Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Monique Toby, Esq. (SBN 365937)
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
mtoby@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Nicole Burton,
on behalf of herself and others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

MICHAEL GONZALES and NICOLE BURTON, individually, on behalf of themselves, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MECHANICS BANK, a California Corporation; RABOBANK, a Corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive, and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: C22-02261

[*Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Benjamin T. Reyes, II, Dept. 16*]

DECLARATION OF MONIQUE TOBY IN SUPPORT OF FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Hearing Information:
Date: December 2, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: 16

DECLARATION OF MONIQUE TOBY

I, Monique Toby, declare:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the state of California and have been admitted to practice before this Court. I am an associate attorney with the law firm Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP, Counsel for Plaintiff Nicole Burton ("Plaintiff") in this action, and I am an attorney assigned to work on this case. Based on my assignment to this case and familiarity with the file in this matter; I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and if called and sworn as a witness, I would and could competently testify under oath thereto. I am a member in good standing of the bar of the State of California and all State and Federal District Courts in California.

2. This Declaration is submitted in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement.

EXPERIENCE OF CLASS COUNSEL

3. Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP is experienced and qualified to act as Class Counsel, to evaluate the class claims, to evaluate settlement versus trial on a fully informed basis, and to evaluate the viability of the defenses.

4. I, and the law firm of Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP, have almost exclusively practiced in the area of labor and employment law.

5. I graduated from LMU Loyola Law School in 2025. I have been in practice with the law firm of Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP since December 2025, focusing exclusively in the area of employment law and specifically wage and hour class actions. I have been involved in numerous cases in all aspects from pre-filing through settlement, including California and Federal class actions, PAGA representative actions, and collective actions, and have previously been appointed as class counsel in wage and hour class actions.

6. I am also familiar with the practice of Lead Counsel Joseph Lavi having worked as an associate with Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP since December 2025, which has often included reviewing Mr. Lavi's declarations in support of motions for attorneys' fees and/or to seek appointment as Class Counsel. Mr. Lavi graduated from law school in 2000 and has handled numerous cases in all aspects of employment and labor law, including state and federal class actions, wrongful termination,

discrimination, harassment and retaliation cases. Mr. Lavi has tried employment cases in State and Federal court, and has argued before various Courts of Appeals, on employment issues such as validity of Arbitration Agreements, Application of Res Judicata in class action cases, and other employment issues. Mr. Lavi has been a panelist and/or speaker for various Employment Law Continuing Legal Education Panels on issues of employment law trials, how to proceed and conduct trials, and proving and winning punitive damages. Mr. Lavi has been named a Southern California Super Lawyer in the area of Plaintiff's employment litigation for Class Actions from 2011-2026. Mr. Lavi has settled dozens of wage and hour class actions and is currently Plaintiff's counsel in many others. Some of the class actions that Mr. Lavi has handled against employers on wage and hour issues and have been approved as class counsel include cases against the following: Kaiser Permanente which settled for $6,510,000.00; Hustler Casino which settled for $980,000.00; Chevron Stations Inc., which settled for $4,500,000.00; Commerce Casino which settled for $1,575,000.00; BP West Cost Products, which settled for $4,000,000.00; Kaiser Permanente which settled for $3,600,000.00, Fuddruckers (as lead counsel) which settled for $900,000.00; Movado Retail Group, Inc. (as lead counsel) which settled for $728,000.00, Chuck-E-Cheese's (as lead counsel) which settled for $1,900,000.00; Aero-Electric Connector, Inc. (as lead counsel) which settled for $1,500,000.00; Clougherty Packing, LLC (as lead counsel) which settled for $4,250,000.00; and Gruma Corporation (as lead counsel) which Defendants' petition to the United States Supreme Court in the matter was denied and the matter settled for $2,300,000.00. Mr. Lavi has been approved as class counsel by both Federal and California Courts. Mr. Lavi and the other attorneys at Lavi & Ebrahimian who are available to assist me in this case if needed are fully capable of adequately and fairly representing Plaintiff and the proposed class in this matter.

7. Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP, and has been appointed Class Counsel in over fifty contested proceedings including the following:

a. *Ischak v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC343535;

b. *Santana v. El Pollo Loco, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC369846;

c. *Edlin, et al. v. Fuddruckers, Inc.,* United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV-07-3678-ABC;

d. *Chavez, et al. vs. CEC Entertainment, Inc. d/b/a Chukee-Cheeses,* Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC380996;

e. *Bustamante, et al. v. Teamone Employment Specialists*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC383266;

f. *Cervantes, et al. v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc.*, Alameda Superior Court Case No. RG 0265835;

g. *Seng Savang v. Club One Casino*; Fresno Superior Court Case No. 05CECG02189;

h. *Norman, et al. v. Movado Retail Group, Inc.,* United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV08-06691 SVW (PLA)

i. *Shand v. G.A.L.A., Inc. dba Giorgio Armani*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC342588;

j. *Solis v. Plycraft Industries, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC374816;

k. *Campos v. HWB Carwash, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC378990;

l. *Acosta, et al. v. Texwood Industries*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV07-3237-DDP (PLAX);

m *Arevalo v. Gruma Corporation*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC410322;

n. *Burrola v. American Promotional Events*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC412315;

o. *Cortez v. Trader Distribution Services*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC397208;

p. *Cueva v. Allied Industries, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC399431;

q. *Del Toro v. Petco Animal Supplies, Inc.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2009-00103626-CU-OE-CTL;

r. *Garcia v. Home Cooking, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC451148;

s. *Alcantar v. Amerimax Building Products, Inc.*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 10-8916 DDP (CWx);

t. *Arancivias v. Clougherty Packaging, LLC dba Farmer John*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC432406;

u. *Barajas v. Menzies Aviation, Inc.,* United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No CV-10-02315-JEM;

v. *Barrera v. BHFC Operating, LLC dba Bottega Louie*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC462603;

w. *Camacho v. American Textile Maintenance Co.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC452570;

x. *Cortes v. Monsanto Company*, Ventura Superior Court Case No. 56-2010-00366952-CU-OE-VTA;

y. *Escobar v. Aero-Electric Connector, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC421009;

z. *Gomez v. Bacara Resort & Spa*, Santa Barbara Superior Court Case No. 1341987;

aa. *Gonzalez v. Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC425708

bb. *Gonzalez v. Burrtec Waste Industries, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC436879;

cc. *Gutierrez v. Visterra Credit Union*, Riverside Superior Court Case No. RIC10020183;

dd. *Hernandez v. Kruse & Son, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC411849;

ee. *Lopez v. Tecno Industrial Engineering*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC411134;

ff. *Lowanga v. Continental Currency Services, Inc*., Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2011-0044011-CU-OE-CXC;

gg. *Aguilar v. PLS Financial Services, Inc.,* United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 10-0415 ODW (FMOx)

hh. *Lozada v. Classic Party Rentals, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC443792;

ii. *Madrid v. OPI Products, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC451489;

jj. *Martinez v. J. Fletcher Creamer & Son, Inc.*, United States District Court Case No. CV 10-0968-PSG-FMOX;

kk. *Martinez v. Administaff Companies II, L.P.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC425799;

ll. *Martinez v. Morgans Hotel Group Management, LLC*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC446744;

mm. *Sanchez v. La Brea Bakery, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC456420;

nn. *Montenegro v. Ruggeri Marble and Granite, Inc.*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV-10-00711 JFW (PLAx);

oo. *Reed v. 99 Cents Only Stores,* Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC436793;

pp. *Santos v. Noble Management Group-California, LLC*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 10-2594 DSF (VBKx)

qq. *Taylor v. U.S. Healthworks Holding Company, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2011-00473505;

rr. *Valencia Diaz v. Gene Wheeler Farms, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC436235;

ss. *Zad-Behtooie v. Valley Village,* Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC451490;

tt. *Bell v. Aidells Sausage Company, Inc.*, Alameda Superior Court Case No. RG10523946;

uu. *Negrete v. Cenveo, Inc.*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 11-09543 DSF (MRWx);

vv. *Bejar v. Exopack-Ontario, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2011-00518396-CU-OE-CXC;

ww. *Aguilar v. PLS Financial Services, Inc.*, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 10-0415 ODW (FMOx);

xx. *Sparks v. Larry Flynt dba Hustler Casino*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC320172;

yy. *Morris v. Chevron Stations, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC361380;

zz. *Marino v. BP West Coast Products, LLC*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC357987.

ATTORNEYS' FEES

8. Our firm has made every effort to litigate this action in an efficient and cost-effective manner. Following review of our case file and hours and discussions with counsel, our firm has spent approximately 152 hours on this matter for a total unadjusted lodestar of $115,225.00.

