Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
Allen Feghali (SBN 301080)
afeghali@moonlawgroup.com
S. Phillip Song (SBN 326572)
psong@moonlawgroup.com
Morgan W. Simpson (SBN 337325)
msimpson@moonlawgroup.com
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
725 S. Figueroa St., Suite 3100
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff GUADALUPE LOPEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

GUADALUPE LOPEZ, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ISTAFFING, INC., a California corporation; ISTAFFING PARTNERS, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 30-2024-01383579-CU-OE-CXC

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

DECLARATION OF KANE MOON IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT

[Filed with (1) Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement Agreement and Release, (2) the Declaration of Plaintiff, (3) the Lawrence Declaration re: Qualifications and Costs for Settlement Administration, (4) [Proposed] PAGA Approval Order, and (5) [Proposed] Judgment]

PAGA APPROVAL HEARING:
Date: March 27, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: CX101
Judge: William D. Claster

Reservation #: 74789223

Action filed: March 1, 2024
Trial date: Not set

DECLARATION OF KANE MOON

I, KANE MOON, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice as such before all the Courts of the State of California and am one of the attorneys of record for Plaintiff Guadelupe Lopez ("Plaintiff"). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to them under oath.

2. This declaration is submitted in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement Agreement and Release. Plaintiff seeks approval of a PAGA Settlement Agreement and Release (the "Settlement") entered into with Defendants iStaffing, Inc. and iStaffing Partners, Inc. ("Defendants") (collectively, Plaintiff and Defendants are the "Parties"). A true and correct copy of the fully executed Settlement is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. Exhibit A to the Settlement contains the Parties' proposed *Notice of PAGA Settlement* to be mailed to PAGA Employees with Individual Settlement Payments following settlement approval and Defendant's full settlement funding.

3. The proposed Settlement seeks to resolve all alleged claims for civil penalties pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"). Plaintiff brought this PAGA action on behalf of herself and all persons who were employed by Defendants in California as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees at any time during the Settlement Period ("PAGA Employees"). For purposes of settlement, the "Settlement Period" is December 16, 2022, through February 10, 2026. (Settlement, ¶ A(10).)

CASE BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

4. Defendants are employment agencies doing business in the State of California. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a recruiter from approximately March 2023 to October 2023. Throughout her employment, Plaintiff was classified as non-exempt and paid on an hourly basis. Plaintiff contends she and her former coworkers were subjected to the same or similar unlawful labor practices during their employment by Defendants, including failure to pay all wages.

5. Plaintiff's claims for unpaid wages stems from allegations of Defendants' failure to pay employees all minimum, overtime, sick pay, and regular rate wages owed, including due to Defendants' failure to compensate employees for on-call time and off-the-clock work, and Defendants' failure to

incorporate all remunerations into the regular rate of pay. Plaintiff's meal and rest period claims are based on allegations that due to the nature of their work and Defendants' employment practices, employees regularly experienced missed, untimely, or interrupted breaks, and that Defendants failed to provide any premiums for non-compliant rest breaks or all premiums for non-compliant meals. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendants failed to reimburse employees for all reasonable and necessary business expenses incurred, including expenses incurred for the use of employees' personal cellphones, computers, and internet for work purposes. Plaintiff further alleges she and other employees did not receive all wages owed at the time of termination nor accurate itemized wage statements due to Defendants' failure to pay all wages and premiums. Accordingly, Plaintiff alleges Defendants are liable for civil penalties under PAGA.

6. Because of the foregoing alleged violations of the Labor Code, pursuant to PAGA, on December 16, 2023, Plaintiff submitted notice of the alleged Labor Code violations to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "LWDA"), with certified mail service on Defendants, and paid the required filing fee. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's PAGA Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**. The administrative exhaustion period under PAGA expired without the LWDA indicating any intent to investigate the allegations. Accordingly, Plaintiff is duly authorized to act as a private attorney general with respect to the PAGA claims involved in this action.

7. Thereafter, on March 1, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Representative Action Complaint to allege a single cause of action for civil penalties under PAGA based on the allegations (the "Operative Complaint").

8. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(s)(1), Plaintiff subsequently submitted to the LWDA a file-stamped copy of the Operative Complaint containing the Court-assigned case number. To date, the LWDA has not sought to intervene in this action.

9. After this action was filed, on July 26, 2024, pursuant to a valid and enforceable arbitration agreement between the Parties, Plaintiff submitted her individual claims to arbitration. On September 23, 2024, pursuant to Plaintiff's request, the Court dismissed defendant iStaffing Partners, Inc. from this Action. For settlement purposes only and concurrent with the filing of Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement, the Parties stipulated to add Defendant iStaffing Partners, Inc. as a defendant to the action.

10. Defendants ardently oppose the merits of this case and denies Plaintiff's factual allegations. Defendants argue all employees were properly paid for all hours worked, that their control for on-call hours

was not such that it required compensation of employees, and that they did not require or permit employees to work off-the-clock. As for the regular rate claim, Defendants argue there was no issue with paying employees the proper regular rate of pay because any additional remuneration was discretionary and thus, not required to be incorporated into the regular rate of pay. Defendants maintain all employees were provided with the opportunity to take all their code-compliant meal and rest breaks and that missed breaks, if any, were solely the result of employees' voluntary choice. As for the unreimbursed business expenses, Defendants maintain they did not require employees to incur any business-related expenses. To the extent employees received wage statements that were allegedly inaccurate, Defendants argue penalties are not warranted because employees suffered no actual damage or harm as a result. (*See, e.g.*, *Angeles v. U.S. Airways, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2013) No. C 12–05860 CRB, 2013 WL 622032, at *10 ["A plaintiff must adequately plead an injury arising from an employer's failure to provide full and accurate wage statements, and the omission of the required information alone is not sufficient."].) Additionally, Defendants allege their good-faith belief that it paid all wages precludes the imposition of waiting time penalties because Plaintiff would be unable to show Defendant's alleged conduct was done willfully or knowingly. (*See, e.g.*, *Pedroza v. PetSmart, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. June 14, 2012) No. ED CV 11–298 GHK (DTBx), 2012 WL 9506073, *5.) For these reasons, Defendants claim they did not engage in any unfair business practices and denies liability under PAGA. Defendants also maintain the claims are not susceptible to proof on a representative basis because of the individualized and varying nature of each employee's experience, making this matter unmanageable.

DISCOVERY AND INVESTIGATION

11. Before initiating arbitration regarding Plaintiff's individual claims, the Parties agreed to an early mediation of the representative PAGA claims. The Parties engaged in informal discovery exchange prior to mediation. Defendants provided information and documents, which enabled Plaintiff's Counsel to meaningfully investigate Plaintiff's allegations and assess the value of the PAGA claims. Specifically, Defendants produced Plaintiff's personnel file and her time and payroll records, documents regarding Defendants' written policies and practices in effect during the relevant period, and time and corresponding payroll records for approximately 20% of all PAGA Employees.

12. Prior to mediation, Plaintiff's Counsel reviewed and analyzed all the information that Defendants produced, including the time/pay records and Defendant's written policies, in conjunction with

information provided by Plaintiff. Plaintiff's Counsel retained an expert to analyze the time/pay records and prepare a damage analysis prior to mediation. The time/pay records contained 7,002 shifts actually worked (approximately 16% of all shifts during the Settlement Period), which allowed the expert to prepare an analysis with a high degree of certainty. Further, Plaintiff's Counsel investigated the applicable law regarding the claims and defenses asserted in this action. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counsel were able to evaluate the probability of success on the merits and Defendants' monetary exposure. In sum, Plaintiff and her Counsel's familiarity with the facts of the case and the legal issues involved allowed them to act intelligently in negotiating the Settlement.

SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS AND NOTICE TO THE LWDA

13. On December 10, 2025, the Parties participated in a full day of private mediation facilitated by the Hon. Carl West (ret.), an experienced PAGA action mediator. The negotiations were at arm's length and although conducted in a professional matter, were adversarial. Both sides went into the mediation willing to explore the potential for a settlement of the dispute, but they were also prepared to litigate their position through trial and appeal if a settlement had not been reached. Negotiations were protracted, with extended discussions and instances in which it appeared the Parties would not reach a resolution. Following a full discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses, the Parties ultimately reached a resolution, the material terms of which are encompassed within the Settlement at issue.

