



1 Elliot J. Siegel (Bar No. 312272)
elliott@kingsiegel.com

2 **KING & SIEGEL LLP**

724 S. Spring Street, Ste. 201
3 Los Angeles, California 90014
4 Tel: (213) 465-4802

5 Navid Barahmand, Esq. (Bar No. 340934)

BARAHMAND LAW GROUP

6 navid@barahmandlaw.com
7324 Sepulveda Boulevard, Suite B
7 Van Nuys, CA 91405
8 tel: (818) 574-3355

9 Bardia Aaron Akhavan, Esq. (Bar No. 316493)

Bardia@baalaw.com

10 **AKHAVAN & ASSOCIATES**

15760 Ventura Blvd. Suite 1720
11 Encino, California 91436
12 Phone: (855) 463-4733

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class

13
14 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
15 **FOR THE COUNTY OF GLENN**

16 **Ferry Mendoza**, individually and on behalf of
17 all similarly situated individuals,

18 Plaintiff,

19 vs.

20 **Baughner Ranch Organics, Inc.**, a
21 California Corporation; and **Does 1-10**,
inclusive;

22 Defendants.
23
24
25
26
27
28

CASE NO. 25CV00036

(Assigned to The Hon. Alicia Ekland; Dept 2)

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF ELLIOT SIEGEL
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR:**

**(1) PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT;**

**(2) APPROVAL OF NOTICE TO CLASS
MEMBERS AND RELATED
MATERIALS; AND**

**(3) SETTING HEARING FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

Date: August 13, 2025

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Dept.: 2

DECLARATION OF ELLIOT J. SIEGEL

I, Elliot J. Siegel, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law before this Court and the federal and state courts of California. I am over 18 years of age. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and if called upon to testify, could and would testify competently thereto. This Declaration does not purport to exhaust my knowledge of the topics discussed.

2. I am a founding shareholder in the law firm of King & Siegel LLP (“Plaintiff’s Counsel” or “Class Counsel”), attorney of record for Plaintiff Ferry Mendoza (“Plaintiff” or “Class Representative”) and the proposed settlement class (the “Class”) in the above-captioned matter.

Plaintiff's Counsel Are Experienced in Wage-And-Hour Litigation

3. I founded King & Siegel LLP with my Partner Julian Burns King in March 2018. King & Siegel LLP is exclusively dedicated to representing employees in individual and class action litigation in California State and federal courts, as well as in arbitration hearings. Since the founding of our firm, King & Siegel LLP has successfully represented thousands of employees in numerous wage and hour and other employment-related class actions.

4. Through my practice at King & Siegel, and my prior employment working for one of the highest ranked litigation firms in the County, I have gained significant experience regarding the obligations and burdens of representing a class from inception to trial and am an experienced practitioner in the realm of wage and hour and employment litigation on both a class and individual level.

5. Though our firm was only founded in 2018, we have been appointed class counsel in dozens of employment class actions, including *Martinez v. Arvato Digital Servs., LLC*, Case No. CIVDS1823989 (San Bernardino Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2018) (final approval granted March 2, 2020); *Quintero v. Miller Milling Company, LLC*, Case No.: CV 19-7459-DMG (JCx) (C.D. Cal 2019) (final approval granted July 31, 2020); *Ayala v. Four Seasons Heating and Cooling, Inc.*, Case No. 56-2019-00529287-CU-OE-VTA (Ventura Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2019) (final approval granted on August 31, 2020); *Martin, et al., v. Break the Floor Productions* (San Diego Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2019) (final approval granted October 23, 2020); *Talkington v. Sanrose Home Health*, Case No. RIC1902475 (Riverside Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2019) (final approval granted December 7,