9. In summary form, counsel's many tasks included the following: pre-filing investigation, legal research, and research of Defendant; meeting and communicating with client regarding her responsibility in bringing the action, the facts of her case, her employment, her work environment, her documents pleadings; reviewing Plaintiff's file and determining liability and evaluating claim and defense strengths and weaknesses; legal research of case law and wage orders regarding applicable claims and defenses; meeting and conferring over informal discovery and the mediation session; drafting notices for litigation; evaluating Defendant's policies; determining case strategy; communicating with Co-Counsel and Defendant's Counsel; analyzing data and information

provided in informal discovery; calculating damages; negotiating settlement and settlement documents; communicating with the administrator and responding to administrator's inquiries; reviewing the motion for preliminary approval and preparing supporting documents; meeting with client regarding approval of the settlement; and drafting supporting documents for the motion for final approval. All of the tasks and work performed were reasonable and necessary to the prosecution of this case and justified, particularly in light of the result achieved.

10. Throughout the course of this litigation, I have spent approximately 7 hours on this matter. My unadjusted lodestar for my hours spent on this case amounts to approximately $4,725.00 (7 x $675.00 = $4,725.00). Given my experience and the focus of my practice, if I were to charge for my type of work by the hour my rate would be $675 per hour. A $675 rate is warranted based on my years of experience in a highly specialized area of law and is in line with the respective Laffey Matrix rates. (See **Exhibit 2** available at http://www.laffeymatrix.com/see.html.) California Courts have applied the Laffey Matrix with adjustments to the specific California locality where the Counsel's office is located based on "Locality Pay Tables." (*Syers Properties III, Inc. v. Rankin* (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 691, 695-696 [affirming fee award based on Laffey Matrix with upward 12 percent rate adjustment from D.C. area compared to San Francisco Bay Area based on Locality Pay Tables]; *In re HPL Techs., Inc., Secs. Litig.* (N.D. Cal. April 22, 2005, No. C-02-3510 VRW) 365 F.Supp.2d 912, 921-922 [using Laffey Matrix with upward adjustment of 12 percent for San Francisco based on difference between D.C. Area 's +33.94 locality pay compared to San Francisco's +46.34 percent locality pay differential from the federal courts' "Judiciary Salary Plan Pay Tables."].) Here, Plaintiff's Counsel's offices are located in Los Angeles County. For 2026, the Locality Pay Tables (and Judiciary Salary Plan Pay Tables referred to in *In re HPL Techs., Inc.*), state a +36.47 percent increase for the Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA area which includes the following counties: Imperial County, Kern County, Los Angeles County, Orange County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, San Luis Obispo County, Santa Barbara County, and Ventura County. (**Exhibits 3-4**) [2026 Locality Pay Tables for Washington-Baltimore-Arlington and Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA available at https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/pdf/2026/DCB.pdf; and https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-

wages/salary-tables/pdf/2026/LA.pdf]; (**Exhibits 5-6**) [Judiciary Salary Plan Pay Tables available at https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/document/jsp_washington_2026.pdf.; and https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/document/jsp_los_angeles_2026.pdf]; (**Exhibit 7**) [2026 Locality Pay Area Definitions defining counties within Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA area available at https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/2026/locality-pay-area-definitions/].) In applying the +36.47% locality increase for attorneys working in Imperial County, Kern County, Los Angeles County, Orange County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, San Luis Obispo County, Santa Barbara County, and Ventura County over the Washington-Baltimore area stated in the Laffey Matrix, the Laffey Matrix states the following relevant rates: $508 for attorneys 1 to 3 years out of law school, $625 for attorneys 4 to 7 years out of law school, $902 for attorneys 8 to 10 years out of law school, $1,019 for attorneys 11 to 19 years out of law school, and $1,227 for attorneys 20 plus years out of law school.

11. Working closely with the other attorneys in my firm, including on motions for attorneys' fees, I am aware of the experience and achievements of the counsel involved in this matter as well as the rates which would be charged if our work was on an hourly basis. Having reviewed numerous declarations in support of fee applications in Los Angeles, I also have knowledge of hourly rates charged by other attorneys practicing in the field of employment law in Los Angeles. Based on that information, I believe that my rate and the rates of the attorneys in my firm are fully consistent with the market rate for attorneys with comparable expertise, experience and qualifications. Based on the information I have, I believe that the rates of our firm are reasonable and appropriate fees for Los Angeles attorneys with comparable expertise, experience, and qualifications.