14. In reaching a resolution, the Parties recognized that the issues presented in this action are likely only to be resolved with extensive and costly pretrial and trial proceedings, and that further litigation will lead to inconvenience, distraction, disruption, delay, and expense disproportionate to the potential benefits of litigation. Plaintiff and her Counsel also considered the risk and uncertainty of the outcome inherent in any litigation when determining whether this Settlement was the correct option. In sum, Plaintiff and her Counsel believe the proposed Settlement is in the best interests of PAGA Employees and the LWDA.

15. In compliance with Labor Code section 2699(s)(2), notice of settlement and a copy of the proposed Settlement has been submitted to the LWDA along with a copy of Plaintiff's motion and the hearing

date. A true and correct copy of the LWDA's email confirming receipt thereof is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. To date, the LWDA has not indicated any objection to the Settlement.

KEY TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

16. Gross Settlement Amount, Funding, Disbursement, and Uncashed Checks. The Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") is $200,000.00 and is non-reversionary. (Settlement, ¶¶ A(6), C(12) [Any uncashed funds will not revert to Defendants but will be transmitted to the California's Unclaimed Property Fund.].) Defendant's settlement funding contribution will be due in two installments: 1) one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount is due within sixty (60) days of the Effective Date of the Settlement, and 2) the remaining balance is due six (6) months after the first payment. (*Id.* at ¶ C(7).) The "Effective Date" means the date (i) the Court has approved the Settlement; and (ii) the Court has issued the Final Order and entered Judgment in accordance with the terms described in the Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶ A(5).) Disbursement will occur within ten (10) days after Defendants fully funds the GSA. (*Id.* at ¶ C(8)–(12).) Any funds remaining uncashed after 180 days from issuance will be transmitted to the California State Controller's Office, to be held pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law in the name of each individual who failed to cash his or her check prior to the void date. (*Id.* at ¶ C(12).)

17. Escalator Clause. The GSA was negotiated based on an estimate that as of the date of the Parties' mediation, there are 8,800 aggregate PAGA Pay Periods. (*Id.* at ¶ B(2)(f).) The Settlement includes an Escalator Clause whereby should the actual number of PAGA Pay Periods exceed the 10% of the estimated count (9,680 Pay Periods), Defendants agree to either (1) make a proportional increase to the GSA by the percentage increase for each additional PAGA Pay Period above the escalator (e.g. if the number of pay periods increases by 11%, the Gross Settlement Amount will increase by 1%), or (2) modify the final day of the Settlement Period such that no more than 9,680 PAGA Pay Periods are included in the Settlement. (*Id.*) The Parties will inform the Court through a supplemental declaration or at the hearing whether the Escalator Clause has been triggered.

18. Incentive Award. The Settlement includes an Incentive Award to Plaintiff in an amount up to $7,500.00, payable from the GSA. (*Id.* at ¶ A(7).) This payment is in recognition of Plaintiff having initiated the action and her services provided and role in the action. (*Id.*) In the event the amount approved by the Court is less, the difference will be allocated to the PAGA Payment. (*Id.* at ¶ B(2)(d).)

19. Attorneys' Fees and Costs. The Settlement includes attorneys' fees in an amount up to one-third (33%) of the GSA (i.e., at least $66,666.67), plus reimbursement for out-of-pocket litigation costs not to exceed $20,000.00, payable to Plaintiff's Counsel from the GSA. (*Id.* at ¶ B(2)(a)–(b).) In the event actual costs are less and/or the amount of fees and costs approved by the Court are less than the amounts requested, the difference will be allocated to the PAGA Payment. (*Id.*) My office has incurred **$14,606.50** in expenses litigating this action without any reimbursement. A true and correct copy of a report showing these costs is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.[1]

20. Settlement Administration Costs. The Settlement provides for Settlement Administration Costs paid to the Administrator, payable from the GSA, in an amount up to $10,000.00, for its fees and expenses in administering this Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶ B(2)(c).) In the event the amount of actual administration costs is less and/or the amount approved by the Court is less than requested, the difference will be allocated to the PAGA Payment. (*Id.*) Following a competitive bidding process, the Parties jointly selected Phoenix Clas Action Administration Solutions ("Phoenix") as the neutral entity to administer this Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶ A(16).) A true and correct copy of Phoenix's bid for $3,750.00 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

21. PAGA Payment. After deducting the Incentive Award, Attorney's Fees and Attorney's Costs, and Settlement Administration Costs from the GSA, in the amounts specifically approved by the Court, any difference in the amounts requested and the amounts awarded will be allocated to the PAGA Payment as PAGA Penalties. (*Id.* at ¶ B(2)(e).) Accordingly, the PAGA Payment is estimated to be approximately **$107,476.83**,[2] which will be distributed 75% (i.e., 75% * $107,476.83 = **$80,607.62**) to the LWDA and 25%

[1] The cost report includes a filing cost for Defendant iStaffing Partners Inc.'s answer to the complaint for $1,495.04. (Ex. 4.) On or about September 13, 2024, the Parties stipulated to the dismissal of Defendant iStaffing Partners, Inc. On or about October 2, 2024, Defendant iStaffing Partners Inc. sought to recover a total of $1,495.04 in costs associated with the filing of its answer to the complaint. On or about October 17, 2024, Plaintiff subsequently filed a Motion to Strike Costs and the Court denied the motion on November 15, 2024. For settlement purposes only, the Parties have stipulated to add Defendant iStaffing Partners, Inc. as a defendant to the action.

[2] The estimated PAGA Payment was calculated by deducting the following amounts from the GSA ($200,000): $7,500.00 for the Incentive Award, $14,606.50 for the Attorney's Costs, $66,666.67 for the Attorney's Fees, and $3,750.00 for the Settlement Administration Costs. (*See* Settlement, ¶ A(12).)

(i.e., 25% * $107,476.83 = **$26,869.21**) to PAGA Employees pursuant to PAGA law governing Plaintiff's claims.[3]

22. Individual Settlement Payments. Each PAGA Employee will be entitled to his or her pro rata amount from the 25% share of the PAGA Payment that is directly proportional to the number of pay periods worked in the Settlement Period without having to submit any claim form. (*Id.* at ¶ C(12).) This results in an average Individual Settlement Payment of roughly **$155.31** for each of the estimated 173 PAGA Employees ($26,869.21 / 173), and a PAGA Pay Period value of **$3.05** for each of the 8,800 estimated PAGA Pay Periods ($26,869.21 / 8,800). Individual Settlement Payments will be allocated to 100% penalties for tax purposes. (*See id.* at ¶ C(14).) PAGA Employees will receive an explanatory notice with their payment. (*Id.* at ¶ A(9), Ex. A.)

23. Plaintiff's Release. Upon entry of final judgment and funding of the Gross Settlement Amount in full, Plaintiff will release and forever discharge Defendants and Defendants' present and former trustees, officers, owners, parent companies, agents, employees, affiliated entities, insurers, attorneys, successors, assigns, and customers, from all claims, causes of action, charges, complaints, obligations, costs, losses, damages, injuries, attorneys' fees, and other legal responsibilities, of any form whatsoever (hereinafter "Claims"), whether known or unknown, unforeseen, unanticipated, unsuspected or latent, which Plaintiff now owns or holds, or have at any time heretofore owned or held, or may at any time own or hold by reason of any matter or thing arising out of or in any way related to the relationship between the parties including, but not limited to, any rights or obligations arising from her employment. (*Id.* at ¶ B(3).) This includes but is not limited to the release of all rights and claims Plaintiff may have under:

a. Anti-Discrimination Statutes, such as the California Fair Employment and Housing Act "FEHA", Government Code 12940 et seq. (prohibits discrimination in employment based on race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, sexual orientation,

[3] On July 1, 2024, new legislation was enacted to amend PAGA in several respects, including as to the recovery split for civil penalties. (Stats. 2024, ch. 44 (Assem. Bill No. 2288), § 1, eff. Jul. 1, 2024).) As amended, PAGA now provides for a 65%-LWDA/45%-aggrieved employee split. (Lab. Code § 2699(m).) However, this provision does not apply retroactively prior to June 19, 2024. (*Id.* at § 2699(v)(1).) In other words, because Plaintiff's PAGA Notice was submitted prior to June 19, 2024, any civil penalties recovered in this action will be split according to prior PAGA law (i.e., 75% to the LWDA and 25% to Aggrieved Employees).

