Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Peter J. Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 295611]
peter@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513
Riverside, CA 92504
Tel: (951) 320-1444 | Fax: (951) 320-1445

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, on behalf of all others similarly situated

[*Additional Counsel for Plaintiffs listed on Next Page*]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

JUSTIN BROWN, and SHAYNA AMSTER individually, on a representative basis, and on behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiffs,

vs.

JOSHUA'S PEST CONTROL, a California Limited Partnership; MOXIE PEST CONTROL, L.P., an Entity Unknown; MOXIE ADVISORS, LLC, a Utah Limited Liability Company; WALTON HOLDINGS GP, LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Company; MGFLEMING HOLDINGS, INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: CVRI2402875
[Assigned to Hon. Harold Hopp, Dept 1, for all purposes]

PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

Filed Concurrently with: (1) [Proposed] Order, and (2) Declarations In Support of this Motion

Hearing
Date: January 8, 2026
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Dept.: 1

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
doug@justicelawcorp.com
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
statavos@justicelawcorp.com
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 8, 2026, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard by the Honorable Harold Hopp in Department 1 of the Riverside County Superior Court, located at 4050 Main Street, Riverside, CA 92501, Plaintiffs Justin Brown and Shayna Amster, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, will and hereby do move the Court for entry of an Order preliminarily approving the Parties' Class Action and Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") settlement between Plaintiffs and Defendants Joshua's Pest Control, L.P., Moxie Pest Control, L.P., Moxie Advisors, LLC, Walton Holdings GP, LLC, and MGFleming Holdings, Inc. ("Defendants"), including:

1. Certifying the class for purposes of settlement only;
2. Preliminarily appointing Plaintiffs as the class representatives;
3. Appointing Plaintiffs' counsel as class counsel for purposes of settlement only;
4. Preliminarily approving the class action and PAGA settlement as fair, adequate, and reasonable, based upon the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement;
5. Directing distribution of the Notice Packet, including notice of the opportunity to exclude oneself from, or object to, the settlement;
6. Setting a date for a final fairness hearing to determine, following dissemination of the Notice Packet, whether to grant final approval of the Settlement.

This motion is based upon this Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support thereof; the Declaration of Plaintiffs' counsel (Brian Mankin and Peter Carlson of Lauby Mankin Lauby LLP, and Douglas Han of Justice Law Corporation); the Declaration of Plaintiffs Justin Brown and Shayna Amster; the Declaration of Defendants' counsel (Ellen Connelly); the Declaration of Defendants' Representative (Jessica Hamue); the Declaration of Michael Moore on behalf of the Settlement Administrator (Phoenix Settlement Administrators); the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Release of Claims (the "Settlement Agreement"); the proposed Order granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement; all other records, pleadings, and papers filed in this action; and upon such other evidence or argument as may be presented to the Court at the hearing of this motion.

Dated: December 15, 2025

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

BY:

Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1
II. BACKGROUND 2
A. THE CLASS 2
B. PROCEDURAL HISTORY 2
C. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CLAIMS AND DEFENSES 3
III. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT 4
A. SETTLEMENT CONSIDERATION AND ALLOCATION 4
B. NOTICE PROCEDURES 5
C. EXCLUSION AND OBJECTION PROCEDURES 6
D. SETTLEMENT ALLOCATION FORMULA FOR SETTLEMENT SHARES 6
E. TIMING OF SETTLEMENT DISBURSEMENTS 7
F. TAX TREATMENT 7
G. PARTICIPATING CLASS MEMBERS' RELEASE OF CLAIMS 8
H. AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' RELEASE OF CLAIMS 8
IV. PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE FOR PURPOSES OF SETTLEMENT 9
A. ASCERTAINABILITY AND NUMEROSITY 9
B. WELL-DEFINED COMMUNITY OF INTEREST 10
V. THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT, WHICH IS FAIR, ADEQUATE, AND REASONABLE 11
A. CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS ARE SUBJECT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL UNDER THE CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT 11
B. THE SETTLEMENT IS THE RESULT OF SERIOUS, INFORMED, NON-COLLUSIVE NEGOTIATIONS 12
C. THE EXTENT OF THE INVESTIGATION WAS MORE THAN SUFFICIENT TO PERMIT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT 12
D. THE SETTLEMENT IS A REASONABLE COMPROMISE OF CLAIMS 13
E. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL IS EXPERIENCED IN WAGE-AND-HOUR LITIGATION 14
F. THE CLASS NOTICE CONFORMS TO ALL APPLICABLE STATUTES AND RULES 15
G. THE NON-REVERSIONARY "CHECKS CASHED" DISTRIBUTION ENSURES MAXIMAL RECOVERY FOR CLASS MEMBERS 16
H. THE ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS ALLOCATION IS FAIR 16
I. THE REQUESTED SERVICE AWARD REQUEST IS FAIR AND APPROPRIATE 17
VI. THE COURT SHOULD APPOINT PHOENIX SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATORS AS THE ADMINISTRATOR 17
VII. TIMELINE AND SCHEDULING A FINAL APPROVAL HEARING 18
VIII. CONCLUSION 18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor (1997) 521 U.S. 591 9

