

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lisa B. Iturriaga (SBN 339678)
lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff John Margaritis, Jr.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

JOHN MARGARITIS, JR., individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AAA OIL, INC. DBA CALIFORNIA FUELS
AND LUBRICANTS, a California corporation;
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2024-01383304-CU-OE-CXC
(lead); 30-2024-01416794-CU-OE-CXC

Assigned for all purposes to:
Hon. David A. Hoffer
Dept. CX103

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

Date: June 1, 2026
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Dept: CX103

1 **TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on June 1, 2026 at 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the
3 matter may be heard in Department CX103 of the above-entitled Court located at 751 W. Santa
4 Ana Boulevard, Santa Ana, CA 92701, Plaintiff John Margaritis, Jr. ("Plaintiff") will and hereby
5 does move this Court for an Order:

- 6 1. Granting final approval of the proposed Class Action and PAGA Settlement
7 Agreement;
- 8 2. Awarding Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the amount of \$176,666.66 and
9 reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of \$22,592.73;
- 10 3. Awarding Plaintiff's Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of
11 \$7,500.00;
- 12 4. Awarding \$7,250.00 to Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions
13 ("Phoenix") for its settlement administration expenses; and
- 14 5. Approving allocation of \$50,000.00 as civil penalties under the Private Attorneys'
15 General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), 75% of which (\$37,500.00) will be paid to the
16 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and 25% of which
17 (\$12,500.00) will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees based on the number of
18 pay periods worked during the PAGA Period.

19 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion, Memorandum of Points and Authorities,
20 the Declaration of John G. Yslas, the Declaration of Mayra Gonzalez, the Declaration of John
21 Margaritis, Jr., and on all records and documents on file, together with such oral and documentary
22 evidence that may be presented at the hearing on this matter.

23 Dated: May 7, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

24
25 By: Lisa B. Iturriaga
26 Lisa B. Iturriaga
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	5
II. THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL.....	6
A. A Presumption of Fairness Exists.....	6
B. The Strength of Plaintiff’s Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial.....	7
C. The Amount Offered in Settlement.....	8
D. The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings.....	8
E. The Experience and Views of Counsel.....	9
F. The Presence of a Government Participant.....	9
G. The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement.....	9
III. THE REQUESTED FEE AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED...	10
A. The Requested Fee Award is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Percentage-of- Recovery Method.....	10
B. A Lodestar Cross-Check Confirms the Reasonableness of the Requested Fee.....	11
C. Class Counsel’s Rates Are Similar to Those Approved by California Courts in Comparable Cases.....	13
IV. THE REQUESTED COST AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED	13
V. THE REQUESTED ENHANCEMENT AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	16
VI. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	17
VII. CONCLUSION.....	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> , 85 Cal.App.4th 1135 (2000)	7
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> , 162 Cal. App. 4th 60 (2008)	11
<i>Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC</i> , 175 Cal.App.4th 785 (2009)	16
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 48 Cal.App.4th 1794 (1996)	6
<i>Golba v. Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.</i> , 238 Cal.App.4th 1251 (2015)	16
<i>Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.</i> , 4 Cal.5th 260 (2018).....	7, 11
<i>Ketchum v. Moses</i> , 24 Cal.4th 1122 (2001)	11
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l</i> , 231 Cal. App. 4th 860 (2004).....	12
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.</i> , 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016)	10, 11
<i>Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc.</i> , 82 Cal.App.4th 19 (2000)	9
<i>Melnyk v. Robledo</i> , 64 Cal.App.3d 618 (1976)	11
<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i> , 186 Cal.App.4th 399 (2010).....	8
<i>PLCM Group, Inc. v. Drexler</i> , 22 Cal.4th 1084 (2000).....	11
<i>Roos v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.</i> , 241 Cal.App.4th 1472 (2015)	10
<i>Serrano v. Priest</i> , 20 Cal. 3d 25 (1977)	11
<i>Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.</i> , No. 08–CV–821–IEG, 2010 WL 2196104 (S.D. Cal. 2010)	11
<i>Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases</i> , 171 Cal. App. 4th 495 (2009)	11, 13
<i>Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 290 F.3d 1043 (9 th Cir. 2002).....	12
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> 91 Cal.App.4th 224 (2001)	7, 11
<i>Wren v. RGIS Inventory Specialists</i> , No. C–06–05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011).....	11