marital status, sex, gender, or age); Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (prohibits discrimination in employment based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or pregnancy); the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (prohibits discrimination); 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1981 (prohibits discrimination); the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA"); Executive Order 11246 (prohibits race, color, religion, sex, and national origin discrimination); the Americans With Disabilities Act (prohibits disability discrimination); the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (prohibits handicap discrimination); and the Equal Pay Act (prohibits paying men and women unequal pay for equal work),

b. Federal and State Employment Statutes, such as the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (protects employee benefits); the Family and Medical Leave Act (provides for leaves of absence); the California Family Rights Act (provides for leaves of absence); and the California Business and Professions Code Sec. 17200 (prohibits unfair business practices); the California Labor Code (protects employee wages),

c. Other Laws, such as federal or local laws or regulations prohibiting discrimination in employment or otherwise, enforcing express or implied contracts, requiring employers to deal fairly or in good faith, or restricting an employer's right to terminate employees. Plaintiff also releases any and all other claims, known and unknown, for breach of contract, express or implied; breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing; wrongful discharge in violation of public policy; and retaliation, defamation, conspiracy, infliction of emotional distress, invasion of privacy, harassment, assault, battery, misrepresentation, or any other tort; and

d. Benefit Plans, such as any stock option, bonus, incentive compensation, commission, medical, dental, life insurance, retirement, disability, and other compensation or benefit plans.

e. Excluded from this release are, (i) any cause of action under ERISA relating to an employee benefit plan that is qualified under Section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, or that is a medical or health care plan, (ii) any claims that Plaintiff may have against Employer for breach of the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement, or (iii) any claims that cannot be released as a matter of law (including but not limited to any workers compensation injury claims).

f. Plaintiff acknowledges and agrees that all of Plaintiff's rights under Section 1542 of the Civil Code of California are hereby expressly waived. Said section reads as follows: "A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY." Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 1542, and for the purpose of implementing a full and complete release and discharge of Claims, Plaintiff expressly acknowledges that this Agreement is intended to include in its effect, without limitations, all Claims which Plaintiff does not know or suspect to exist in Plaintiff's favor at the time of execution hereof, and that the settlement agreed upon contemplates the extinguishment of any such Claims.

(*Id.* at ¶ B(3)(a)–(4).)

g. Plaintiff alleges that she performed approximately 10 minutes of off-the-clock work per shift. This equates to approximately 50 minutes per week (i.e., 0.83 hours per week, based on five shifts per week). At Plaintiff's hourly rate of $22, this results in unpaid wages of approximately $18.33 per week. Over 32 weeks, the approximate time period that Plaintiff worked for Defendants, this equals approximately $586.56 in unpaid wages for off-the-clock work. Plaintiff also reports noncompliant meal periods occurring approximately five times per week. At Plaintiff's rate of $22 per hour, Plaintiff's meal period premium pay totals approximately $110 per week. Over 32 weeks, this equals approximately $3,520 for meal period premiums. Plaintiff further reports that her rest breaks were interrupted and/or not provided in accordance with California law at least five times per week. At Plaintiff's rate of $22 per hour, Plaintiff's rest period premium pay totals approximately $110 per week. Over 32 weeks, this equals approximately $3,520. As to Plaintiff's claim for unreimbursed business expenses, Plaintiff estimates that she should have been reimbursed at least $10.00 per month for expenses incurred for the use of her personal cellphone, laptop, and internet for work purposes. Over 8 months, this equals approximately $80. Given Defendant's minimal exposure to Plaintiffs' claims that Defendants failed to compensate her for on-call time and failed to incorporate non-discretionary bonuses into her regular rate of pay for purposes of paying overtime, and sick pay, as discussed *supra* at paragraph 26, Plaintiff's estimate for these claims is $0.00. Assuming a $100 civil penalty per pay period during Plaintiff's employment (approximately 16 pay periods), Plaintiff's estimate for civil penalties is approximately $1,600. As a result, the value of Plaintiff's individual claims is approximately $8,720 ($586.56 + $3,520, $3,520 + $80 + $1,600).

24. Released Claims. Upon entry of final judgment and funding of the Gross Settlement Amount in full, Plaintiff, as representative on behalf of the State of California and the PAGA Employees, will release the Released Parties from all claims for civil penalties under PAGA arising from the same facts and/or claims alleged in the Operative Complaint as well as those included in Plaintiff's LWDA Notice, including claims under California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 245, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2699, 2699.3, 2802, as well as IWC Wage Orders, including, but not limited to, Wage Orders Nos. 1 and 16, or claims that were pled or that could have been pled based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint during the Settlement Period. (*Id.* at ¶ B(5).) The "Released Parties" are "Defendants and their past, present and future subsidiaries, parents, affiliated and related companies, divisions, successors, predecessors or assigns; and their past, present, and future officers,

directors, shareholders, partners, agents, insurers, employee, advisors, accountants, representatives, trustees, heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors or assigns." (*Id.* at ¶ A(15).)

THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE

25. There can be no doubt that this Settlement is the result of vigorous, adversarial, non-collusive, and arm's-length negotiations between the Parties. Based on Plaintiff's Counsel's analysis of the arguments and information provided by Defendant, on an expert analysis of the time and pay records, and on information from Plaintiff, Plaintiff's Counsel evaluated Defendant's both maximum and risk-adjusted potential exposure in preparation for mediation. Although the expert's analysis revealed that the time and pay records supported several violations by Defendant, those identifiable violations were primarily limited to the regular rate and meal period claims. The records themselves did not provide strong support for the off-the-clock work, on-call pay, rest period, and expense reimbursement claims, and derivative penalties for those claims, as these claims are predominantly testimony based. In other words, Plaintiff's analysis revealed that certain claims were not as strong as originally believed.

26. Because Defendants did not require employees to record rest periods, there are no records to establish the rest period claim on the merits. Additionally, there are no records to establish the off-the-clock work claim, nor the on-call pay claim on the merits. Rather, proof of these claims would need to be supported by declarations from PAGA Employees regarding missed rest periods, unpaid on-call time, and off-the-clock work as the records themselves cannot demonstrate what breaks were missed, when, and why and they cannot demonstrate the time, if any, PAGA Employees spent working off the clock or on-call and sufficiently under Defendant's control.

27. Additionally, the exposure figures that were calculated for mediation were based on assumed high violation rates that would not likely be demonstrated at trial, as they assume either the participation of all PAGA Employees (which would be difficult given the size of this group), or alternatively, the use of surveys or statistical data as a surrogate (which would still require the participation of a majority of PAGA Employees to establish a sound representation of all non-exempt employees). The reality is that many, if not all, employees would be unwilling to participate due to fear of retaliation. However, even assuming those employees would be willing to participate, obtaining such declarations would potentially reveal that each PAGA Employee had a different experience. The individualized nature of their employment experience

and the numerosity of employees affected present significant risk with manageability and proof on the merits.

28. Even as to the regular rate and meal period claims, our analysis found that Defendant's exposure is less than initially believed. As to meal periods, a review of the time/pay records shows only a 20.1% violation rate for Defendant. The records also show substantial use of meal period waivers by Defendant, which reduces the net violation rate to 12.8%. As to the regular rate issue, Plaintiff's expert only identified 1 payment that was not factored into the regular rate of pay for purposes of paying sick pay and overtime, resulting in a violation rate of 0.1% violation rate for overtime, and a violation rate of 0.1% for sick pay. Moreover, these violation rates assume Plaintiff would be able to show the bonus payments were non-discretionary payments that should have been factored into the regular rate.

29. The likelihood that Defendants could assert viable legal defenses would likely further reduce its overall exposure. For example, the individualized and testimony-intensive nature of the claims could bar manageability of this representative action or otherwise significantly reduce Defendant's overall liability.

30. Further, a claim-by-claim penalty calculation is overly optimistic as it presumes Plaintiff would be able to stack the penalties. Rather, without either (i) a prior finding by the LWDA or a court within the past five years that the employer violated PAGA or (ii) evidence that the employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive, PAGA only provides for a maximum $100 penalty for each pay period. (Lab. Code § 2699(f)(2)(A)–(B).) Moreover, Plaintiff's Counsel believe it would be unrealistic to expect the Court to award the full (penalty-stacked) exposure given the discretionary nature of awarding penalties and given Defendant's defenses, including that any failure to pay premiums, regular rate wages, on-call pay, or for off-the-clock work was not knowingly or willfully done, and additionally, to the extent employees received wage statements that were allegedly inaccurate, employees suffered no actual resulting damage or harm. Moreover, awarding the full penalties amount would likely raise Due Process concerns.

