members; a detailed class list that included each Settlement Class members' hire date, termination date (if applicable), and rates of pay; its applicable wage and hour policies, and other relevant information. Larsen Decl., ¶ 16. Plaintiff's counsel hired an expert data analyst (EconOne) to analyze and extrapolate the data produced by Defendants. *Id*. This discovery allowed the Parties to assess the merits and value of Plaintiff's claims and Defendants' defenses, as well as the chances for class certification. *Id*.

The Parties attended a mediation with Monique Ngo-Bonnici, Esq. on October 7, 2024. Larsen Decl., ¶ 17. At mediation the Parties vigorously debated Plaintiff's claims and Defendants' defenses, the potential value of Plaintiff's claims, and the chances of certification. *Id.* The Parties reached a settlement in principle at mediation. *Id*. Over the following months, the Parties negotiated the finer terms of the settlement, ultimately resulting in the Settlement. *Id*.

III. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

A. ESSENTIAL TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT

Under the Settlement, Defendants will pay a non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") of $295,000.00. The monetary terms of the Settlement are summarized below:

• Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA"):	$295,000.00
• Minus Court-approved attorneys' fees (one-third):	$98,323.50
• Minus Court-approved costs (up to):	$20,000.00
• Minus Court-approved Service Payment:	$10,000.00
• Minus Amount Set Aside as PAGA penalties:	$25,000.00
• Minus estimated Settlement Administration costs:	$8,250.00
Net Settlement Amount ("NSA"):	**$133,426.50**
PLUS 25% of PAGA penalties ("PAGA Amount"):	$6,250.00
Total Amount Paid to Settlement Class:	**$139,676.50**

1. Funding of the Settlement

The GSA shall be deposited with the Settlement Administrator no later than twenty (20) Court days after the "Effective Date". *See* Settlement, § 4.1. The Effective Date of the settlement shall be the day after both of the following have occurred: (i) final approval of the settlement is granted by the Court, and (ii) Judgment approving the settlement becomes Final. "Final" shall mean the latest of: (i) if there is an appeal of the Court's Judgment, the date the Judgment is affirmed on appeal, the date of dismissal of such appeal, or the expiration of the time to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court, or, (ii) if a petition for writ of certiorari is filed, the date of denial of the petition for writ of certiorari, or the date the Judgment is affirmed pursuant to such petition; or (iii) if no appeal is filed, the expiration date of the time for filing or noticing any appeal of the Judgment. *See* Settlement, § 1.12.

Defendants' share of payroll taxes on any wage portion of the payments to Settlement Class members shall be paid by Defendants separately from, and in addition to, the NSA. *See* Settlement, § 4.1. Defendants' share of payroll taxes shall be deposited with the Settlement Administrator at the same time it deposits the GSA. *Id*.

2. The Settlement Provides for Reasonable Monetary Payments

As noted above, after deducting amounts for a court-approved Class Representative Service Payment, settlement administration costs, attorneys' fees and costs, and PAGA payment to the LWDA, Defendants will pay at least $133,426.50 to Settlement Class members. *See*

Settlement, § 4.7. Defendants represent that there are approximately 253 Settlement Class members. *Id.*, § 1.6. Thus, the average Settlement Award is estimated to be $527.37. Larsen Decl., ¶ 19.

The NSA shall be distributed to Participating Settlement Class members (i.e., those Settlement Class members who do not opt out of the Settlement) as follows: each Participating Settlement Class member will receive a payment from the NSA based on their proportionate number of Workweeks worked for Defendants as non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period. *See* Settlement, §§ 4.7. The Settlement Administrator will calculate each Participating Class Member's payment from the NSA by multiplying the NSA by a fraction, the numerator of which is the Participating Class Member's number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period, and the denominator of which is the total Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period. *Id*.

In addition, all Aggrieved Employees (regardless of whether they opt out from the Class) who were employed by Defendants in California at any time between December 5, 2022 through December 7, 2024 (the "PAGA Period"), will receive a portion of the $6,250 PAGA Amount, based on their proportionate number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. *See* Settlement, §§ 1.3, 1.17, 4.8.