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Plaintiff John Margaritis, Jr. (“Plaintiff”) seeks final approval of a non-reversionary
3 Gross Settlement Amount of \$530,000.00. The Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement
4 (“Settlement”) provides that the deductions will be made from the Gross Settlement Amount:

- 5 1. Attorneys’ fees in the amount of up to \$176,666.66;
6 2. Litigation costs in the amount of up to \$25,000.00¹;
7 3. Class Representative Service Payment of up to \$7,500.00 to Plaintiff;
8 4. Settlement administration expenses of up to \$7,250.00; and
9 5. Civil penalties in the amount of \$50,000.00 for claims under the Private
10 Attorneys’ General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), 75% of which (\$37,500.00) will be paid to the
11 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA), and 25% of which
12 (\$12,500.00) will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees based on the number of pay periods
13 worked during the PAGA Period. *See* Settlement §§ 1.37, 3.2.5.1; *see also* Declaration of Mayra
14 Gonzalez (“Gonzalez Decl.”), at ¶¶ 13, 15.

15 After all deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount will be distributed to 146
16 Class Members as of the filing of this Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA
17 Settlement (the “Motion”) (“Participating Class Members” or “Settlement Class Member”)
18 based on the number of weeks worked during the Class Period. Gonzalez Decl. at ¶¶ 11-14.

19 The proposed Settlement is a product of diligent efforts, litigation, arm’s length
20 negotiations, and informal discovery that resulted in the best possible outcome for the Class. By
21 resolving this matter now, Class Members will receive a guaranteed recovery without risk of
22 nonpayment, delay, or an adverse judgment at trial.

23 There are no objections to the Settlement and no requests for exclusion. *Id.* at ¶¶ 8, 9.
24 The Participating Class Members will receive an average settlement payment of \$1,821.85, with
25 the highest payout reaching \$3,981.35. Gonzalez Decl. at ¶ 14. Aggrieved Employees will

26 _____
27 ¹ In litigation costs, WLF has spent \$22,292.73 on items such as filing fees, service fees, mediation fees, and
28 expert fees. *See* Declaration of John G. Yslas in Support of Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and
 PAGA Settlement (“Yslas MFA Decl.”) at ¶ 22. Additionally, we anticipate incurring \$300.00 in anticipated
 future costs for filing fees and service fees (such as, filing the Final Approval moving papers, supplemental
 Final Approval papers (if any), and final distribution declaration(s)) for a total of **\$22,592.73** in costs. *Id.*

1 receive an average settlement payment of \$128.87, with the highest payout reaching \$178.51.
2 *Id.* at ¶ 15. Plaintiff’s estimated Individual Class Payment and Individual PAGA Payment total
3 is \$392.32. *Id.* at ¶¶ 14, 15. In light of the Class’s favorable response, and the facts and law set
4 forth below as well as in the motion for preliminary approval, Plaintiff respectfully requests that
5 the Court now enter an Order: (1) granting final approval of the Settlement; (2) entering final
6 judgment; (3) requiring distribution of individual settlement shares to Participating Class
7 Members; and (4) approving payments for attorneys’ fees, litigation costs, the Class
8 Representative Service Payment, Settlement Administration Expenses, and civil penalties under
9 PAGA.