31. For the foregoing reasons, the *realistic* exposure is thus far below an *optimistic* claim by claim estimate.

32. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff's Counsel believe it is more reasonable to assess penalties on a $100 civil penalty per pay period basis pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)(A) for each of the estimated 8,800 pay periods at issue, as opposed to a claim-by-claim approach. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counsel

estimate Defendant's maximum PAGA exposure to be **$880,000.00** ($100 x 8,800). However, based on the discovery, Defendant's arguments at mediations and continued settlement discussions, an understanding that the claims are heavily dependent on the unlikely participation by PAGA Employees and their varying employment experience, and other important considerations discussed above, it is reasonable to assume a violation occurred in at most one-third of all pay periods, which results in a realistic (*risk-adjusted*) exposure of **$293,333.33** ($880,000 / 3). As a result, the GSA of $200,000 represents roughly **68.2%** of the realistic exposure ($200,000 / $293,333.33).

33. The proposed Settlement therefore represents a substantial recovery when compared to the reasonably forecasted recovery. When considering the risks of litigation, the uncertainties involved in continued litigation, the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability, and the probability of appeal, it is clear the GSA of $200,000 is within the "ballpark" of reasonableness, and that settlement approval is appropriate. (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc*. (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133; *see Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of L.A.* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408–09 [holding that *Kullar* does not require "an explicit statement of the maximum amount the plaintiff class could recover if it prevailed on all its claims," but instead, only an "understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the litigation"].)

34. The $200,000 GSA amounts to "genuine and meaningful" relief. This is an excellent result, particularly because, under the Settlement, PAGA Employees and the LWDA will receive timely, guaranteed relief and will avoid the risk of not being able to recover anything at all.

35. The Settlement is a fair and reasonable resolution that satisfies PAGA's dual statutory purposes of deterrence and punishment, on the one hand, and providing PAGA Employees with genuine and meaningful relief, on the other. As a result of this litigation, Defendants has had to hire legal counsel, engage in employee-wide discovery, and participate in mediation. Assuming approval is granted, Defendants will also have to pay civil penalties pursuant to PAGA. Not including its own attorneys' fees and costs, Defendants will pay at least $200,000 to resolve this matter—of which at least $107,476.83 is allocated toward PAGA Penalties and will be distributed as 75% to the LWDA and 25% to PAGA Employees, in compliance with PAGA law governing the claims in this Action. (*See* Settlement, ¶ 3.2.4.) This amount represents roughly **36.6%** of the realistic exposure for the claims ($107,476.83 /

$293,333.33), as discussed above. Additionally, the release obtained under the Settlement does not preclude PAGA Employees from pursuing any individual (non-PAGA) claims they may have against Defendants or the other Released Parties. (Settlement at ¶ B(5).)

36. Plaintiff's Counsel have conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of the allegations. Based on discovery and on their own independent investigation and evaluation, Plaintiff's Counsel are of the opinion that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Furthermore, considering all known facts and circumstances, the risk of significant delay, trial risk, appellate risk, the defenses that could be asserted by Defendants on the merits, Plaintiff's Counsel respectfully submit that the Settlement is in the best interests of the PAGA Employees and the State of California.

37. Although Plaintiff's Counsel believe there is merit to Plaintiff's allegations, they also acknowledge a legitimate controversy exists as to each allegation. Plaintiff's Counsel also recognize that proving the amounts of penalties owed to each PAGA Employee would be an expensive, time-consuming, and uncertain proposition.

38. Moreover, Plaintiff's Counsel are also of the opinion that because the issues here are fairly contested, there is a possibility of the Court not awarding PAGA penalties even if Plaintiff prevailed on the merits due to the largely discretionary nature of awarding PAGA penalties. In other words, were this matter to go to trial, any award granted would be at the discretion of the Court and subject to a substantial reduction.

39. While Plaintiff's Counsel believe there would be no persuasive grounds to reduce penalties, they recognize that the Court could determine otherwise and significantly reduce any award of penalties. This wide range of potential recovery and additional delays and risks of trial provide justification to settle for a reasonable amount of recovery at this point in the litigation. In all, based on the investigation and analysis of the claims in preparation for mediation, the maximum exposure did not comport with the realistic exposure that Defendants faced, as discussed above.

40. Plaintiff's Counsel took into account the risk of not being able to proceed on a representative basis at all due to the potential manageability issues, the risk of not prevailing at trial, and the risk that even if Plaintiff prevailed at trial, the penalties would be limited due to the largely discretionary nature of awarding PAGA penalties. The provisions of the Labor Code triggering PAGA penalties in this case include Labor Code sections 203, 210, 226, 1197.1, and 2802. However, PAGA penalties are not

mandatory, but rather, permissive. (Lab. Code § 2699(e)(2).) Accordingly, it is entirely possible that even if Plaintiff would be successful at trial, assuming she is first able to win on the merits regarding her individual claims at arbitration and then defeat the manageability issues presented at litigation by the large number of PAGA Employees in this action, Plaintiff may still be awarded substantially less than what was obtained through the Settlement.

41. The Settlement avoids the significant risks, burdens, and the accompanying expense of further litigation. Though the Parties have engaged in a significant amount of investigation, informal discovery, and employee data analysis, they have not participated in formal discovery procedures, including depositions and expert discovery. Moreover, Plaintiff would have to proceed with arbitration of her individual claims and win on the merits before proceeding with litigation of the representative PAGA claims. Preparation for trial and the prospect of appeals in the wake of any summary judgment ruling would remain for the Parties. As a result, the Parties would incur considerably more attorneys' fees and costs through trial, a lengthy and uncertain process that could result in recovering less than was settled for.

THE INCENTIVE AWARD SHOULD BE APPROVED

42. Throughout this litigation, Plaintiff, who was a former employee of Defendant, has cooperated immensely with my office and has taken many actions to protect the interests of the State of California and the PAGA Employees. Plaintiff provided valuable information regarding her hours worked, and what duties were performed during those hours. Plaintiff participated in decisions concerning this action, assisted in preparation for the mediation, and searched for potential witnesses. Before we filed this action, Plaintiff worked with my office to determine the viability of her claims. Plaintiff also provided information and documents relating to her employment with Defendant. The information and documentation provided by Plaintiff was instrumental in establishing the violations alleged in this action, and the recovery provided for under the Settlement would have been impossible to obtain without her participation.

43. At the same time, Plaintiff faced many risks in adding herself as the PAGA Representative in this matter. Plaintiff faces actual risks with her future employment, as putting herself on public record in an employment lawsuit could also very well affect her likelihood for future employment. For example, a search of Plaintiff's name will reveal this action, and as a result, many employers may likely forego hiring Plaintiff upon learning she sued a former employer.

44. In turn, PAGA Employees will now be reimbursed civil penalties for wage violations they may have never known about or been willing to pursue on their own. If each PAGA Employee would have tried to pursue legal remedies on their own, that would have resulted in each having to expend a significant amount of their own monetary resources and time, not to mention limited judicial resources, which were obviated by Plaintiff putting herself on the line on behalf of the PAGA Employees and the LWDA. Further, prior to executing the Settlement, Plaintiff carefully reviewed the document and asked questions to ensure her understanding, including as to the total recovery and releases of claims.

45. In the final analysis, this representative action would not have been possible without the aid of Plaintiff, who put her own time and effort into this litigation and placed herself at risk for the sake of the State of California and the PAGA Employees. The requested enhancement payment to Plaintiff for her service as the PAGA Representative is a relatively small amount of money considering the time and effort put into the litigation. For all the foregoing reasons, the requested Incentive Award to Plaintiff is reasonable.

MY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

46. I received a B.A. in History in 1998 from UCLA, and my J.D. from Loyola Marymount Law School in 2006. I became an Active Member of the State Bar of California in June 2007 and have been an Active Member in good standing continuously since then. I have been selected to Super Lawyers each year from 2019 to 2023.

47. I co-founded Moon & Yang, APC—now Moon Law Group, PC—in March 2010. My practice is focused exclusively on advocating for the rights of employees in wage-and-hour litigation, almost entirely in class and/or PAGA representative actions.

48. For the past decade, I have built my practice to have an emphasis on employment and related civil litigation cases and have both prosecuted and defended employment-related litigation cases. I have been heavily, successfully, and continuously involved in active litigation and trial work, and have conducted bench and jury trials on behalf of both employees and employers in wage-and-hour cases.