12. Throughout the course of this litigation, Joseph Lavi estimates he has spent at least 31 hours litigating this matter. Accordingly, Mr. Lavi's unadjusted lodestar in this matter is $31,000.00 (31 x $1,000 = $31,000.00). If Mr. Lavi were to charge a rate for this type of work by the hour, given his experience and the focus of his practice, his current hourly rate would be $1,000 per hour. A $1,000 rate is warranted based on Mr. Lavi's years of experience in a highly specialized area of law and is in line with the Laffey Matrix. This rate is also in line with other partners out of law school and

practicing for over 15 years in California as indicated by the 2014 and 2008 National Law Journal Survey.

13. Throughout the course of this litigation, Vincent C. Granberry estimates he has spent at least 34 hours litigating this matter. Accordingly, Mr. Granberry's unadjusted lodestar in this matter is $25,500.00 (34 x $750 = $25,500.00). If Mr. Granberry were to charge a rate for this type of work by the hour, given his experience and the focus of his practice, his current hourly rate would be $750. Mr. Granberry is a graduate of the Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law at Arizona State University and has been in practice since 2011. A $750 rate is warranted based on Mr. Granberry's years of experience in a highly specialized area of law and is in line with the Laffey Matrix.

14. Ashly Valenzuela is a former attorney of Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP. Ms. Valenzuela spent approximately 20 hours litigating this matter. Ms. Valenzuela is no longer associated with our firm. I am aware that she graduated from Stetson University College of Law and has been in practice since 2019. If Ms. Valenzuela were to charge a rate for this type of work by the hour, given her experience, her currently hourly rate would be $675 per hour. Accordingly, Ms. Valenzuela unadjusted lodestar in this matter is $13,500 (20 x $675 =$13,500).

15. Jeffrey M. Schwartz is a former attorney of Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP. Mr. Schwartz spent approximately 21 hours litigating this matter. Mr. Schwartz is no longer an associate with our firm. I am aware he graduated from Chapman University School of Law and has been licensed to practice law since 2008. If Mr. Schwartz were to charge a rate for this type of work by the hour, given his experience, his currently hourly rate would be $675 per hour. Accordingly, Mr. Schwartz unadjusted lodestar in this matter is $14,175.00 (21 x $675 =$14,175.00).

16. Woodard Jones is a former attorney of Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP. Mr. Jones spent approximately 23 hours litigating this matter. Mr. Jones is no longer an associate with our firm. I am aware he graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law and has been licensed to practice law since 2019. If Mr. Jones were to charge a rate for this type of work by the hour, given his experience, his currently hourly rate would be 675.00 per hour. Accordingly, Mr. Jones unadjusted lodestar in this matter is $15,525.00 (23 x $675 =$15,525.00).

17. Eve Howe is a former attorney at Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP. Ms. Howe estimates she has spent at least 16 hours litigating this matter. Ms. Howe graduated from Harvard Law School in 2021 and has been practicing at Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP since July 2023. If Ms. Howe were to charge a rate for this type of work by the hour, given her experience, her current hourly rate would be $675 per hour, in line with the Laffey Matrix. Accordingly, Ms. Howe's unadjusted lodestar in this matter is $10,800.00 (16 x $675 = $10,800.00).

18. Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP is co-counsel in this matter with: (i) JCL Law Firm, APC, and (ii) Zakay Law Group, APLC, representing Plaintiffs in this Action and there is an agreement to split the attorneys' fees recovered in this Action.

ATTORNEYS' COSTS

19. Our firm maintains all records regarding costs expended on each case. I have reviewed the records of costs expended in this matter which total Five Thousand Thirty-Five Dollars and Nine Cents ($5,035.09). All costs were reasonably incurred in prosecution of the lawsuit and paid on a contingency basis. A large portion of these costs were associated with filing fees for this case, service of documents, and telephonic court appearances; the remainder was reasonably incurred in prosecution of the lawsuit. (See **EXHIBIT 1** for a true and correct copy of the Lavi and Ebrahimian Costs expended in this matter.)