10 **II. THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL**

11 In deciding whether to grant final approval of a class action settlement, California courts
12 consider whether the settlement is “fair, adequate, and reasonable.” *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*,
13 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996). In evaluating whether a settlement is fair, adequate, and
14 reasonable, courts evaluate the following factors: (1) the strength of the plaintiff’s case; (2) the
15 risk, expense, complexity and duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class
16 action status through trial; (4) the amount offered in settlement; (5) the extent of discovery
17 completed and the stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7) the
18 presence of a governmental participant; and (8) the reaction of class members to the proposed
19 settlement. *Id.*

20 **A. A Presumption of Fairness Exists**

21 While the burden is on the proponent to demonstrate that a proposed settlement is fair,
22 adequate, and reasonable, “a presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached
23 through arm’s length bargaining; (2) investigation is sufficient to allow counsel and the court
24 to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of
25 objectors is small.” *Id.* at 1802.

26 At preliminary approval, Plaintiff presented evidence that this Settlement is entitled to a
27 presumption of fairness because: (1) it was reached through arm’s length bargaining with the
28 assistance of an experienced mediator; (2) Plaintiff conducted a thorough investigation through

informal discovery and an analysis of Class Members’ time and payroll records; and (3) Plaintiff’s Counsel is experienced in similar litigation. *See* Declaration of John G. Yslas in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Yslas MPA Decl.”) filed June 16, 2025 at ¶¶ 6-29; *see generally* Declaration of Lisa B. Iturriaga in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Iturriaga Decl.”) filed December 23, 2026. No Class Members have opted out and none have objected. *See* Gonzalez Decl. at ¶¶ 8, 9. Therefore, the Court can confidently conclude that a presumption of fairness exists.

B. The Strength of Plaintiff’s Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial

Courts are not required to ensure that a settlement maximizes the value of released claims with mathematical precision. “[T]he test is not the maximum amount plaintiffs might have obtained at trial on the complaint, but rather whether the settlement is reasonable under all of the circumstances.” *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 250 (2001), disapproved of on other grounds by *Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.*, 4 Cal.5th 260, 269-270 (2018); *see also 7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.*, 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1150 (2000) (“the merits of the underlying class claims are not a basis for upsetting the settlement of a class action; the operative word is ‘settlement.’”). The relevant circumstances include the strengths and weaknesses of plaintiffs’ claims and the risks they faced in litigation. *7-Eleven*, 85 Cal.App.4th at 1146.

Here, Plaintiff presented sufficient information at preliminary approval regarding the number of class members and an estimate of the maximum value of each of the claims alleged. *See* Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶¶ 9-18. Plaintiff has also described in detail the risks the Class faced in litigation and the strengths and weaknesses of each of the claims. *See id.* Plaintiff noted potential difficulties in obtaining class certification and succeeding on the merits at trial. *See id.* The factual record here is sufficiently developed to allow the Court to independently satisfy itself “that the consideration being received for the release of the class members’ claims is reasonable in light of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and the risks of the particular

litigation.” *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles*, 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 410 (2010).

C. The Amount Offered in Settlement

The Settlement provides a \$530,000.00 Gross Settlement Amount (“GSA”) to be distributed among the 146 Class Members who did not opt out as of the date of this filing. Gonzalez Decl. at ¶¶ 11, 13. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees and costs, Plaintiff’s service payment, and Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions (“Phoenix”) for its administration of the Class Notice and settlement funds. *Id.* at ¶ 13. The Settlement also allocates \$50,000.00 from the Gross Settlement Amount to civil penalties under PAGA. *See* Settlement at §§ 1.37, 3.2.5; *see also* Gonzalez Decl. ¶¶ 13, 15. After all deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount will be \$265,990.61, which will be distributed to Participating Class Members according to the number of weeks they worked for Defendant during the Class Period. *See* Settlement at § 3.2.4; *see also* Gonzalez Decl. ¶¶ 13, 14.

The Settlement Administrator has calculated a total of 16,731 workweeks in the Class Period. Gonzalez Decl. at ¶ 11. As a result, the average recovery for Participating Class Members is \$1,821.85, and the highest payout is \$3,981.35. *Id.* at ¶ 14. Weighing the potential value of the class claims against the risk and expense of trial, the Settlement provides sufficient relief in light of the potential risks associated with seeking a class judgment.