49. My current billing rate is $950.00 per hour, which is my usual rate in wage-and-hour litigations. This billing rate is reasonable considering my years of experience practicing in the highly specialized area of employment and labor law and my Laffey Matrix rate. (The Laffey Matrix, http://www.laffeymatrix.com/see.html [last visited Feb. 27, 2026].) The Laffey Matrix is a "well-

established objective source for rates that vary by experience" used by the District of Columbia. (*In re HPL Tech., Inc. Sec. Litig.* (N.D. Cal. 2005) 366 F. Supp 2d 912, 921.) A true and correct copy of the Laffey Matrix is attached hereto as **Exhibit 6**. California Courts have adjusted the Laffey Matrix rate upwards based on "locality pay differentials" and the location of counsel's office in California to determine whether counsel's rates are reasonable. (*See, e.g.*, *id.* [applying a 9% upward adjustment to the Laffey Matrix rate based on an approximate difference of 9% between the locality pay differential of the District of Columbia and San Francisco, California, where counsel's office was located].) To determine the locality pay differential, the Court in *In re HPL Technologies, Inc.* utilized the locality pay differentials within the federal courts. (*Id.* at pp. 921–22.) Using the same method here and based on my firm's location in Los Angeles, California, the locality pay differential of the Los Angeles-Long Beach area is 36.47% and of the Washington-Baltimore-Arlington area is 33.94%, which results in a difference of approximately 2.53%. (*Compare* Judiciary Salary Plan of Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA, eff. January 12, 2026, *with* Judiciary Salary Plan of Washington-Baltimore-Arlington, eff. January 12, 2026.) True and correct copies of the Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA and Washington-Baltimore-Arlington salary plans are attached hereto as **Exhibit 7** and **Exhibit 8**, respectively. Based on my 19+ years of experience out of law school, my Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.53% adjustment is $971.98 per hour ($948 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.53% x $948)). (*See* Exh. 6.) Accordingly, my billing rate of $950 per hour is reasonable.

50. I am experienced in prosecuting and defending employment matters, particularly class and PAGA actions. My firm has focused a substantial percentage of its practice on wage, hour, and working conditions violations. In addition to the present case, I am also class counsel for other wage-and-hour class action lawsuits pending in various counties throughout California, including in state and federal courts. The following is a list of some of our recent class action settlements that have received preliminary and final approval: *Aparicio v. Lineage Logistics, LLC* (LASC No. BC722764) (class size approx. 155; lead counsel); *Black v. Mission Healthcare Servs., Inc*. (LASC No. 19STCV04602) (class size approx. 1,000; lead counsel); *Campa v. Bloomingdeals, Inc*. (LASC No. BC700366) (class size approx. 1,500; lead counsel); *Garcia v. Comfy U.S.A. Apparel, Inc.* (LASC No. BC709630) (class size approx. 210; lead counsel); *Gomez v. H Mart Cos., Inc.* (LASC No. BC671525) (class size approx. 2,500; co-counsel); *Jones v. Citiguard, Inc.* (LASC No. BC664890) (class size approx. 587; lead counsel); *Jones v. Fitness Alliance, LLC* (Riverside No.

PSC1404079) (class size approx. 1,000; lead counsel); *Lagos v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Corp.* (LASC No. BC682972) ($750,000 for 79 class members; lead counsel); *Mark Brulee et al. v. DAL Global Servs., LLC* (C.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2018) No. CV 17-6433 JVS(JCGx), 2018 WL 6616659, at *10 (class size approx. 2,650; lead counsel) (in approving my $650 hourly rate in that case, the Court found: "Class Counsel's declarations show that the attorneys are experienced and successful litigators. Other courts have approved the attorneys' current rates for the Moon & Yang, APC attorneys"); *Martinez v. Bail Hotline Bail Bonds, Inc.* (LASC No. BC700131) (class size approx. 173; lead counsel); *Montoya v. Golden 1 Credit Union* (Sacramento No. 34-2018-00228252) (class size approx. 1,900; lead counsel); *Onofre v. Caitac Garment Processing, Inc*. (LASC No. BC702283) (class size approx. 750; lead counsel); *Rodriguez v. Rossmoyne, Inc.* (LASC No. BC699137) (class size approx. 220; lead counsel); *Sison v. Cha Hollywood Med. Ctr., L.P.* (LASC No. BC6441 29) (class size approx. 2,100; co-counsel); *Slaughter v. ACA Sec. Stems, LP* (LASC No. BC699137) (class size approx. 300; lead counsel); *Taylor v. Sherman's Delicatessen & Bakery, LLC* (LASC No. BC722765) (class size approx. 515; lead counsel); *Vargas v. AMS Paving, Inc*. (LASC No. BC722767) (case size approx. 260; lead counsel); *Vertti v. Bagcraft Papercon III, LLC* (LASC No. 19STCV12729) (class size approx. 260; lead counsel); and *Wallick v. Campbell Soup Supply Co., LLC* (San Joaquin No. STK-CV-UOE-2021-0000865) (class size 435; lead counsel).

ALLEN FEGHALI'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

51. Allen Feghali is a partner at Moon Law Group, PC. He received his B.A. in Global and International Studies in 2011 from UC Santa Barbara, and his J.D. from University of La Verne College of Law in 2014. Mr. Feghali became an Active Member of the State Bar of California in December 2014 and has been an Active Member in good standing continuously since then. He was selected by Super Lawyers as a "Southern California Rising Star" in 2020–2023.

52. Mr. Feghali began working at Moon Law Group, PC in May 2015, and his practice has focused on advocating for the rights of employees at the trial-court and appellate level. Prior to roughly June 2018, with the exception of a handful of cases, his practice focused on individual FEHA and wrongful termination claims, as well as individual wage-and-hour claims. Since June 2018, Mr. Feghali's practice has shifted to almost exclusively representing employees in wage-and-hour class and PAGA representative actions.

53. Mr. Feghali's current billing rate is $900.00 per hour, which is his usual rate in wage-and-hour litigations. Based on Mr. Feghali's 11 years of experience out of law school, his Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.53% adjustment is $971.98 per hour ($948 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.53% x $948)). (*See* Exh. 6.) As compared to the Laffey Matrix rate and when considering his significant wage-and-hour class action experience, Mr. Feghali's billing rate of $900 per hour is reasonable.

54. During Mr. Feghali's tenure with Moon Law Group, PC, he has played a critical role in obtaining outstanding results for employees who have been wronged by their employers. Mr. Feghali's litigation experience includes, but is not limited to:

(a) In March 2021, Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in the matter of *Rivera, et al. v. Clearpath Federal Credit Union* (LASC No. 19STCV33504), which resulted in a certification order on all causes of action following contested briefing in a wage-and-hour class action.

(b) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Dawson, et al. v. GoHealth, LLC, et al.* (No. CGC-19-577790), which was argued and taken under submission by the Court on February 3, 2022.

(c) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Brown v. NTI-CA, Inc., et al.* (No. 21STCV04397), which is not currently scheduled for hearing.

(d) Mr. Feghali was part of a team that prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Thong, et al. v. Outlook Resources, Inc., et al*. (No. 19STCV44400), which was granted, in part, and denied, in part, in October 2022.

(e) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing which resulted in a remand order in the matter of *Andrade v. Rehrig Pacific Corp.* (C.D. Cal. April 22, 2020) No. CV 20-1448 FMP (RAOx), 2020 WL 1934954, where Defendant removed a wage-and-hour class alleging that Plaintiff's claims were pre-empted by the Labor Management Relations Act.

(f) Mr. Feghali briefed, argued, and won the matter of *Lee, et al. v. The Christian Herald, U.S.A., Inc.* (Cal. Ct. App. Dec. 12, 2017) No. B266853, 2017 WL 6333905, at *1. There, the Court of Appeal reversed a dismissal of an individual defendant following the trial court's granting of a demurrer without leave to amend relating to alter ego allegations.

(g) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing which resulted in a remand order in the matter of *Sotelo v. Belfor USA Group, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2018) No. 2:17–cv–09056–RSWL–MRWx, 2018 WL 1352910. Defendants there sought to remove the case based on the inclusion of a "sham defendant," but the court agreed with Mr. Feghali's briefing which argued that the individual defendant, who was alleged to have harassed the plaintiff under FEHA, was a proper defendant.

(h) Mr. Feghali has been the lead counsel, or co-lead counsel, in individual cases that settled for $850,000.00, $375,000.00, and $250,000.00. In addition to the foregoing, Mr. Feghali has resolved or assisted in the resolution of approximately 100 cases which has resulted in millions of dollars of unpaid wages being returned to low-wage employees.