Payments from the NSA will be treated as 33% wages reported on a Form W-2, with the remaining 67% treated as interest and penalties and reported on a Form 1099. *See* Settlement, § 4.9.1, 4.9.2. Payments from the PAGA Amount will be treated as 100% penalties. *Id*., at § 4.9.3. As noted above, Defendants will separately pay the employer's share of payroll taxes on the amount designated as "wages," in addition to the GSA. *Id*., § 4.1. Settlement Class members will have sixty (60) days from the Notice mailing to opt out of or object to the Settlement, or submit disputes, thereby providing ample time to review the Notice without unduly delaying the Settlement. *See Id.*, §§ 6.6.1-6.6.3.

Upon the Settlement being approved and the Settlement being fully funded by Defendants, Plaintiff, and every Participating Settlement Class member will release and discharge Defendants from any and all causes of action, claims, rights, damages, and penalties under California law that are alleged in the First Amended Complaint in the Action or that could have been alleged based on the facts alleged in the First Amended Complaint in the Action, including but not limited to: (a) any alleged failure by Defendants: (1) to authorize and permit rest periods or pay rest period premium wages, (2) to issue compliant wage statements, or (3) to timely pay wages; (b) any right or claim for unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq*., based on the alleged failures set forth in (a)(1) through (a)(3) above; and (c) any violation of the California Labor Code arising from or related to the conduct alleged in (a)(1) through (a)(3) above, including, without limitation, violation of California Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 516, 558, 1198, or any other applicable state statute, rule and/or regulation (Wage Order), during the Class Period ("California Released Claims"). *See* Settlement, § 3.2.

In addition, Aggrieved Employees (whether or not they opt-out of the class portion of the Settlement) shall release Defendants from any right or claim for civil penalties pursuant to the PAGA based on Labor Code violations that were alleged in Plaintiff's December 5, 2023 notice letter to the LWDA and/or in the First Amended Complaint, for the duration of the PAGA Period ("PAGA Released Claims"). *Id*., § 3.3.

3. <u>Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Class Representative Service Payment, and PAGA Payment</u>

At final approval, Plaintiff will apply for a Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of $10,000.00. *See* Settlement, § 4.4. "[I]ncentive awards are fairly typical in class action cases…and are intended to compensate class representatives for work done on behalf of the class [and] to make up for financial or reputational risk undertaken in bringing the action." *In re Cellphone Fee Termination Cases*, 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1393-94 (2010).

As will be fully briefed at final approval, Plaintiff's requested payment is in recognition of the reputational risks that Plaintiff assumed by acting as the Class Representative, Plaintiff's general release of her individual claims (broader than any of Class Member), and the time and effort she expended on behalf of the Settlement Class, including providing factual information and documents to counsel, discussing with counsel the claims and theories at issue in the litigation, identifying potential witnesses, attending multiple telephonic meetings to discuss the claims and theories at issue in this Action, remaining available during the mediation, reviewing the settlement agreement, and otherwise actively participating in the prosecution of this case. *See* Miramontes Decl., ¶¶ 4-9; *see also* Settlement, § 3.4.

Plaintiff respectfully submits that the requested payment is well within the range of approval. *See, e.g., Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Company,* 306 F.R.D. 245, 268 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (approving $15,000 payment to named plaintiff from wage and hour class action settlement, including $10,000 incentive payment and additional $5,000 for his general release, where payments to class members averaged just over $450); *Martinez v. Knight Transportation*, No. 1:16-cv-01730, 2023 WL 5917989 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2023) (approving $10,000 award to plaintiff in $400,000 wage and hour class action settlement where payments to class members averaged about $127).

The Parties have also designated $25,000.00 of the GSA as PAGA penalties, of which $18,750.00 (75%) will be paid to the LWDA, with the remaining $6,250.00 (25%) distributed to Settlement Class members (*see* Settlement, § 4.8, consistent with the PAGA's requirement that 75% of penalties be allocated to the LWDA with the remaining 25% of penalties allocated to aggrieved employees (Labor Code § 2699(i)). Plaintiff submits this allocation to the LWDA is appropriate in light of other settlements allocating penalties to the LWDA. *See, e.g., Chu v. Wells Fargo Inv., LLC*, No. C-05-4526-MHP, 2011 WL 672645 at *1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2011) (approving PAGA payment of $7,500 to LWDA from $6.9 million settlement); *Hudson v. Libre Technology, Inc.*, No. 3:18-cv-1371-GPC, 2020 WL 2467060 at *8 (S.D. Cal. May 13, 2020) (approving $21,250 PAGA payment from $425,000 settlement).