D. The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings

Class Counsel sufficiently investigated the alleged claims, applicable law, and potential defenses. *See* Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶¶ 9-18. Specifically, Class Counsel assessed the value of the claims using data and documents provided by Defendant in informal discovery, which included policy documents and timekeeping and payroll records. *See id.* Following a complete analysis of this information, the Parties attended mediation on October 18, 2024 with an experienced mediator. *Id.* at ¶ 6. The Parties were able to reach an agreement and spent the next several months negotiating the terms of the Settlement. *Id.* at ¶¶ 6-8.

///

1 **E. The Experience and Views of Counsel**

2 Plaintiff is represented by Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. Yslas MFA Decl., ¶ 3. Class Counsel
3 prosecute wage and hour cases, including class and representative actions. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4, 5. Class
4 Counsel has litigated many wage and hour cases and have successfully resolved cases involving
5 similar issues presented in this matter. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4-18. Class Counsel has negotiated a settlement
6 here that they believe is fair, reasonable, and adequate based on their prior experience litigating
7 these types of cases. *Id.* at ¶ 25.

8 **F. The Presence of a Government Participant**

9 The LWDA has received the required notice of this Settlement. On May 29, 2024,
10 Plaintiff provided notice to the LWDA of his intention to file a PAGA claim. Yslas MPA Decl.
11 at ¶ 4. The Settlement provides for the payment of \$50,000.00 in civil penalties, 75% of which
12 (\$37,500.00) will be paid to the LWDA, and 25% of which (\$12,500.00) will be paid to
13 Aggrieved Employees based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period.
14 *See* Gonzalez Decl. at ¶¶ 13, 15; *see also* Settlement at §§ 1.34, 3.2.5.1. Plaintiff submitted a
15 copy of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Amendment to the Class Action
16 and PAGA Settlement Agreement to the LWDA. Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 8, Exhibit 2; Yslas MFA
17 Decl. at ¶ 28, Exhibit 5. The LWDA has not responded to or objected to the Settlement. Yslas
18 MFA Decl. at ¶ 26.

19 **G. The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement**

20 Class Members' reaction to the Settlement has been favorable. A court may properly
21 infer that a class action settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate when few class members
22 object to or opt out of it. *Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc.*, 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 51 (2000).

23 When the Court granted preliminary approval, it also approved the method of providing
24 notice to Class Members. Following a search of the National Change of Address database,
25 Phoenix mailed the Class Notice to all Class Members on February 4, 2026. Gonzalez Decl. at
26 ¶¶ 4, 5. The Class Notice informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, the amount
27 of their individual settlements and how those amounts were calculated, their right to either
28 participate in the Settlement, opt out of it, object to it, or dispute the amount of their individual

1 settlement payment, the procedures and deadlines to submit an opt out, objection, or dispute,
2 and the date, time, and place of the hearing on Plaintiff’s Motion for Final Approval and
3 instructions to be heard at the hearing. *Id.* at ¶¶ 5, Exhibit A. Here, in response to the Class
4 Notice, no Class Member opted out, and none objected as of the date of the filing of this Motion.
5 *Id.* at ¶¶ 8, 9. Class Members’ favorable response to the Settlement further supports final
6 approval.

7 **III. THE REQUESTED FEE AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE**
8 **APPROVED**

9 There are two primary methods of determining a reasonable attorney fee in the context
10 of class action litigation. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 489 (2016). The
11 percentage-of-recovery method calculates the fee as a percentage of a common fund recovered
12 on behalf of the class. *Id.* The lodestar method calculates the fee by multiplying the number of
13 hours reasonably expended by counsel by a reasonable hourly rate, which amount then may be
14 adjusted based on other factors. *Id.* In *Laffitte*, the California Supreme Court held that trial
15 courts have the discretion to choose between the two calculation methods. *Id.* at 504. Trial courts
16 also have the discretion to blend the two fee calculation methods, using one method to “cross-
17 check” the reasonableness of the other’s result, but a cross-check is not required. *Id.* 506.