(i) Mr. Feghali was part of a team that prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of Hernandez v. CR Laurence, Inc., et al. (No. 20STCV32372), which was granted, in part, and denied, in part, in February 2024.

55. Since June 2018, Mr. Feghali's practice has shifted to almost exclusively representing employees in wage-and-hour class and PAGA representative actions. His fee has been approved by Courts throughout the state. He has participated as lead, or co-lead counsel, in the litigation and resolution of over 100 wage-and-hour class actions, including obtaining preliminary and final approval of settlements. A selection of settled cases wherein Mr. Feghali served as lead or co-lead class counsel includes the following: *Barahona v. Methodist Hosp. of Cal*. (No. 20STCV09876) ($5,000,000); *Vazquez v. St. Mar 2.0 Inc.* (No. 37-2021-00042702-CU-OE-CTL) ($2,250,000); *Duncan v. Infineon Technologies Americas Corp*. (No. 21STCV16872) ($2,500,000); *Aquino v. Coast King Packing, LLC* (No. 21CV002448) ($2,300,000); *Martinez, et al. v. Curative LLC* (No. 21STCV20778) ($1,500,000); *Calderon v. Installed Building Products* (No. 37-2021-00035844-CU-OE-CTL) ($1,500,000); *Majdoub v. Argent Hotel Mgmt.* (No. CGC-20-582921) ($1,800,000); *Fuentes v. Covid Clinic, Inc*. (No. CIVSB2106806) ($1,526,317.57); *Rahman, et al. v. Gate Gourmet, Inc*. (No. 3:20-cv-03047) ($3,850,000); *Pagoulatos v. Coast Hills Credit Union* (No. 20CV02801) ($1,100,000); *Hammers v. Redwood Oil Co., Inc*. (No. SCV-269625) ($1,180,000); *Cuadras v. R.C. Wendt Painting, Inc*. (No. BC705964) ($1,400,000); *Zaragoza v. The Roman Catholic Bishop of Fresno* (No. 22CV-00282) ($1,500,000); *Garcia v. San Jose Water Co.* (22CV396328) ($1,200,000); *Garcia v. Tri-*

Valley Plastering, Inc. (No. 22CECG00591) ($1,250,000); *Garcia v. Tapia Enter., Inc*. ($2,137,651 for 507 class members); *Cha v. Center Point, Inc*. (No. CIV2102081) ($1,000,000); *Sison v. Cha Hollywood Med. Ctr., L.P*. (No. BC644129) (2,137 class members); *Lagos v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Corp.* (No. BC682972) ($750,000 for 79 class members); and *Montoya v. Golden 1 Credit Union* (No. 34-2018-00228252) ($1,250,000).

S. PHILLIP SONG'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

56. S. Phillip Song is a Senior Attorney at my office. He received his undergraduate degree in 2006 from the University of Houston, graduating cum laude with a Communications B.A. and minor in Accounting. Mr. Song earned his Juris Doctor degree in 2011 from the University of Houston Law Center. Mr. Song has been admitted to practice law since 2013 (Texas). Mr. Song is presently admitted to practice in all state courts of California (admitted in 2019), and before all federal district courts in California.

57. The focus of Mr. Song's practice is currently on class actions, wage-and-hour law, and employment law. Mr. Song has worked on numerous class action cases and representative actions that have been granted final approval, including *Paez et al. v. C&R Restaurant Group, LP*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-103181-SDS; *Baker v. Central Coast Home Health, Inc.*, San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV-0219; *Martinez v. Community Playgrounds, Inc.*, Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS53879; *Duval v. Pacific States Petroleum, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2018-00231934; *Flores v. Wilmar Oils & Fats (Stockton), LLC*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2018-0012758; *Garcia v. Continental Intermodal Group LP dba CIG Logistics*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-19-102776; *Tourchette adv. Finelite, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19022885; *Touch v. Presidio Components, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV_20-101005; *Johnston v. Environmental Logistics, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-100865-DRL; *Lewis v. Environmental Waste Minimization, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-19-102248-SDS; *Priess v. Fiore Management LLC dba Canndescent*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-20-100930; *Alcantar v. Bay Equity LLC*, Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV1903376; *Spier v. Gibbs International, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-19-101774-DRL; and *Ferrara v. South Coast Winery, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2101920 (Consolidated with Case Nos. CVRI2102449 and MCC2001498).

58. Mr. Song is currently handling multiple class action and PAGA matters. Mr. Song's current billing rate is $775.00 per hour. Based on Mr. Song's 14 years of experience, his Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.5% adjustment is $971.70 per hour ($948 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.5% x $948)). (*See* Exh. 6.) As compared to the Laffey Matrix rate and when considering his experience, Mr. Song's billing rate of $775.00 per hour is reasonable.

MORGAN SIMPSON'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

59. Morgan W. Simpson is an Associate Attorney at my office. He graduated from the University of South Carolina – Columbia in 2016 with a Bachelor of Arts in Journalism, magna cum laude. Mr. Simpson attended the University of Southern California Gould of School of Law and graduated in 2020. Mr. Simpson was admitted to the California State Bar as an attorney in June 2021. Mr. Simpson began practicing Plaintiff-side wage and hour class and representative actions in July 2024 when he joined Moon Law Group, PC. Mr. Simpson has served as a handling attorney on the following matters that successfully settled and are in the process of obtaining or have obtained preliminary or final approval: *Ocampo v. DNA Motor, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 23STCV31444; *Gutierrez v. Allegion Access Technologies, LLC*, San Bernardino County Case No. CIVSB2406590; *Gutierrez v. Patton Sales Corp.*, Los Angeles County Case No. 24STCV16019; *Stamm v. Pacific Clay Products, Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County Case No. 24STCV04369; *Velo v. Chicken Choice, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Case No. 24CV441906; *Calderon v. B-Per Electronic, Inc.*, Orange County Case No. 30-2024-01409795-CU-OE-CXC. Mr. Simpson's current billing rate is $600.00 per hour. Based on Mr. Simpson's 5 years of experience, his Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.5% adjustment is $595.53 per hour ($581 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.5% x $581)). (*See* Exh. 6.) As compared to the Laffey Matrix rate and when considering his experience, Mr. Simpson's billing rate of $600.00 per hour is reasonable.

PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

60. As demonstrated by the foregoing, my office is qualified to handle this litigation because we are experienced in litigating Labor Code and Wage Order violations in individual, class, and representative actions. The attorneys at my office have been appointed as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous wage-and-hour class and/or PAGA actions in state and federal courts by way of motion for settlement approval. Including myself, Moon Law Group, PC is currently comprised of roughly

35 attorneys, all of whom are actively and continuously practicing employment litigation, representing almost entirely employee-plaintiffs, in both individual and class and/or PAGA actions, in this Superior Court and other Superior Courts throughout the State, in the Courts of Appeal, and in various federal courts. The attorneys at my firm have a high level of skill, knowledge, and experience in areas of wage-and-hour class and PAGA actions, and labor and employment law generally, the substantiative (state and federal) and procedural law of which is frequently.

61. Moon Law Group, PC has been engaged in the practice of employment and labor law for over a decade and presently focuses exclusively on plaintiffs' employment law. The firm and its lawyers have tried both bench and jury trials (representing both plaintiffs and defendants) in employment-related matters. As noted above, my firm has been appointed lead or co-lead class counsel in federal and state courts in California. Also, the firm and its lawyers have successfully settled hundreds of cases during that time, including wage-and-hour class and/or PAGA actions.

62. The foregoing experience of myself and other attorneys of Moon Law Group, PC is helpful in assessing the reasonableness of settlements, such as the one at issue here, and from this experience we concluded that this litigation could not have been settled on better terms than provided under the proposed Settlement.

63. I do not believe that I or any other attorneys of my firm have any conflicts of interest with the named Plaintiff, PAGA Employees, or the proposed Settlement Administrator. I am not related to Plaintiff. I respectfully submit that Moon Law Group, PC is competent and well suited to act as PAGA Counsel in this action, and we have and will continue to vigorously represent the interests of the PAGA Employees.

<u>REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS</u>

64. In line with the Settlement, my firm requests an award of attorneys' fees in an amount of one-third of the GSA (i.e., $66,666.67), plus reimbursement for actual litigation costs in the amount of $14,606.50. (*See* Settlement, ¶ B(2)(a)–(b).)

65. The requested Attorney's Fees can be justified under either the common fund or lodestar method. However, we base the requested award on the common fund method. Nonetheless, the lodestar

method can be used to cross-check the reasonableness of the award calculated under the common fund method.