At final approval, Plaintiff's counsel will request attorneys' fees of one-third of the GSA (currently estimated at $98,323.50), and up to $20,000 in litigation costs. Larsen Decl., ¶ 26; *see also* Settlement, § 4.2. The requested fee is fair compensation for undertaking complex, risky, expensive, and time-consuming litigation on a contingent basis. Larsen Decl., ¶ 26. Plaintiff's counsel have incurred substantial attorneys' fees conducting pre-filing investigation and legal research; analyzing timekeeping, payroll, and other data with Plaintiff's data expert to create a comprehensive damages model; preparing for and attending mediation; negotiating and preparing the Settlement; preparing this Motion; and otherwise prosecuting this case. *Id*. Counsel will also incur future attorney fees in overseeing the Notice process, fielding phone calls from Settlement Class members, preparing the Final Approval Motion, and appearing at the Final Approval Hearing. *Id*.

It is appropriate to award attorney fees as a percentage of the "common fund" created by the settlement. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.,* 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016) (holding "the percentage of fund method survives in California class action cases"). Counsel's fee request is well within the range of reasonableness and is typical for common fund settlements. *See*, *e.g.*, *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal.App.4th 43, n.11 (2008) ("regardless whether the percentage method or the lodestar method is used, fee awards in class actions average around one-third of the recovery"). As will be briefed at final approval, the fee request is reasonable in light of the substantial risks and work undertaken, the results obtained, and the efficiency with which counsel conducted the litigation.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL IS WARRANTED

California Rule of Court 3.769 conditions class action settlements on court approval, which is generally evaluated under the same standards as Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 23. *See Reed v. United Teachers Los Angeles*, 208 Cal.App.4th 322, 337 (2012) (Rule 3.769 requires court to determine "that the settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned"); *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1026 (9th Cir. 1998) (Rule 23(e) requires court to determine "whether a proposed settlement is fundamentally fair, adequate, and reasonable"). Settlement is the preferred means of dispute resolution, particularly in complex class action litigation. *See In re Syncor ERISA Litig.*, 516 F.3d 1095, 1101 (9th Cir. 2008). The Court's role is to ensure the settlement agreement taken as a whole is fair and within the range of reasonableness. *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1027. There is a presumption of fairness when a settlement is negotiated at arm's length by counsel. *See, e.g.*, *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 130 (2008).

1. Standard for Preliminary Approval

To make a fairness determination, the Court should consider several factors, including: "the strength of Plaintiff's case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, [and] the experience and views of counsel." *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996). "The list of factors is not exclusive and the Court is free to engage in a balancing and weighing of the factors depending on the circumstances of each case." *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 245 (2001). As discussed below, the proposed Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable in light of the overall balance of factors in this case.

a. <u>The Strength of Plaintiff's Case</u>

Although she maintains her claims are meritorious, Plaintiff acknowledges there were substantial risks and uncertainty in proceeding with class certification and eventual trial on the merits. As described in section II.B., *supra*, Defendants presented multiple defenses to Plaintiff's claims, both on the merits and to class certification, rendering success far from certain.

b. <u>Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Duration of Further Litigation</u>

Although the Parties engaged in significant informal discovery, they had not completed formal written and deposition discovery, which would have required expenditure of substantial time and resources. Larsen Decl., ¶ 28. Plaintiff also still had to file for class certification. *Id*. Even if Plaintiff obtained certification, the Parties would incur considerable fees and costs through a possible decertification motion, motions for summary judgment, trial, and potential appeals. *Id*. The Settlement avoids those risks and the accompanying expense.