18 **A. The Requested Fee Award is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Percentage-**
19 **of-Recovery Method**

20 The ultimate purpose of the percentage-of-recovery method is to “spread the attorney fee
21 among all the beneficiaries of the fund.” *Id.* at 503. The California Supreme Court recognized
22 that the percentage-of-recovery method has many advantages, “including relative ease of
23 calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better approximation of
24 market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement is provides counsel to seek an
25 early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging the litigation [citation] . . .” *Id.*

26 The requested fee award (one-third (1/3) of the GSA) is consistent with the average fee
27 award in class actions. *See, e.g., Roos v. Honeywell Int’l, Inc.*, 241 Cal.App.4th 1472 (2015)
28 (fee award of 37.5% was not an abuse of discretion), disapproved of on other grounds by

1 *Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.*, 4 Cal.5th 260, 287 (2018); *Wren v. RGIS Inventory*
2 *Specialists*, No. C-06-05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826, at *29 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011)
3 (approving fee award of 42%); *Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.*, No. 08-CV-821-IEG, 2010
4 WL 2196104, at *8 (S.D. Cal. June 1, 2010) (approving fee award of one-third and noting that
5 the typical fees awarded in wage and hour class action cases ranges from 33.33% to 40%).
6 Therefore, the percentage-of-recovery method should be utilized to approve the requested fee.

7 **B. A Lodestar Cross-Check Confirms the Reasonableness of the Requested Fee**

8 Although *Laffitte* makes clear that a lodestar cross-check is not required, Class Counsel's
9 lodestar supports the reasonableness of the requested fee. The lodestar is determined by
10 multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by the reasonable hourly rate. *PLCM*
11 *Group, Inc. v. Drexler*, 22 Cal.4th 1084, 1095 (2000). The lodestar figure may then be adjusted,
12 based on consideration of factors specific to the case, in order to fix the fee at the fair market
13 value for the legal services provided." *Id.* The factors that can be considered include "the nature
14 of the litigation, its difficulty, the amount involved, the skill required in its handling, the skill
15 employed, the attention given, the success or failure, and other circumstances in the case."
16 *Melnyk v. Robledo*, 64 Cal.App.3d 618, 623-624 (1976) (citations omitted). Additionally, Courts
17 utilize "multipliers" to account for the risk of taking on cases where there is no guarantee of
18 recovery, uncertainties as to the amount that will be recovered, uncertainty as to the cost of
19 litigating the case (both in effort and expenses), and uncertainty about how much time will pass
20 before the recovery is obtained. *Ketchum v. Moses*, 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-33 (2001); *see also*
21 *Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal. 3d 25, 48-49 (1977) (approving the adjustment of the lodestar figure
22 based on factors specific to the case to ensure fair market value for legal services provided on
23 a contingency basis). Application of that rule is particularly appropriate where the case is
24 brought to redress important rights of vulnerable persons. *Ketchum*, 24 Cal.4th at 1133.

25 Generally, "[m]ultipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even higher." *Wershba v. Apple*
26 *Computers, Inc.*, 91 Cal.App.4th at p. 255 (2001); *see also Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing*
27 *Cases*, 171 Cal. App. 4th 495, 512 (2009) (applying a 2.52 multiplier on a cross-check in an
28 antitrust class action); *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal. App. 4th, 60 (2008) (applying a 2.5

multiplier on a lodestar cross-check); *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043, 1051 n.6 (9th Cir. 2002) (“most” common fund cases apply a multiplier of 1.0-4.0); *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l*, 231 Cal. App. 4th 860, 881-82 (2004) (affirming a 2.13 multiplier after finding that “2 to 4” is a reasonable range for multipliers on a cross-check). Here, the negative multiplier supports Class Counsel’s fee request of \$176,666.66. Yslas MFA Decl., ¶¶ 21, 22.