Archibald v. Cinerama Hotels, (1976) 15 Cal.3d 853 15

Arenas v. El Torito Rests., Inc. (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 723 10

Barboza v. West Coast Digital GSM, Inc. (2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 540 11

Bond v. Ferguson Enterprises, Inc. (E.D. Cal. 2011) 2011 WL 2648879........ 17

Bush v. Superior Court (1992) 10 Cal.App.4th 1374 11

Dunk v. Ford Motor Co. (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794 .... 9, 12

Ellis v. Naval Air Rework Facility (N.D. Cal. 1980) 87 F.R.D. 15 15

Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs. (N.D. Cal. 2007) 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476 17

Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc. (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116........ 13, 15

Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l Inc. (2016) 1 Cal.5th. 480 16

Local Joint Exec. Bd. of Culinary/Bartender Trust Fund v. Las Vegas Sands, Inc. (9th Cir. 2001) 244 F.3d 1152 11

Medrazo v. Honda of N. Hollywood (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 89 10

Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com. (9th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 615 9

Reyes v. San Diego County Board of Supervisors (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 1263 10

Ross v. US Bank National Association (N.D. Cal. 2010) 2010 WL 3833922 17

Stuart v. RadioShack Corp. (N.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2010) 2010 WL 3155645........ 17

Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing, Inc. (E.D. Cal. 2010) 266 F.R.D. 4150........ 17

Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc. (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224........ 12, 13

West v. Circle K Stores, Inc. (E.D. Cal. 2006) 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76558........ 17

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs Justin Brown and Shayna Amster seek preliminary approval of a $500,000 class action settlement on behalf of approximately 400 current and former nonexempt (hourly paid) employees employed by Defendant Joshua's Pest Control, L.P., in California during the "Class Period" of May 24, 2020, through July 29, 2025.

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement,[1] Defendants Joshua's Pest Control, L.P., Moxie Pest Control, L.P., Moxie Advisors, LLC, Walton Holdings GP, LLC, and MGFleming Holdings, Inc. ("Defendants") will not oppose Plaintiffs' Counsel's application for a reasonable award of attorneys' fees not to exceed $166,666.67 (1/3 of the Settlement Amount), litigation expenses not to exceed $30,000, Settlement Administrator Costs of $10,000, PAGA penalties of $20,000 (75% to LWDA and 25% to Aggrieved Employees), and a Service Payment of $10,000 each to Plaintiffs Justin Brown and Shayna Amster ("Class Representatives"). (S.A. ¶ 50).

After all Court-approved deductions from the Settlement Amount, it is estimated that $253,333.33 will be available to pay the Class Members, as follows:

Settlement Amount	**$ 500,000.00**
Attorneys' Fees (1/3)	$ 166,666.67
Litigation Costs (not to exceed)	$ 30,000.00
Administrator Costs	$ 10,000.00
PAGA Penalties	$ 20,000.00
Class Representative Service Awards	$ 20,000.00
Net Settlement Amount	**$ 253,333.33**

Assuming 400 total Class Members, the average payment will be $633.33 ($253,333.33 / 400). However, the actual payments will be calculated on a pro-rata basis according to the number of Weeks Worked by each Class Member during the Class Period. (S.A. ¶ 50(c); Mankin Decl. ¶¶ 51 [description of high/low payments]). In addition, approximately 250 Aggrieved Employees will receive a share of the $5,000 PAGA Penalties (25% of the $20,000 allocation), calculated pro-rata based on Pay Periods Worked during the PAGA Period. (S.A. ¶ 54(h)).

[1] The Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Release of Claims (the "Settlement Agreement" or "S.A.") is attached as Exhibit A to the Decl. of Brian Mankin ("Mankin Decl.").