2020); *Oliver, et al., v. The J. Paul Getty Trust*, Case No. 19STCV40123 (Los Angeles Ctny. Sup. Ct. 2019) (final approval granted October 22, 2020); *Lachman, et al. v. Berlitz Languages, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 19STCV01533 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2019) (final approval granted April 1, 2021); *Ramirez v. Mid-West Fabricating Co.*, No. 30-2019-01102221-CU-OE-CXC (Orange Ctny. Sup. Ct. 2019) (final approval granted June 4, 2021); *Le, et al. v. Walgreen Co., et al.*, No. 18-cv- 01548 (C.D. Cal. 2018) (final approval granted on July 21, 2021); *Nunez v. California Custom Sunrooms & Patio Covers*, Case No. 34-2020-00286923 (Sacramento Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2020) (final approval granted on March 9, 2022); *Anwad, et al. v. Splitsville*, Case No. 30-2018-01026248-CU-OE-CXC (Orange Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2018) (final approval granted on June 28, 2022); *Noer v. Five Star Food Containers, Inc.*, Case No. CIVSB-2116131 (Sacramento Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2021) (final approval on July 28, 2022); *Hernandez v. Yolo Federal Credit Union*, Case No. CV-2021-1000 (Yolo Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2021) (final approval on August 4, 2022); *Hamilton et al., v. Vail Corporation*, et al., Case No. SC20210148 (El Dorado Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2021) (final approval on August 19, 2022); *Fernandez v. Uni-Fab Industries, Inc.*, Case No. RG21113621 (Alameda Sup. Ct. 2021) (final approval on November 2, 2022); *Romero v. Retrofitting360, Inc.*, Case No. 56-2020-00546674-CU-OE-VTA (Ventura Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2020) (final approval on October 25, 2022); *Brown v. DirectTV, LLC* Case No. 2:13-cv-01170-DMG-E (C.D. Cal. 2013) (final approval on March 3, 2023); *Gomez v. Purple Heart Compassion, Inc.*, Case No. 22STCV04548 (Los Angeles Sup. Ct. 2022) (final approval granted April 13, 2023); *Urena v. Raypak, Inc.*, Case No. 56-2022-00563198-CU-OE-VTA (Ventura Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2022) (final approval on June 12, 2023); *Goetz v. Dynacorn*, Case No. 56-2023-00575474-CU-OE-VTA (Ventura Sup. Ct. 2022) (final approval granted September 20, 2023); *Cardenas v. Thorpe Design, Inc.*, Case No. C22-01545 (Contra Costa Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2022) (final approval granted on September 28, 2023); *Woods v. Insight Global*, Case No. C21-01934 (Contra Costa Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2021) (PAGA approval granted on September 28, 2023); *Rodriguez v. Boudreau Pipeline Corporation*, Case No. CVRI2203480 (Riverside County Sup. Ct. 2022) (PAGA approval on November 2, 2023); *Duenas v. Stremicks Foods*, Case No. 5:22-cv-01039-FLA-SHK (C.D. Cal. 2022) (final approval granted on November 3, 2023); *Torres v. D/T Carson*, Case No. RIC1821431 (Riverside Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2018) (final approval granted on November 16, 2023); *Gonzales v. LRB Millwork & Casework, Inc.*, Case No. CIVSB2204728 (Santa Barbara Superior Court 2022) (final approval granted

1 on March 4, 2024); *Mazantini v. Mission Park Health Center LLC*, Case No. 23CV02465 (Santa Barbara
2 Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (PAGA approval granted on March 6, 2024); *Lopez v. Bay State Milling Company*, Case No.
3 CV2023-0742 (Yolo County Sup. Ct. 2023) (final approval granted on May 15, 2024); *Ayala v. Mt. Whitney*
4 *Dairy*, Case No. 23CECG00449 (Fresno Cnty Sup. Ct.) (PAGA approval granted on June 5, 2024); and
5 *Iranroub v. Highlands Community Charter and Technical Schools*, Case No. 34-2022-00324342 (Sacramento Sup.
6 Ct. 2022) (final approval granted on August 2, 2024); *Paula Norton v. Strategic Staffing Solutions-S3, L.L.C.*,
7 Case No. 3:23-cv-06648-JSC (N.D. Cal) (preliminary approval granted on January 27, 2025); *Nikol Lockett*
8 *v. Stanford Park Hotel, LLC*, Case No. 24-CIV-01940 (San Mateo Sup. Ct. 2024) (PAGA approval on
9 January 28, 2025); *Brian Rubio v. Green Knight Security, Inc.*, Case No. 24STCV01923 (Los Angeles Cnty.
10 Sup. Ct.) (preliminary approval on March 12, 2025); *Lorena Ortiz, et al., v. Target Corporation*, Case No.
11 CV2023-0586 (Yolo County Superior Court 2023) (preliminary approval granted on March 28, 2025).