EXHIBITS

20. Attached as **EXHIBIT 1** to this declaration is a true and correct copy of the Lavi & Ebrahimian Costs.

21. Attached as **EXHIBIT 2** to this declaration is a true and correct printout of the Laffey Matrix available at http://www.laffeymatrix.com/see.html.

22. Attached as **EXHIBIT 3** to this declaration is a true and correct copy of the 2026 Locality Pay Table for Washington-Baltimore-Arlington available at https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/pdf/2026/DCB.pdf.

23. Attached as **EXHIBIT 4** to this declaration is a true and correct copy of the 2026 Locality Pay Table for Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA available at https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/pdf/2026/LA.pdf.

24. Attached as **EXHIBIT 5** to this declaration is a true and correct copy of the Judiciary Salary Plan Pay Table for Washington-Baltimore-Arlington available at https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/document/jsp_washington_2026.pdf.

25. Attached as **EXHIBIT 6** to this declaration is a true and correct copy of the Judiciary Salary Plan Pay Table for Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA available at https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/document/jsp_los_angeles_2026.pdf.

26. Attached as **EXHIBIT 7** to this declaration is a true and correct copy of 2026 Locality Pay Area Definitions defining counties within Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA area available at https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/2026/locality-pay-area-definitions/.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: October 27, 2026

/s/ Monique Toby
Monique Toby, Esq.

“EXHIBIT 1”

October 14, 2026

RE: ***BURTON, NICOLE vs. MECHANICS BANKS***

COSTS AND FEES ADVANCED BY LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

DATE	ITEM	COST
	SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	**$**
N/A	Copying	$7.50
N/A	Scanning	$7.50
N/A	Mail	$104.06
	LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT	
03/07/2024	Summons and Complaint Filing Fee (Class)	$1,435.00
05/13/2024	Summons and Complaint Filing Gee (PAGA)	$435.00
	DDS LEGAL SERVICES	
03/07/2024	Filing of Summons and Complaint (Class)	$76.75
03/14/2024	Process of Service of Summons and Complaint on Defendant Mechanic Banks (Class)	$124.90
03/27/2024	Filing of Summons and Complaint on Defendant Mechanic Banks (Class)	$69.90
04/03/2024	Filing of Proof of Service (Class)	$33.70
05/13/2024	Filing of Summons and Complaint (PAGA)	$76.75
06/28/2024	Filing of Notice and Acknowledgement of Receipt-Civil (PAGA)	$33.70
09/09/2024	Filing of Case Management Statement (Class)	$33.70
09/12/2024	Fling of Notice of Remote Appearance (Class)	$33.70
09/13/2024	Courtesy Copy Delivery of Remote Appearance (Class)	$49.95
09/12/2024	Filing of Notice of Remote Appearance (PAGA)	$33.70
09/19/2024	Filing of Notice of Proceedings and Minute Order (Class)	$33.70
09/19/2024	Filing of Plaintiff's Notice of Proceedings & Minute Order (PAGA)	$33.70
03/18/2025	Filing of Plaintiff's Notice of Minute Order: Notice for Order to Show Cause (Class)	$35.15
09/29/2025	Filing of Request for Dismissal and the [Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiff's Request for Dismissal (Class)	$35.89
09/29/2025	Filing of Request for Dismissal (PAGA)	$35.89
09/30/2025	Delivery of Courtesy Copy- Request for Dismissal and the [Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiff's Request for Dismissal (Class)	$129.95

	DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	
	Initial PAGA Filing Fee (PAGA)	$75.00
	PROMISSORY NOTES	
12/22/2025	Promissory Note #1	$2,100.00
	Total Costs, fees and expenses	**$5,035.09**
	Attorney's Fees	$
	Total Fees and Costs	$
	Net Settlement to Client	**$**

“Exhibit 2”