66. The total current lodestar for Moon Law Group, PC is *not less than* the following:

Attorney	**Rate**	**Hours**	**Lodestar**
Kane Moon	$950.00	21.9	$20,805.00
Allen Feghali	$900.00	6.8	$6,120.00
S. Phillip Song	$775.00	23.7	$18,367.50
Morgan W. Simpson	$600.00	49.2	$29,520.00
	Total:	**101.6**	**$74,812.50**

67. True and correct billing entries for myself, Mr. Feghali, Mr. Song, and Mr. Simpson are attached hereto as **Exhibit 9**. There are additional hours devoted to this litigation by the attorneys and legal assistants in my office that are not reflected in the foregoing lodestar, including additional attorney time that will be spent to obtain and monitor approval of the Settlement and requested awards, oversee the settlement administration process and distribution of funds, respond to inquiries, and communicate with Plaintiff regarding the case. I estimate that my office will commit *no less than* 10 hours, although likely more time, to these additional tasks, which are hours not included in the foregoing lodestar total. My office also bears the risk of taking whatever actions are necessary if Defendants fail to pay. At my $950 hourly rate, these additional 10 hours results in a lodestar of **$9,500.00**.

68. "California case law permits fee awards in the absence of detailed time sheets." (*Wershba v. Apple Comp., Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 255.) The Court "should defer to the winning lawyer's professional judgment as to how much time he was required to spend on the case." (*Moreno v. City of Sacramento* (9th Cir. 2008) 534 F.3d 1106, 1112.) We can provide complete, detailed billing records in the event the Court requests them but would request the opportunity to redact attorney-client privileged information and any other privileged information. As discussed below, application of a positive multiplier is warranted—***but not requested***—in this case.

69. The lodestar method requires the Court to determine a "touchstone" or lodestar figure based on a compilation of time spent and reasonable hourly compensation for each attorney. (*Graham v.*

DaimlerChrysler Corp. (2004) 34 Cal.4th 553, 579.) Generally, hours are reasonable if they were "reasonably expended in pursuit of the ultimate result achieved in the same manner that an attorney traditionally is compensated by a fee-paying client." (*Hensley v. Eckerhart* (1983) 461 U.S. 424, 431.)

(a) Number of Hours Expended by My Office is Reasonable: As set forth in this declaration, my office expended a significant amount of time litigating the case to achieve an excellent result on behalf of the PAGA Employees. To date, my office has spent no less than **101.6 hours** litigating this case. In the event the Court grants settlement approval, my office will spend additional time related to this litigation, including to monitor administration of the settlement after approval, committing no less, although likely more, than **10** hours to those additional tasks. The number of hours that my office has and will devote to this case is reasonable. (*See, e.g.*, *Ketchum III v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1133 [fee award should be fully compensatory and, "absent circumstances rendering the award unjust, an attorney fee award should ordinarily include compensation for *all* the hours *reasonably spent*"] [emphasis in original]; *Serrano v. Unruh* (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 621, 624 [counsel are entitled to compensation for all hours reasonably expended]; *Hensley*, *supra*, 461 U.S. at pp. 435–36; *Caudle v. Bristow Optical Co.* (9th Cir. 2000) 224 F.3d 1014, 1028; *Cabrales v. Cty. of L.A.* (9th Cir. 1991) 935 F.2d 1050, 1052–53.) As discussed above, my office was required to expend considerable time and resources to investigate, litigate, and successfully settle these claims for the benefit of the PAGA Employees.

(b) The Attorneys' Hourly Rates are Reasonable: "[T]he established standard when determining a reasonable hourly rate is the 'rate prevailing in the community for similar work performed by attorneys of comparable skill, experience, and reputation.'" (*Camacho v. Bridgeport Fin., Inc.* (9th Cir. 2008) 523 F.3d 973, 979 [quoting *Barjon v. Dalton* (9th Cir. 1997) 132 F.3d 496, 502].) This rule applies even when, as here, the attorneys representing a named plaintiff perform the work on a contingent fee basis. (*See, e.g.*, *Robertson v. Fleetwood Travel Trailers of Cal., Inc.* (2006) 144 Cal.App.4th 785, 818; *Blanchard v. Bergeron* (1989) 489 U.S. 87, 96.) These hourly rates are reasonable in light of the significant experience, expertise, and skill my firm brought to this action. Rates are reasonable if they are "within the range of reasonable rates charged by and judicially awarded comparable attorneys for comparable work." (*Children's Hosp. & Med. Ctr. v. Bonta* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 740, 783.) The trial court may "find hourly rates reasonable based on evidence of other courts approving similar rates." (*Parkinson v. Hyundai Motor Am.* (C.D. Cal. 2010) 796 F.Supp.2d 1160, 1172.) The attorneys at Moon Law Group, PC are experienced litigators who specialize in employment law, with a substantial wage-and-hour class action practice. The hourly rates of each attorney are also reasonable as compared to their respective Laffey Matrix rates as explained *supra*. Moreover, these rates are not opposed or challenged, and have been approved by other courts, as explained *supra*.

(c) Application of a Multiplier is Warranted (But Not Requested): Once this lodestar figure has been determined, the Court may take into account other "enhancement" factors to adjust the lodestar award. As the California Supreme Court has held, contingency fees should be higher than fees for the same legal services paid concurrently with the provision of the services. (*Ketchum III*, *supra*, 24 Cal.4th at pp. 1132–33; *see also Fischel v. Equitable Life Assurance Soc'y of the U.S.* (9th Cir. 2002) 307 F.3d 997, 1008.) "A lawyer who both bears the risk of not being paid and provides legal services is not receiving the fair market value of his work if he is paid only for the second of these functions. If he is paid no more, competent counsel will be reluctant to accept fee award cases." (*Ketchum,* 24 Cal.4th at p. 1133.) Application of that rule is particularly appropriate where the case is brought to redress important rights of vulnerable persons. (*Id.*) A risk enhancement is "earned compensation; unlike a windfall, it is neither unexpected nor fortuitous. Rather, it is intended to approximate market-level compensation for such services, which typically includes a premium for the risk of nonpayment or delay in payment of attorney fees." (*Id.* at p. 1138.) **Multipliers normally range from two to four or higher.** (*Wershba*, *supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at p. 255; *see also Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.* (9th Cir. 2002) 290 F.3d 1043, 1051, n.6 ["most" common fund cases apply a multiplier of 1.0–4.0]; *Been v. O.K. Indus., Inc.* (E.D. Okla. 2011, No. CIV–02–285–RAW) 2011 WL 4478766, *11 [citing a study "reporting [an] average multiplier of 3.89 in survey of 1,120 class action cases" and finding that a multiplier of 1.22 would be "per se reasonable"].) Factors considered in determining whether a lodestar multiplier is appropriate generally include: (1) the risks presented by the contingent nature of the case; (2) the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved and the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly; (3) the nature of the opposition; (4) the preclusion of other employment by the attorney due to acceptance of the case; and (5) the result obtained and the importance of the lawsuit to the public. (*Serrano v. Ivy Baker Priest* (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 25, 48–49 [hereinafter "*Serrano III*"].) All these factors favor approval of a multiplier along the lines of those approved in the cases above. To date, my office has incurred no less than **$74,812.50** in attorneys' lodestar fees, anticipates incurring at least another $9,500.00 in lodestar fees, and has advanced **$14,606.50** in actual litigation costs. Thus, after reimbursement of our out-of-pocket expenses, the fee request of $66,666.67 is a **negative** multiplier of the lodestar fees incurred to-date in prosecuting this case. In other words, we are requesting an amount that is less than what we would be entitled to under a lodestar check.