12 6. We are currently prosecuting claims on behalf of class members and/or aggrieved
13 employees in *Cohen v. Living Spaces Furniture LLC*, Case No. 30-2020-01140662-CU-OE-CXC (Orange
14 Cnty. Sup. Ct. 2020) (wage and hour relating to failure to provide suitable seating and compliant rest
15 periods); *Aguilar v. Midas Trucking*, Case No. 22STCV39767 (Los Angeles Sup. Ct. 2022) (wage and hour
16 case relating to failure to pay all wages and provide compliant meal/rest periods); *Newsome v. Kiva Sales*
17 *and Services, LLC*, Case No. 23CV035642 (Alameda Sup. Ct. 2023) (PAGA action relating to failure to
18 pay all wages and provide compliant meal/rest periods); *Teeba v. California Steel Industries, Inc.*, Case No.
19 CIVSB2313467 (San Bernardino Sup. Ct. 2023) (wage and hour case relating to failure to pay all wages
20 and provide compliant meal/rest periods); *Gerardo Ramirez v. Garcia's Landscaping Maintenance, Inc.*, Case
21 No. 56-2023-00576200-CU-OE-VTA (Ventura County Superior Court 2023) (wage and hour case
22 relating to failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods, unlawful uniform time clock
23 rounding policy, failure to reimburse business expenses, and failure to pay all wages); *Rodgers v. Brinker*
24 *Restaurant Corporation*, Case No. CGC-23-608589 (San Francisco County Sup. Ct. 2023) (PAGA action
25 relating to failure to pay all wages and provide compliant meal/rest periods); *Dorian Laviene v. Urban*
26 *Flavours*, Case No. 23CV040942 (Alameda Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour case relating to failure to pay
27 all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Ashley Foltz v. Space*
28

1 *Exploration Technologies Corp.*, Case No. 23STCV24097 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (PAGA matter relating
2 to failure of California's Equal Pay Act); *Amed Mullins v. Harmonium, Inc.*, Case No. 37-2023-00040472-
3 CU-OE-CTL (San Diego Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour case relating to failure to pay all wages and
4 failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Shakora Sanders v. Pacifica Senior Living*
5 *Management, LLC*, Case No. 37-2023-00047009-CU-OE-CTL (San Diego Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (case relating to
6 illegal employment medical examinations and pregnancy discrimination); *Benjamin Ruiz v. Game Sports Bar*
7 *and Grill, LLC*, Case No. 23STCV26500 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour case relating to
8 failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Ana Molina*
9 *v. LattCo Services, Inc.*, Case No. 23CV010964 (Sacramento Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour case relating to
10 failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Alex Mesquita*
11 *v. California Ammonia Co.*, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2024-0001136 (San Joaquin Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and
12 hour case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest
13 periods); *Tiffany Allen v. Ariat International, Inc.*, Case No. 24CV061565 (Alameda Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage
14 and hour case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and
15 rest periods, violation of sick leave laws, and illegal paid vacation policy); *Alan Garibay v. LA Taco*
16 *Management, LLC*, Case No. 24STCV02792 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour case relating to
17 failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Darryl Hall*
18 *v. Cepheid*, Case No. 23CV424954 (Santa Clara Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour case relating to failure to
19 pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Ronald Robles v.*
20 *Integrated Demolitions and Remediation, Inc.*, Case No. 24STCV07208 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and
21 hour case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest
22 periods); *Antony Monterroso v. Shiki Sushi, Teppan, Grill and Sport Bar, Inc., et al.* (case number pending) (San
23 Bernardino Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize
24 and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Viera v. Up Real Estate Holding Co.*, Case No.
25 2024CUOE021511 (Ventura Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case relating to failure to pay all
26 wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Lalezarian v. Homak*
27 *Enterprises*, Case No. 24STCV06524 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case relating
28