The total hours expended on this action by Class Counsel were reasonable and in line with comparable cases. While it is not necessary to substantiate the fee award with a lodestar in this Action, it should be noted that Class Counsel spent approximately 214.5 hours prosecuting this action, which were divided among the attorneys working on this case according to skill level. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶¶ 20-22, 27, Exhibit 4. Multiplying the total hours expended by Class Counsel by their reasonable hourly rates yields a lodestar of \$204,785.00. *Id.* at ¶ 21. This amount surpasses the requested \$176,666.66, resulting in a negative multiplier. *Id.* at ¶ 22. This amount does not include the time Class Counsel will spend at the final approval hearing and assisting the Settlement Administrator following final approval. *Id.* WLF dedicated significant resources to this case by dividing the tasks required according to skill level. *Id.* The hours expended by each attorney were not duplicative and reflect the extensive investigation and analysis that was required to achieve this Settlement. *Id.* This time could have been spent on other potentially lucrative cases. *Id.* Moreover, Class Counsel has singularly assumed the risk and costs of litigation purely on a contingency basis. *Id.* And, while Plaintiff is confident in the merits of his claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each cause of action posing an actual risk that Plaintiff may not succeed at class certification and/or trial. *Id.* Any of these obstacles could have prevented recovery completely, meaning Class Counsel would have been left with no compensation for all the time and money invested in litigating this case. *Id.* Despite these risks, Class Counsel took this case on a contingency basis so that Class Members (a particularly vulnerable group of hourly paid workers) could be compensated for their unpaid wages. *Id.* Consequently, Class Counsel was precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases which could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain. *Id.*

///

1 **C. Class Counsel’s Rates Are Similar to Those Approved by California Courts in**
2 **Comparable Cases.**

3 Class Counsel’s hourly rates are comparable to those charged by other class action
4 plaintiffs’ counsel and the firms defending class actions. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶ 16. Class Counsel’s
5 rates are well within the range of hourly rates that the Los Angeles legal marketplace would
6 compensate counsel for similar services accomplishing similar results. *Id.* For
7 example, in *Bronshteyn v. State of California*, Los Angeles County Superior Ct. No.
8 19SMCV00057, Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Statutory Attorneys’ Fees and Costs filed
9 March 30, 2023, an employment action brought by two small law firms (Levy, Vinick, Burrell &
10 Hyams LLP and Law Offices of Wendy Musell), the court found that counsel’s 2022 hourly rates
11 of \$1,100 and \$1,000 per hour were reasonable for the plaintiff’s five senior attorneys, including
12 \$1,000 per hour for the plaintiff’s 23-year lead counsel and \$850 per hour for a senior associate.
13 *Id.* These rates were then augmented by a 1.75 lodestar multiplier and affirmed by the California
14 Court of Appeals. *Id.* The rates (and multiplier) requested here are well in line with those found
15 reasonable in *Bronshteyn*. In *Tran v. Golden State FC LLC, et al.* (LASC Case No. BC699931),
16 Fee Order filed 4/8/2022, the court found hourly rates of \$1,300 per hour reasonable for plaintiff’s
17 32-year attorney and \$1,000 per hour reasonable for a 14-year attorney. *Id.* The multiplier
18 requested here is even more compelling given PAGA counsel represents approximately 220 PAGA
19 Members. *Id.*

20 WLF has also been approved as Class Counsel by courts in California. Yslas MFA Decl. at
21 ¶ 17. *See, e.g., Matthew Veliz v. DrinkPak, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
22 22STCV37384, *Ismael Villegas-Sanchez v. COE Orchard Equipment, Inc.*, Sutter County Superior
23 Court, Case No. CVCS22-0002261; *Jessica Bronsal v. PTI Technologies Inc.*, Ventura County
24 Superior Court, Case No. 202200570361CUOE; *Miguel A. Vigil Ruiz v. The De Ruosi Group, LLC*,
25 San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2022-8780; *Gutierrez v. Top Drawer*
26 *Merch, LLC et al*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV04299; *Wing v. Road*
27 *Machinery, LLC et al*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-22-102896; *Hernandez v.*
28 *SGPS Showrig Los Angeles, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV28155;