c. <u>Risk of Maintaining Class Action Status</u>

Plaintiff had not yet filed her class certification motion, and as such, the extent to which of Plaintiff's proposed classes were certifiable is somewhat speculative. Absent settlement, there was a risk there would not be a certified class at trial, or if there were, that it would consist of a significantly smaller group of employees than the proposed Settlement Class, and the expected recovery would be significantly reduced. Thus, this factor supports preliminary approval.

d. <u>Amount Offered in Settlement Given Realistic Value of Claims</u>

The Settlement provides a fair and reasonable monetary recovery for the Settlement Class for disputed claims. As detailed in the Larsen Declaration, and with the assistance of an expert data analyst, Plaintiff conducted an analysis of potential damages due to Defendants' allegedly unlawful policies and practices. After applying reasonable discounts for risks of not obtaining class certification and risks of losing on the merits, Plaintiff estimated her claims had a realistic potential value of approximately $330,735. Larsen Decl., ¶¶ 20-25. The proposed settlement of $295,000.00 therefore represents about 89.1% of Plaintiff's reasonably forecasted classwide recovery. *Id.*, ¶ 25. As noted above, payments under the Settlement will average $527.37. Preliminary approval is appropriate as the Settlement provides significant monetary relief to the Class.

e. <u>The Experience and Views of Counsel</u>

"Parties represented by competent counsel are better positioned than courts to produce a settlement that fairly reflects each party's expected outcome in litigation." *In re Pac. Enter. Securities Litig.*, 47 F.3d 373, 378 (9th Cir. 1995). Here, counsel have extensive experience litigating wage and hour class actions, and have been appointed class counsel in numerous cases alleging similar claims. *See* Larsen Decl., ¶¶ 2-5. Counsel conducted an in-depth review of Defendants' policies, timekeeping and payroll records, and other relevant data, and drew on their extensive experience to assess Plaintiff's claims. Larsen Decl., ¶¶ 2-6, 20-25. The Settlement was also reached at the mediation session with Monique Ngo-Bonnici, Esq., an experienced wage and hour class action mediator. *Id.*, ¶ 17. This strongly supports preliminary approval. *Kullar*, 168 Cal.App.4th at 130.

2. <u>The Preliminary Approval Standard Is Met</u>

The Court can grant preliminary approval of a proposed settlement and direct that notice be given if the settlement: (1) falls within the range of possible approval; (2) appears to be the product of serious, informed negotiations; and (3) has no obvious deficiencies. *See Manual for Complex Litig.*, § 30.41 (3rd Ed. 1995); *Newberg on Class Actions*, §§ 11:24-25 (4th Ed. 2013).

a. <u>The Settlement Is Within the Range of Possible Approval</u>

As noted, the Settlement reflects about 89.1% of the realistic estimated recovery on Plaintiff's claims, and will provide tangible, monetary compensation for hotly disputed wage claims. Accordingly, Plaintiff submits the Settlement is within the range of possible approval.

b. The Settlement Resulted from Serious, Informed Negotiations

The Settlement resulted from an exchange of substantial information, arm's-length negotiations, mediation with an experienced mediator, and months of additional negotiations. Plaintiff carefully vetted the claims at issue and conducted a detailed analysis of the relevant data and information. Larsen Decl., ¶¶ 16, 20-25. The Settlement is thus entitled to a presumption of fairness. *Kullar*, 168 Cal.App.4th at 130.

c. The Settlement Is Devoid of Obvious Deficiencies

The Settlement provides tangible monetary relief to the Settlement Class, and the amounts proposed for attorneys' fees and costs, Plaintiff's Class Representative Service Payment, and PAGA penalties are all reasonable and appropriate based on the facts of this case. Because the Settlement is devoid of obvious deficiencies, this supports preliminary approval.

B. THE COURT SHOULD CERTIFY THE PROPOSED CLASS

The proposed Settlement Class satisfies the criteria for certification because: (1) the Settlement Class is ascertainable and numerous; (2) common questions of law and fact predominate; (3) Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Settlement Class; and (4) Plaintiff and her counsel will fairly and adequately represent the Settlement Class. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 382.