1 to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Jenkins v.*
2 *Beacon Property Management, Co.*, Case No. CIVSB2417563 (San Bernardino Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour
3 class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal
4 and rest periods); *Dunbarr v. Pacific Drive-Ins, LLC*, Case No. 37-2024-00025683-CU-OE-CTL (San Diego
5 Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (PAGA Representative Action for civil penalties arising out of Labor Code violations);
6 *Torres, Isaiah v. Delta Scientific Corp.*, Case No. 24STCV10812 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (PAGA
7 Representative Action for civil penalties arising out of Labor Code violations); *Aguirre, Sophia v. Shift4*
8 *Payments, LLC*, Case No. C24-01636 (Contra Costa Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case
9 relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods);
10 *Rodriguez Gisela v. Reflechtech, Inc.*, Case No. 23CV010783 (Sacramento Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class
11 action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest
12 periods); *Covarrubias v. Medtrans, Inc.*, Case No. 24STCV13023 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and
13 hour class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant
14 meal and rest periods); *Palcher v. MG JV, LLC*, et al., Case No. 24STCV12991 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup.
15 Ct.) (PAGA Representative Action for civil penalties arising out of Labor Code violations); *Payan v. Evolve,*
16 *LLC*, Case No. CVRI2402353 (Riverside Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (PAGA Representative Action for civil penalties
17 arising out of Labor Code violations); *Johnson, Cinnamon v. ASLB, LLC*, Case No. 24STCV13710 (Los
18 Angeles Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (PAGA Representative Action for civil penalties arising out of Labor Code
19 violations); *Terrones v. TRB, LLC d/b/a Tin Roof Bistro*, Case No. 24STCV32371 (Los Angeles Cnty. Sup.
20 Ct.) (PAGA Representative Action for civil penalties arising out of failure to comply with Labor Code §
21 226); *Patterson v. Advanced Home Health, Inc.*, Case No. 24CV018567 (Sacramento Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage
22 and hour class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant
23 meal and rest periods); *Quilhuiz v. Sugared + Bronzed, LLC*, Case No. 24STCV20871, (Los Angeles Cnty.
24 Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and
25 permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Ferreira v. Frontline Express Solutions LLC*, Case No. CV-24-
26 007354 (Stanislaus Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and
27 failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Gonzalez v. PNC Management LLC*, Case
28

No. CGC-24-618497 (San Francisco Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Quiroz v. Del Sol Harvesting, Inc.*, Case No. 2024CUOE033910 (Ventura Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (PAGA Representative Action for civil penalties arising out of failure to comply with meal, rest, and cooldown break requirements); *Abalos v. McCampbell Analytical, Inc.*, Case No. CV-24-02882 (Contra Costa Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Yang v. Mains'l California*, Case No. 24CV03708 (Butte Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods); *Ramirez v. Bando, Inc.*, Case No. 24CU021719C (San Diego Cnty. Sup. Ct.) (wage and hour class action case relating to failure to pay all wages and failure to authorize and permit compliant meal and rest periods).

7. Our firm has filed four motions for class certification, two of which were contested¹—and prevailed in our certification motion for rest periods violations and derivative penalties on behalf of approximately 1,000 class members in *Torres v. D/T Carson*.

8. I have been named “Rising Stars” by Super Lawyers magazine in each year from 2018 to the present. This is an honor awarded to no more than two and a half percent of attorneys under the age of 40 in California.

The Attorneys’ Fees Allocation is Reasonable

9. Plaintiff also requests that the Court preliminarily approve an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees amounting to 1/3 of the settlement fund, or \$83,333.33. The attorneys’ fee award of 1/3 of the settlement fund is reasonable considering the experience of Class Counsel in wage-and-hour cases, including class actions, the legal expertise required to litigate this case and negotiate this Settlement, and the amount of actual time that Class Counsel has dedicated to this case and the salutary effect of the lawsuit on Defendants’ policies and practices with respect to the Labor Code violations alleged in the Complaint. The attorneys’ fees sought are comparable to attorneys’ fee awards granted in comparable

¹ As to the other two certification motions, the parties settled the matters shortly after filing.

1 cases. Significantly, the retainer agreement in this case provides for fees up to one-third of the amount
2 obtained.

3 10. If the Court grants preliminary approval to the Settlement and authorizes the
4 dissemination of notice of the Settlement to the Class, Class Counsel anticipates filing a Motion for
5 Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Incentive Award that will be scheduled to be heard concurrently (or will be
6 part of) the Motion for Final Approval and Fairness Hearing. In connection with the filing of the Motion
7 for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Class Counsel will submit updated information in the form of a sworn
8 declaration setting forth a summary of their lodestar hours on this case, as well all of their costs reasonably
9 incurred in the litigation this case.