LAFFEY MATRIX

History
Case Law
See the Matrix
Contact us
Home

			Years Out of Law School *				
Year	Adjustmt Factor**	Paralegal/ Law Clerk	1-3	4-7	8-10	11-19	20 +
6/01/25- 5/31/26	1.075336	$277	$508	$625	$902	$1,019	$1,227
6/01/24- 5/31/25	1.080182	$258	$473	$581	$839	$948	$1,141
6/01/23- 5/31/24	1.059295	$239	$437	$538	$777	$878	$1,057
6/01/22- 5/31/23	1.085091	$225	$413	$508	$733	$829	$997
6/01/21- 5/31/22	1.006053	$208	$381	$468	$676	$764	$919
6/01/20- 5/31/21	1.015894	$206	$378	$465	$672	$759	$914
6/01/19- 5/31/20	1.0049	$203	$372	$458	$661	$747	$899
6/01/18- 5/31/19	1.0350	$202	$371	$455	$658	$742	$894
6/01/17- 5/31/18	1.0463	$196	$359	$440	$636	$717	$864
6/01/16- 5/31/17	1.0369	$187	$343	$421	$608	$685	$826
6/01/15- 5/31/16	1.0089	$180	$331	$406	$586	$661	$796
6/01/14- 5/31/15	1.0235	$179	$328	$402	$581	$655	$789
6/01/13- 5/31/14	1.0244	$175	$320	$393	$567	$640	$771
6/01/12- 5/31/13	1.0258	$170	$312	$383	$554	$625	$753
6/01/11- 5/31/12	1.0352	$166	$305	$374	$540	$609	$734
6/01/10- 5/31/11	1.0337	$161	$294	$361	$522	$589	$709
6/01/09- 5/31/10	1.0220	$155	$285	$349	$505	$569	$686
6/01/08- 5/31/09	1.0399	$152	$279	$342	$494	$557	$671
6/01/07-5/31/08	1.0516	$146	$268	$329	$475	$536	$645
6/01/06-5/31/07	1.0256	$139	$255	$313	$452	$509	$614
6/1/05-5/31/06	1.0427	$136	$249	$305	$441	$497	$598
6/1/04-5/31/05	1.0455	$130	$239	$293	$423	$476	$574
6/1/03-6/1/04	1.0507	$124	$228	$280	$405	$456	$549
6/1/02-5/31/03	1.0727	$118	$217	$267	$385	$434	$522
6/1/01-5/31/02	1.0407	$110	$203	$249	$359	$404	$487
6/1/00-5/31/01	1.0529	$106	$195	$239	$345	$388	$468
6/1/99-5/31/00	1.0491	$101	$185	$227	$328	$369	$444
6/1/98-5/31/99	1.0439	$96	$176	$216	$312	$352	$424
6/1/97-5/31/98	1.0419	$92	$169	$207	$299	$337	$406

6/1/96-5/31/97	1.0396	$88	$162	$198	$287	$323	$389
6/1/95-5/31/96	1.032	$85	$155	$191	$276	$311	$375
6/1/94-5/31/95	1.0237	$82	$151	$185	$267	$301	$363

The methodology of calculation and benchmarking for this Updated Laffey Matrix has been approved in a number of cases. See, e.g.,DL v. District of Columbia, 267 F.Supp.3d 55, 69 (D.D.C. 2017)

* ï¿½Years Out of Law Schoolï¿½ is calculated from June 1 of each year, when most law students graduate. ï¿½1-3" includes an attorney in his 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of practice, measured from date of graduation (June 1). ï¿½4-7" applies to attorneys in their 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th years of practice. An attorney who graduated in May 1996 would be in tier ï¿½1-3" from June 1, 1996 until May 31, 1999, would move into tier ï¿½4-7" on June 1, 1999, and tier ï¿½8-10" on June 1, 2003.

** The Adjustment Factor refers to the nation-wide Legal Services Component of the Consumer Price Index produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

“Exhibit 3”

Salary Table 2026-DCB
Incorporating the 1% General Schedule Increase and a Locality Payment of 33.94%
For the Locality Pay Area of Washington-Baltimore-Arlington, DC-MD-VA-WV-PA
Total Increase: 1%
Effective January 2026