1) *Risks presented by the contingent nature of the case*: The major consideration in determining the necessity of a multiplier is the contingent nature of the award. (*Ketchum III*, *supra*, 24 Cal.4th at pp. 1132–33; *see also Fischel*, *supra*, 307 F.3d at p. 1008.) In determining what multiplier to award, the probability of success must be assessed *ex ante*, that is, as viewed from the outset of the case. (*See, e.g.*, *Harman v. Lyphomed, Inc.* (7th Cir. 1991) 945 F.2d 969, 976.) Further, the possibility of no recovery is only one of the uncertainties involved in taking on such a case. Other uncertainties are the amount that will be recovered, uncertainty as to the cost, both in effort and expenses, and uncertainty about how much time will pass before the recovery is obtained. (*See, e.g.*, *Ketchum*, 24 Ca1.4th at pp. 1132–1133, 1138.) My office's outlay of time and money in this case has been significant. In all, my office has spent *no less than* **101.6** hours to date investigating, analyzing, researching, litigating, and negotiating a favorable resolution of this case, in addition to *a minimum of* **10** hours that will be spent following final settlement approval, including to monitor settlement administration and

distribution of funds, and has incurred $14,606.50 in necessary litigation costs. Unsettled legal issues also presented risks to the claims in this case. My office bore the substantial risk of an uncertain outcome in agreeing to prosecute this PAGA action on a contingency fee basis, as well as the difficulties and delay inherent in such litigation. There was the prospect of the enormous cost inherent in PAGA representative action litigation, as well as extensive negotiations with a corporate Defendants who vigorously opposed Plaintiff's claims and right to pursue her individual or class action claims in state court. My office risked significant time and expense to ensure a successful settlement. As detailed *supra*, the risks presented in this case were significant, and Defendant's defenses posed serious risks to the success of this PAGA matter on the merits, assuming we were first successful at proving the merits of Plaintiff's individual claims at arbitration. These risks illustrate the recognition by the California Supreme Court in *Ketchum III* that, if multipliers are not awarded to PAGA counsel in the cases that are successfully settled, counsel's fees are essentially being cut because the lodestar in and of itself would not account for contingent risk.

2) *Difficulty of the questions involved and the skill required*: My office is comprised of skilled attorneys who have had success in wage-and-hour class and PAGA actions. This case required experienced and competent lawyers, as well as expertise in the issues presented herein. To obtain such an attorney on the free market, a client must pay the market rate. While most class/PAGA actions are complex and involve some risk, my office had to overcome several major obstacles in prosecuting this case, as explained *supra*. Defendant's contentions underscore the risk of prevailing at trial, and any of these obstacles could have prevented recovery completely.

3) *Vigorous opposition by Defendant*: Counsel who skillfully overcome difficult issues or uncompromising opposition in the litigation are entitled to a fee enhancement. (*Serrano III*, *supra*, 20 Cal.3d at 49.) Here, before eventually agreeing to a settlement, Defendants asserted a vigorous defense and challenged Plaintiff's ability to litigate her individual and class action claims. The settlement effort was protracted, with extended discussions

and instances in which it appeared the Parties would not reach a settlement. Further, proceeding to arbitration, and if successful, then trial would have added years to the resolution of this case because of the difficult legal and factual issues raised and the likelihood of appeals. Indeed, even if Plaintiff prevailed on the representative PAGA claims at trial, assuming she was first successful at arbitration, Defendants would likely have mounted an appeal.

4) *The extent to which litigation precluded other employment would justify an enhancement*: There are only so many cases that my office can take at any one time. Consequently, there were other meritorious cases presented to my office that would have generated substantial fees, but were declined, during the pendency of this action in order to devote the attention necessary to achieve favorable results.

5) *The result obtained would justify an enhancement*: The results obtained in litigation can properly be used to enhance a lodestar calculation where an exceptional effort produced excellent results. (*Graham*, *supra*, 34 Cal.4th at p. 582.) Here, the final maximum settlement figure is **$200,000**, which represents roughly **68.2%** of the total realistic recovery. Considered against the size of the PAGA Employees, the risks posed by continued litigation, and the importance of the employment rights and a speedy recovery, the relief provided under the Settlement represents a very strong result for the PAGA Employees and LWDA.

6) *The use of a multiplier is permitted in PAGA actions*: PAGA provides that "[a]ny employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs." (Lab. Code § 2699(k)(1).) Although, PAGA does not provide a specific standard for evaluating attorneys' fees in connection with a settlement of PAGA claims, California Courts have employed a lodestar analysis and use of multipliers for this purpose. "Where a settlement produces a common fund for the benefit of the entire class, courts have discretion to employ either the lodestar method or the percentage-of-recovery method. . . . To guard against an unreasonable result, the Ninth Circuit encourages district courts to "cross-check[] their calculations against a

> second method. . . . Accordingly, the Court calculates attorneys' fees in the instant case using the percentage-of-recovery method and then cross-checks its calculations against the lodestar method." (*Hermosillo v. Davey Tree Surgery Co.* (N.D. Cal. July 7, 2021) No. 18-CV-00393-LHK, 2021 WL 2826697, at *1 [quoting *In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.* (9th Cir. 2011) 654 F.3d 935, 942, 944–45].)

70. I am informed and believe that the fees and costs provision under the Settlement is reasonable. My office invested significant time and resources into the case, with payment deferred to the end of the case, and then, of course, contingent on the outcome.

71. The risk to my office has been very significant, particularly if we would not be successful in pursuing this representative action. In that case, we would have been left with no compensation for all the time taken in litigating this case. Indeed, I have taken on a number of class and/or PAGA action cases that have resulted in thousands of attorney hours being expended and ultimately having the defendant company going bankrupt. The contingent risk in these types of cases is very real and occurs regularly. Furthermore, we were precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases which could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain.

72. Because most individuals cannot afford to pay for legal representation on an hourly basis, Moon Law Group, PC represents virtually all its employment law clients on a contingency fee basis, including Plaintiff in this action. Pursuant to this arrangement, we are not compensated for our time unless we prevail at trial or our clients' cases are successfully settled. Because Moon Law Group, PC is taking the risk that we will not be reimbursed for our time unless our client settles or wins his or her case, we cannot afford to represent an individual employee on a contingency basis if, at the end of our representation, all we are to receive is our regular hourly rate for services. It is essential that we recover more than our regular hourly rate when we win if we are to remain in practice so as to be able to continue representing other individuals in civil rights employment disputes.

73. My office invested significant time and resources into the case, with payment deferred to the end of the case, and then, of course, contingent on the outcome. My office's efforts have included, and will include following an approval order, without limitation, the following:

a. Numerous interviews with Plaintiff and review of documents provided by her;

b. Legal research and investigation regarding the Defendant's practices at numerous points in the litigation;

c. Preparation and submission of Plaintiff's PAGA Notice;

d. Preparation of multiple drafts of the complaint, as well as finalization and filing of said complaint;

e. Extensive meet-and-confer discussions with Defendant's counsel regarding the arbitration agreement and the impact on Plaintiff's class action claims;

f. Informal discovery activity;

g. Extensive meet-and-confer discussions with Defendant's counsel regarding mediator selection and production of relevant documents and information in preparation for mediation through informal discovery;

h. Analysis of Defendant's informal discovery production and preparation of a damages model with the aid of a statistics expert;

i. Contacting witnesses;

j. Research and preparation of Plaintiff's mediation brief;

k. Attendance and active participation at a full day of mediation;

l. Drafting, negotiating, and reviewing multiple drafts of the Settlement and its attachment;

m. Preparation and submission of the instant motion for settlement approval and accompanying filings;

n. Anticipated preparation for and attendance at the hearing on the motion for approval, monitoring approval of the Settlement and requested awards, and overseeing the administration process and distribution of funds; and

o. Communications with Plaintiff throughout the case.

74. As of the drafting of this motion, my office has incurred **$14,606.50** in expenses litigating this action without any reimbursement. (Ex. 4.) These expenses were reasonably necessary to the litigation and were actually incurred by my office. These to-date expenses are summarized as follows:

(a) "Journal- Complaint": the initial case filing fee for initiating Plaintiff's action;

(b) "Berger Consulting Group": costs of expert review of discovery for mediation;

(c) "Jams Mediation with Carl West": a one-time cost for mediation services;

(d) "ACE," "Orange SC," and "One Legal": costs for purchasing court documents, and for filing and serving various documents during this Action.

75. We anticipate incurring additional costs up to and after Settlement approval, including filing costs for the approval motion and any notice of entry of approval order and judgment. However, at this time, we are only requesting reimbursement of our to-date costs ($14,606.50). Moreover, because our costs are below the maximum allocation ($20,000) under the Settlement, the difference ($20,000 - $14,606.50 = $5,393.50) will revert to the PAGA Payment. (Settlement, ¶ B(2)(c).) I respectfully submit that our reimbursement request is fair and reasonable.

76. Through the efforts of my office and Plaintiff in this case, a fair and reasonable resolution has been reached that includes a non-reversionary payment by Defendants of at least $200,000 to compensate PAGA Employees for Defendant's alleged employment practices. I am informed and believe that, without the efforts of my office or Plaintiff, the Labor Code and Wage Order violations alleged in this action would have gone completely unremedied.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 2, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

Kane Moon