10 11. I have no knowledge of the existence of any conflicting interests between my firm and
11 any of its attorneys, on the one hand, and Plaintiff or any other Class Member, on the other.

12 *The Class Representative Enhancement Award is Fair and Appropriate*

13 12. Plaintiff requests payment of an Enhancement Award from the non-reversionary
14 Maximum Settlement Amount to the Class Representative in the amount of \$7,500, in addition to
15 whatever payment he is otherwise entitled to receive as a Class Member and in satisfaction of his
16 individually plead claims. The proposed Enhancement Award is reasonable compensation given the time
17 and effort that the Named Plaintiff devoted to this case; the valuable assistance he provided to Class
18 Counsel; and the strength of his individual claims, discussed in more depth below.

19 13. Plaintiff provided invaluable assistance to Class Counsel and the Class in this case,
20 including providing factual background for mediation and the Class Complaint; reviewing the relevant
21 documents, and Complaint; participating in Zoom, phone, and text message communications with Class
22 Counsel in regard to nine potential Class Members for witnesses interviews, participating in phone calls
23 with Class Counsel to discuss litigation and settlement strategy; remaining on-call and available during
24 mediation, and reviewing the settlement documents. Plaintiff agreed to participate in this case with no
25 guarantee of personal benefit.

26 14. Further, Plaintiff agreed to undertake the financial risk of serving as Class Representative
27 and exposed himself to the risk of negative publicity by anyone who opposed this case. Moreover, the
28

1 requested \$7,500.00 Incentive Payment for the Named Plaintiff falls within the range of incentive
2 payments typically awarded to Class Representatives in similar class actions. *See e.g., Bond v. Ferguson*
3 *Enterprises, Inc.*, No. 1:09-cv-1662 OWW MJS, 2011 WL 2648879 (E.D. Cal. June 30, 2011) (approving
4 \$11,250 service award to each of the two class representatives in a trucker meal break class action); *Ross*
5 *v. US Bank National Association*, No. C 07-02951 SI, 2010 WL 3833922, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2010)
6 (approving \$20,000 enhancement award to Class Representative in California wage-and-hour class action
7 settlement); *Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing, Inc.*, 266 F.R.D. 482, 493 (E.D. Cal. 2010) (approving service
8 awards in the amount of \$10,000 each from a \$300,000 settlement fund in a wage/hour class action);
9 *West v. Circle K Stores, Inc.*, NO. CIV. S-04-0438 WBS GGH, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76558, at *28 (E.D.
10 Cal. Oct. 19, 2006) (“the court finds plaintiffs’ enhancement payments of \$ 15,000 each to be
11 reasonable.”); *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*, No. C-06-4068 MMC, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476, at *52 (N.D.
12 Cal. Jan. 26, 2007) (finding “requested payment of \$ 25,000 to each of the named plaintiffs is appropriate”
13 in wage and hour settlement); *Louie v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc.*, CASE NO. 08cv0795 IEG RBB,
14 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314, at *18 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2008) (approving “\$25,000 incentive award for
15 each Class Representative” in wage an hour settlement); *Garner v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, No. CV
16 08 1365 CW (EMC), 2010 WL 1687832, at *17 n.8 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2010) (“Numerous courts in the
17 Ninth Circuit and elsewhere have approved incentive awards of \$20,000 or more where, as here, the class
18 representative has demonstrated a strong commitment to the class”).

19 15. Based on Class Counsel’s investigation and the discovery in this Action, Plaintiff’s claims
20 were strong and had merit. However, Plaintiff and his counsel also recognized the potential risk, expense,
21 and complexity posed by litigation. The resulting Settlement took into consideration the merits of
22 Plaintiff’s claims on balance with the risks identified above. The resulting Enhancement Award of \$7,500
23 in satisfaction of Plaintiff’s individual claims is a fair and equitable compromise.

24
25 //

26
27 //

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of California
2 that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 28, 2025 in Los Angeles, California.

3 By: /s/ Elliot Siegel
4 Elliot Siegel
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