1. The Proposed Class Is Ascertainable and Numerous

A class is "ascertainable" where members "may be readily identified without unreasonable expense or time by reference to official [or business] records." *Sevidal v. Target Corp.*, 189 Cal.App.4th 905, 919 (2010). The Settlement Class includes non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California during the Class Period, and thus can be readily identified from Defendants' records. Defendants represent there are approximately 253 Settlement Class members, rendering it impracticable to bring them all before the Court. Numerosity is therefore satisfied.

2. Common Issues of Law and Fact Predominate

The focus on certification is not on the merits of the case, but rather on what types of questions, "common or individual," are likely to arise in the action. *Sav-On Drug Store, Inc. v. Sup. Ct.*, 34 Cal.4th 319, 327 (2004). Plaintiff's claims are predicated on Defendants' alleged failure to authorize and permit rest periods. Such claims are commonly held proper for class certification. *See, e.g., Benton v. Telecom Network Specialists, Inc.* 220 Cal.App.4th 701, 726 (2013) (certifying meal and rest period claims).

3. The Named Plaintiff's Claims Are Typical

The typicality requirement is satisfied where class representatives have claims that are typical of the class. *B.W.I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Illinois, Inc.,* 191 Cal.App.3d 1341, 1347 (1987). Here, Plaintiff's claims are typical of those held by Settlement Class members. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period, and she was injured by the same challenged policies that allegedly injured the Settlement Class as a whole. *See* Declaration of Esthela Miramontes ("Miramontes Decl."), ¶¶ 2-3. Thus, typicality is satisfied.

4. Plaintiff and Class Counsel Will Adequately Represent the Class

The adequacy requirement examines conflicts of interest between named parties and the class(es) they seek to represent. *Capital People First v. State Dept. of Developmental Svcs.,* 155 Cal.App.4th 676, 697 (2007). Plaintiff and her counsel will adequately represent the Settlement Class, as there are no known conflicts between Plaintiff or her counsel and the Settlement Class. *See McGhee v. Bank of Am.,* 60 Cal.App.3d 442, 450 (1976) (finding adequacy satisfied where there was no indication that plaintiff's counsel was not qualified and the named plaintiff had no interests antagonistic to those of the proposed class). Class Counsel also has extensive experience in wage and hour class action litigation, as noted above.

C. THE COURT SHOULD ORDER DISTRIBUTION OF THE NOTICE

The Court should order distribution of the proposed Notice by U.S. Mail, using last known mailing addresses provided by Defendants. *See* Settlement, § 6.1. This is the "best notice practicable" under the circumstances, as it provides "individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort." *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin,* 417 U.S. 156, 173 (1974). Plaintiff proposes the Settlement be administered by Phoenix Settlement Administrators, an experienced class action settlement administrator. *See* Jodey Lawrence Declaration and exhibits. Settlement Class members' addresses will be ascertainable through Defendants' records. Phoenix will also run all addresses through the U.S. Postal Service National Change of Address database and/or perform "skip traces" to obtain current addresses. *See* Settlement, §§ 6.1 & 6.5.

The proposed Notice satisfies Cal. Rule of Court 3.766(d) because it advises Settlement Class members of the nature of the claims; the basic contentions of the parties; the key terms of the Settlement; the 60-day deadline to opt-out, object, or submit a dispute and how to do so; explains the recovery formula and expected recovery amount for each Settlement Class member; and explains the releases of claims included in the Settlement. *See* Larsen Decl., Exh. A to Exh. 1. The proposed Notice also includes the final approval hearing date and time, and it provides contact information for Class Counsel and Settlement Administrator ("Phoenix") in the event Settlement Class members have any questions about the Settlement. *Id*. This Notice satisfies Cal. Rule of Court 3.766(e) as the most reliable and cost-effective method of reaching the Settlement Class.

D. <u>THE COURT SHOULD SET A FINAL APPROVAL HEARING</u>

Finally, the Court should set a hearing for final approval on a date appropriately scheduled to follow Settlement Class members' response deadline. *See* Cal. Rule of Court 3.769.

V. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court preliminarily approve the proposed Settlement, provisionally certify the Settlement Class, and enter the Proposed Order submitted concurrently herewith.

Dated: September 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

By: __________________________
Neil M. Larsen
Attorneys for Plaintiff