1 *Azevedo v. Tulare Nursing & Rehabilitation Hospital, Inc.*, Tulare County Superior Court, Case
2 No. VCU293325; *Haser v. Universal Chain of California, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior
3 Court, Case No. 34-2022-00332268; *Caldera v. Performance Online, Inc. et al*, Riverside County
4 Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2306013; *Goosby v. CiminoCare, Inc.*, Sacramento County
5 Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00329033; *Rooks v. Hot Cakes Restaurant Group, Inc.*, San
6 Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2022-11056; *Garcia v. Compassionate*
7 *Heart*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2022-01294409-CU-OE-CXC; *Parra v. Citrus*
8 *Valley Management Services, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2301768;
9 *Torres v. HomeShield Pest Control Inc.*, Placer County Superior Court, Case No. S-CV-0049525;
10 *Cabrera v. Creekside Auto Group*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV415661;
11 *Simpson v. Arcos*, Riverside Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2303337; *Payne v. Planned*
12 *Parenthood: Shasta-Diablo, Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-
13 607359. *Id.* The total hours expended on this action are reasonable and in line with those expended
14 in comparable cases. *Id.*

15 In cases in which WLF has been approved as Class Counsel, California courts have
16 approved rates similar to those requested by Class Counsel in the instant case. Yslas MFA Decl.
17 at ¶ 18. *See, e.g., Rodolfo Ponce v. Youbar, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
18 22STCV37519 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha
19 A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga
20 (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Sabrina N. Batres v. Wish Automotive II, Inc. dba*
21 *Infiniti of Van Nuys*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV19968 (WLF's rates
22 were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Aram
23 Boyadjian (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Diandrea*
24 *Correa et al. v. CareMeridian, LLC, et. al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
25 23STCV10707 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha
26 A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Fawn F. Bekam (\$800.00), Diego Aviles
27 (\$800.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Harry Erganyan (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00),
28 and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Carlos Santos Granados v. Sunny Hills Management Co.*,

1 *Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV02109 (WLF's rates were approved
2 as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C.
3 Bils (\$850.00), Diego Aviles (\$750.00), Courtney M. Miller (\$650.00), Aram Boyadjian
4 (\$600.00), Harry Erganyan (\$600.00), Mariam Nazaretyan (\$550.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga
5 (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Kayla Kurges v. Khanna Enterprises, Ltd. dba*
6 *Sheraton Agoura Hills*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV01590 (WLF's
7 rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Aram
8 Boyadjian (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Thora*
9 *Magney et al. v. Levi Strauss & Co., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
10 24STCV02320 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha
11 A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Fawn F. Bekam (\$800.00), Aram Boyadjian
12 (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Armando Muniz, et*
13 *al. v. Lot LLC, dba Lot Management LLC (fka Red Cow, Inc.) et. al.*, Los Angeles County
14 Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV32901 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas
15 (\$1,500.00), Samantha A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Diego Aviles
16 (\$750.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Harry Erganyan (\$600.00), Mariam Nazaretyan
17 (\$550.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *George Munoz v.*
18 *Century West, LLC dba Century West BMW*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.
19 23STCV04247 (WLF's rates were approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha
20 A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C. Bils (\$850.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga
21 (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)); *Ivan S. Martinez II et. al. v. The Haar Company,*
22 *et. al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV21651 (WLF's rates were
23 approved as follows: John G. Yslas (\$1,500.00), Samantha A. Smith (\$1,000.00), Jeffrey C.
24 Bils (\$850.00), Diego Aviles (\$750.00), Aram Boyadjian (\$600.00), Harry Erganyan (\$600.00),
25 Mariam Nazaretyan (\$550.00), Lisa B. Iturriaga (\$550.00), and Andrew Sandoval (\$500.00)).
26 *Id.*

27 Likewise, Class Counsel's hourly rates are reasonable when compared to rates charged
28 within the relevant legal marketplace. Yslas MFA Decl. ¶ 19, Exhibit 1. In light of the foregoing,

1 and considered against the risks of continued litigation, and the importance of advocating for
2 employment rights and a speedy recovery, the relief provided under the Settlement represents a
3 very strong result for the Class. Class Counsel’s fee request is fair and reasonable and should
4 be approved. Accordingly, Class Counsel respectfully requests the Court approve their
5 \$176,666.66 fee request.