Annual Rates by Grade and Step

Grade	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10
1	$ 30,249	$ 31,263	$ 32,269	$ 33,271	$ 34,274	$ 34,862	$ 35,857	$ 36,859	$ 36,900	$ 37,835
2	34,011	34,820	35,948	36,900	37,313	38,410	39,507	40,604	41,701	42,798
3	37,112	38,350	39,587	40,825	42,063	43,300	44,538	45,775	47,013	48,251
4	41,659	43,048	44,437	45,826	47,215	48,604	49,993	51,382	52,771	54,160
5	46,610	48,163	49,717	51,271	52,825	54,378	55,932	57,486	59,039	60,593
6	51,957	53,689	55,420	57,152	58,884	60,616	62,348	64,080	65,811	67,543
7	57,736	59,661	61,586	63,510	65,435	67,360	69,284	71,209	73,134	75,059
8	63,940	66,071	68,202	70,333	72,464	74,595	76,726	78,857	80,988	83,119
9	70,623	72,977	75,332	77,687	80,041	82,396	84,751	87,105	89,460	91,815
10	77,771	80,363	82,954	85,546	88,138	90,730	93,321	95,913	98,505	101,097
11	85,447	88,296	91,145	93,994	96,843	99,692	102,540	105,389	108,238	111,087
12	102,415	105,829	109,243	112,657	116,071	119,485	122,899	126,313	129,728	133,142
13	121,785	125,845	129,904	133,964	138,024	142,084	146,143	150,203	154,263	158,322
14	143,913	148,711	153,509	158,306	163,104	167,902	172,700	177,497	182,295	187,093
15	169,279	174,922	180,565	186,207	191,850	197,200 *	197,200 *	197,200 *	197,200 *	197,200 *

* Rate limited to the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5304 (g)(1)).

Applicable locations are shown on the 2026 Locality Pay Area Definitions page:
https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/2026/locality-pay-area-definitions/

“Exhibit 4”

Salary Table 2026-LA
Incorporating the 1% General Schedule Increase and a Locality Payment of 36.47%
For the Locality Pay Area of Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA
Total Increase: 1%
Effective January 2026

Annual Rates by Grade and Step

Grade	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10
1	$ 30,820	$ 31,853	$ 32,878	$ 33,899	$ 34,921	$ 35,520	$ 36,534	$ 37,555	$ 37,597	$ 38,550
2	34,654	35,478	36,627	37,597	38,018	39,136	40,253	41,371	42,489	43,606
3	37,813	39,074	40,335	41,596	42,857	44,118	45,379	46,640	47,901	49,162
4	42,446	43,861	45,277	46,692	48,107	49,522	50,937	52,353	53,768	55,183
5	47,490	49,073	50,656	52,239	53,822	55,405	56,989	58,572	60,155	61,738
6	52,938	54,703	56,467	58,232	59,996	61,761	63,525	65,290	67,055	68,819
7	58,827	60,788	62,749	64,710	66,671	68,632	70,593	72,554	74,515	76,476
8	65,148	67,319	69,491	71,662	73,833	76,004	78,175	80,347	82,518	84,689
9	71,957	74,356	76,755	79,154	81,553	83,952	86,351	88,751	91,150	93,549
10	79,240	81,881	84,521	87,162	89,803	92,443	95,084	97,725	100,365	103,006
11	87,061	89,964	92,866	95,769	98,672	101,575	104,477	107,380	110,283	113,185
12	104,349	107,828	111,306	114,785	118,264	121,742	125,221	128,699	132,178	135,657
13	124,085	128,222	132,358	136,495	140,631	144,767	148,904	153,040	157,177	161,313
14	146,632	151,520	156,408	161,297	166,185	171,073	175,962	180,850	185,738	190,627
15	172,476	178,226	183,975	189,725	195,474	197,200 *	197,200 *	197,200 *	197,200 *	197,200 *

* Rate limited to the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5304 (g)(1)).

Applicable locations are shown on the 2026 Locality Pay Area Definitions page:
https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/2026/locality-pay-area-definitions/

“Exhibit 5”

JUDICIARY SALARY PLAN
Washington-Baltimore-Arlington, DC-MD-VA-WV-PA - Table DCB
33.94% Locality Payment Included
Effective January 12, 2026

Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	$30,249	$31,263	$32,269	$33,271	$34,274	$34,862	$35,857	$36,859	$36,900	$37,835
2	$34,011	$34,820	$35,948	$36,900	$37,313	$38,410	$39,507	$40,604	$41,701	$42,798
3	$37,112	$38,350	$39,587	$40,825	$42,063	$43,300	$44,538	$45,775	$47,013	$48,251
4	$41,659	$43,048	$44,437	$45,826	$47,215	$48,604	$49,993	$51,382	$52,771	$54,160
5	$46,610	$48,163	$49,717	$51,271	$52,825	$54,378	$55,932	$57,486	$59,039	$60,593
6	$51,957	$53,689	$55,420	$57,152	$58,884	$60,616	$62,348	$64,080	$65,811	$67,543
7	$57,736	$59,661	$61,586	$63,510	$65,435	$67,360	$69,284	$71,209	$73,134	$75,059
8	$63,940	$66,071	$68,202	$70,333	$72,464	$74,595	$76,726	$78,857	$80,988	$83,119
9	$70,623	$72,977	$75,332	$77,687	$80,041	$82,396	$84,751	$87,105	$89,460	$91,815
10	$77,771	$80,363	$82,954	$85,546	$88,138	$90,730	$93,321	$95,913	$98,505	$101,097
11	$85,447	$88,296	$91,145	$93,994	$96,843	$99,692	$102,540	$105,389	$108,238	$111,087
12	$102,415	$105,829	$109,243	$112,657	$116,071	$119,485	$122,899	$126,313	$129,728	$133,142
13	$121,785	$125,845	$129,904	$133,964	$138,024	$142,084	$146,143	$150,203	$154,263	$158,322
14	$143,913	$148,711	$153,509	$158,306	$163,104	$167,902	$172,700	$177,497	$182,295	$187,093
15	$169,279	$174,922	$180,565	$186,207	$191,850	$197,200 **	$197,200 **	$197,200 **	$197,200 **	$197,200 **
16	$198,534	$205,152	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *
17	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *
18	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *

* Rate limited to the rate for Level III of the Executive Schedule.

** Rate limited to the rate for Level IV of the Executive Schedule.

“Exhibit 6”

JUDICIARY SALARY PLAN
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA - Table LA
36.47% Locality Payment Included
Effective January 12, 2026

Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	$30,820	$31,853	$32,878	$33,899	$34,921	$35,520	$36,534	$37,555	$37,597	$38,550
2	$34,654	$35,478	$36,627	$37,597	$38,018	$39,136	$40,253	$41,371	$42,489	$43,606
3	$37,813	$39,074	$40,335	$41,596	$42,857	$44,118	$45,379	$46,640	$47,901	$49,162
4	$42,446	$43,861	$45,277	$46,692	$48,107	$49,522	$50,937	$52,353	$53,768	$55,183
5	$47,490	$49,073	$50,656	$52,239	$53,822	$55,405	$56,989	$58,572	$60,155	$61,738
6	$52,938	$54,703	$56,467	$58,232	$59,996	$61,761	$63,525	$65,290	$67,055	$68,819
7	$58,827	$60,788	$62,749	$64,710	$66,671	$68,632	$70,593	$72,554	$74,515	$76,476
8	$65,148	$67,319	$69,491	$71,662	$73,833	$76,004	$78,175	$80,347	$82,518	$84,689
9	$71,957	$74,356	$76,755	$79,154	$81,553	$83,952	$86,351	$88,751	$91,150	$93,549
10	$79,240	$81,881	$84,521	$87,162	$89,803	$92,443	$95,084	$97,725	$100,365	$103,006
11	$87,061	$89,964	$92,866	$95,769	$98,672	$101,575	$104,477	$107,380	$110,283	$113,185
12	$104,349	$107,828	$111,306	$114,785	$118,264	$121,742	$125,221	$128,699	$132,178	$135,657
13	$124,085	$128,222	$132,358	$136,495	$140,631	$144,767	$148,904	$153,040	$157,177	$161,313
14	$146,632	$151,520	$156,408	$161,297	$166,185	$171,073	$175,962	$180,850	$185,738	$190,627
15	$172,476	$178,226	$183,975	$189,725	$195,474	$197,200 **	$197,200 **	$197,200 **	$197,200 **	$197,200 **
16	$202,284	$209,027	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *
17	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *
18	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *	$209,600 *

* Rate limited to the rate for Level III of the Executive Schedule.
** Rate limited to the rate for Level IV of the Executive Schedule.

“Exhibit 7”

Laredo, TX

Texas

Place Name	FIPS
Jim Hogg County, TX	48247
La Salle County, TX	48283
Webb County, TX	48479

Las Vegas-Henderson, NV-AZ

Nevada

Place Name	FIPS
Clark County, NV	32003
Nye County, NV	32023

Arizona

Place Name	FIPS
Mohave County, AZ	04015

Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA

California

Place Name	FIPS
Imperial County, CA	06025
Kern County, CA	06029
Los Angeles County, CA	06037
Orange County, CA	06059
Riverside County, CA	06065
San Bernardino County, CA	06071
San Luis Obispo County, CA	06079
Santa Barbara County, CA	06083
Ventura County, CA	06111