6 **IV. THE REQUESTED COST AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE**
7 **APPROVED**

8 The Settlement permits Class Counsel to seek reimbursement of litigation costs in an
9 amount up to \$25,000.00. The actual costs incurred are \$22,292.73 and we anticipate incurring
10 \$300.00 in anticipated future costs for a total of \$22,592.73 in costs. As such Class Counsel is
11 seeking reimbursement of \$22,592.73. *Id.* at ¶ 23, Exhibit 2. Since Class Counsel’s costs do not
12 exceed the maximum of \$25,000.00, the remaining \$2,407.27 will revert to the Net Settlement
13 Amount. *Id.* These costs were reasonable and necessary to prosecute this case and obtain the
14 results achieved. *Id.*

15 **V. THE REQUESTED SERVICE PAYMENT IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE**
16 **APPROVED**

17 Plaintiff also requests that he be awarded a service payment of \$7,500.00 for his role in
18 obtaining the Settlement. In evaluating a service payment, the Court may consider: “(1) the risk,
19 both financial and otherwise, the class representative faced in bringing the suit; (2) the notoriety
20 and personal difficulties encountered by the class representative; (3) the amount of time and
21 effort spent by the class representative; (4) the duration of the litigation; and (5) the personal
22 benefit received by the class representative as a result of the litigation.” *Golba v. Dick’s Sporting*
23 *Goods, Inc.*, 238 Cal.App.4th 1251, 1272 (2015); *Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC*,
24 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804 (2009).

25 Here, Plaintiff provided a declaration in support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary
26 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and a declaration in support of Plaintiff’s
27 Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement detailing the risks he faced
28 in bringing the suit, the notoriety and personal difficulties he encountered, the amount of time

1 and effort he spent on this litigation, the duration of this litigation, and the personal benefit he
2 will receive as a result of the litigation. *See generally* Declaration of John Margaritis, Jr. in
3 Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed on
4 June 16, 2025 and Declaration of Plaintiff John Margaritis, Jr. in Support of Motion for Final
5 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed concurrently herewith. Plaintiff should
6 be adequately compensated for his role in obtaining this Settlement.

7 Additionally, no Class Members objected to the amount of additional compensation
8 sought by Plaintiff. As such, the award is reasonable in light of the substantial benefits Plaintiff
9 conferred upon the settlement class.

10 **VI. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND**
11 **SHOULD BE APPROVED**

12 The Parties agreed to hire Phoenix as the Settlement Administrator in this case and the
13 Court approved this choice at preliminary approval. The Settlement Administrator was
14 responsible for updating Class Members' mailing addresses, mailing the Class Notice to each
15 Class Member, responding to Class Member questions, providing weekly status reports, and
16 providing a declaration as to the results of the mailing. *See* Gonzalez Decl., at ¶ 2. Following
17 final approval, Phoenix's duties will continue in order to calculate and to mail the settlement
18 payments to Class Members, disburse other payments as ordered by the Court, and perform such
19 other duties described in the Settlement. *Id.* The requested amount of \$7,250.00 for services
20 rendered and to be rendered is therefore fair and reasonable. Gonzalez Decl., at ¶ 17, Exhibit B.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **VII. CONCLUSION**

2 Based on the foregoing, Class Counsel respectfully requests that the Court grant final
3 approval of the Settlement and Amendment, approve Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the
4 amount of \$176,666.66 and reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of \$22,592.73, the
5 Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of \$7,500.00 to Plaintiff, civil penalties
6 under PAGA in the amount of \$50,000.00, and \$7,250.00 to Phoenix for its settlement
7 administration expenses.

8
9 Dated: May 7, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

10 By: Lisa Iturriaga
11 Lisa B. Iturriaga
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28