Because the settlement is fair, reasonable, and negotiated at arm's length by experienced counsel and an experienced mediator following a sufficient exchange of information and documents prior to mediation, it should be preliminarily approved. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter an order preliminarily approving the settlement, conditionally certifying the Class under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 for settlement purposes, approving the proposed Class Notice, appointing Plaintiffs' counsel as class counsel, appointing Phoenix Settlement Administrators as the Administrator, and scheduling a hearing for final approval.

II. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

A. <u>THE CLASS</u>

The Class is defined as follows: "All current and former nonexempt (hourly paid) employees employed by Defendant Joshua's Pest Control, L.P., in California during the Class Period. (S.A. ¶¶ 4, 8).

B. <u>PROCEDURAL HISTORY</u>

Plaintiff Brown submitted a letter to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), and simultaneously sent a letter to Defendants requesting the production of personnel and timekeeping records to further evaluate her wage and hour claims. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 13). On May 24, 2024, Plaintiff Brown filed this class action, alleging that Defendants violated various sections of the Labor Code. Then, on August 5, 2024, Plaintiff Brown filed a First Amended Complaint alleging putative class and representative PAGA claims. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 14; S.A. ¶ 41).

Separately, on May 6, 2024, Plaintiff Amster submitted an LWDA Notice letter, and then Plaintiff Amster filed a separate class action on July 17, 2024, against Defendant Joshua's Pest Control, L.P., in San Diego County Superior Court, entitled *Amster v. Joshua's Pest Control*, Case No. 24CU001671C, which generally alleged the same wage-and-hour violations as Plaintiff Brown's action. (S.A. ¶ 42).

Plaintiffs' counsel in Brown and Amster ultimately joined forces and entered into a Joint Prosecution Agreement. (S.A. ¶ 43).

Meanwhile, Defendants retained counsel and immediately began to defend the cases. Plaintiff Brown immediately commenced discovery under the Court's CMO by demanding the names and contact information of the putative class members pursuant to a Belaire Notice. Then, after early discussions among counsel, the Parties agreed to attend private mediation in an effort to avoid a contested class certification process. In preparation for mediation, the Parties informally exchanged documents and information that allowed both sides to calculate the potential damages and evaluate potential risk, including policies and procedures pertaining to the claims, statistics relating to the number of current and former employees, number of shifts, workweeks and pay periods worked and other things, and a sampling of payroll and timekeeping records for Class Members. This information enabled both parties to take a deep dive into the claims. Additionally, during this process, Plaintiffs and their counsel analyzed, researched, and investigated the potential issues, including matters related to the calculation of damages, trial, and appellate issues and risks. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 15).

On November 12, 2024, the Parties attended private mediation with Steve Serratore, but the matter did not settle. Over the course of the next several months, the Parties engaged in ongoing negotiations and analysis, and ultimately reached this Settlement. As part of the Settlement, the Parties agreed to consolidate Plaintiff Amster's action into Plaintiff Brown's action by stipulating to file a consolidated complaint to add Plaintiff Amster as a plaintiff and to add any claims in Plaintiff Amster's action that were not already included within Plaintiff Brown's action. After the Court granted the Parties' stipulation, Plaintiffs filed the operative second amended complaint on September 12, 2025. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 16).

C. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CLAIMS AND DEFENSES

Plaintiffs alleged numerous wage and hour violations on behalf of the Class. However, Defendants vigorously contested and denied each of Plaintiffs' material allegations on the merits and as to the propriety of a class action or PAGA representative action. Still, Plaintiffs believed there were several strong claims. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 17).

For instance, Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants paid the Class on an hourly basis plus additional earned compensation but failed to include this compensation in the regular rate calculations, leading to a failure to pay all required overtime, sick pay, and meal premiums. However, Defendants opposed this regular rate claim, arguing that the payments were properly excluded from the regular rate, and therefore these claims would lose on the merits and as to the propriety of class certification. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 18).

Plaintiffs also alleged that they and the Class Members were often denied compliant meal and rest breaks due to the nature of the work. However, Defendants argued that they provided and made all mandated meal and rest breaks available to the Class, and any employee who did not take a break did so entirely of their own volition. Thus, Defendants argued that these claims were without merit because, for each violation, a factfinder would have to determine why a break was noncompliant, because if it was by the employee's choice, no liability attaches to Defendants. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 19).

Finally, Plaintiffs alleged a variety of other claims (all of which Defendants disputed), such as the failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely pay wages each period and upon separation of employment and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 20).

Despite the disputed nature of the claims, the Parties concluded that further litigation of the Action would be protracted and expensive, and that it is desirable that the Action be fully and finally settled to limit further risk, expense, and protracted litigation. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 21).

III. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

The following is a summary of the principal terms of the Settlement Agreement.

A. SETTLEMENT CONSIDERATION AND ALLOCATION

The $500,000 Settlement Amount [2] is non-reversionary and will be paid out to Class Members without the need to submit a claim form or take any affirmative action. It includes (1) Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees and costs, as approved by the Court; (2) a service award of $10,000

[2] If the "Escalator Clause" is triggered, Defendants may elect to increase the Settlement Amount or shorten the Class Period. S.A. ¶¶ 14, 54(a). If Defendants elect to increase the Settlement Amount, other figures will also shift upward along with the Settlement Amount, such as attorneys' fees (but this is still constrained to 1/3 of the Settlement Amount) along with increased Administration Costs (*see* S.A. ¶ 54(g)).

each to Plaintiffs, subject to approval by the Court; (3) Administration Costs, not to exceed $10,000; (4) a $20,000 PAGA award, with 75% paid to the LWDA and 25% to the Aggrieved Employees; and (5) the aggregate of all Individual Class Payments to the Participating Class Members. (S.A. ¶ 50). Additionally, the Parties agreed to an Escalator Clause in the event that the Workweek information is more than 10% higher than Defendants' estimate. (S.A. ¶ 15). Defendants will also separately pay its share of employer payroll taxes. (S.A. ¶ 50).

B. NOTICE PROCEDURES

The Parties will provide notice of this settlement in strict compliance with Court's Class Action Case Management Order #1, issued on January 27, 2023 (the "CMO"). Thus, as required by CMO ¶ G(3)(k), the Parties will send each Class Member a Class Notice, a Request for Exclusion Form and an Objection Form. (S.A. ¶ 64), which are attached to the Mankin Decl. as Exhibits B, C and D, respectively.

The proposed Notice complies with CMO ¶ G(5) because it informs each Class Member of the estimated recovery, the number of Weeks Worked that each Class Member is credited with, and the applicable average payments, minimum, and high payments. The Notice Packet will be provided in English only because Defendants state "a Spanish translation is unnecessary because all Class Members can read and communicate in English." (S.A. ¶ 64).

Within 14 calendar days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Defendants shall provide the Settlement Administrator with the "Class Data" consisting of Class Member names, addresses, Social Security Numbers, and Weeks Worked during the Class Period and Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period. (S.A. ¶¶ 7, 62). Within 15 calendar days of receipt of the Class Data, the Settlement Administrator shall calculate the numbers for each Class Member, populate the Notice, and send each Class Member the Notice Packet via first-class, United States mail. (S.A. ¶ 64).

If a Notice is returned as undelivered by the U.S. Postal Service, the Settlement Administrator shall perform a skip trace and seek an address correction for the Class Member(s), and a second Notice will be sent to any new or different address obtained. (S.A. ¶ 65).

/ / /

C. EXCLUSION AND OBJECTION PROCEDURES

Class Members who do not timely Opt-Out of the Settlement will be deemed to participate in the Settlement and shall become a Participating Class Member without having to submit a claim form or take any other action. To Opt-Out of the Settlement, the Class Member must submit a written request to the Administrator no later than 45 days after being mailed by the Settlement Administrator ("Response Deadline"). (S.A. ¶ 34). Any Opt-Out request that is not postmarked by the Response Deadline will be invalid, unless a Notice was remailed in which case the Class Member's exclusion or objection must be returned by the later of the original Response Deadline or 15 calendar days after the remailing of the notice. (S.A. ¶¶ 69, 70).

The Class Notice shall inform Class Members of their right to object to the Settlement. Any Participating Class Member who wishes to object to the Settlement must complete the Objection Form in the Notice Packet. To be valid, any Objection Form must be mailed to the Settlement Administrator and postmarked on or before the Response Deadline. (S.A. ¶ 69(c)).

D. SETTLEMENT ALLOCATION FORMULA FOR SETTLEMENT SHARES

The amount of each Class Member's Individual Class Payment is tied to the number of Weeks Worked by each Class Member for Defendants in California during the Class Period. Therefore, Individual Class Payments will be calculated by: (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Weeks Worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period, and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Members' Weeks Worked. (S.A. ¶ 50(c)). Additionally, each "Aggrieved Employee" will receive an Individual PAGA Payment, calculated by dividing and distributing the $5,000 on a pro-rata Pay Periods Worked basis. (S.A. ¶ 50(h)).

The Class Notice will inform Class Members of the number of Weeks Worked during the Class Period, Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period, and the estimated Individual Class and PAGA Payments. Class Members may dispute their Weeks Worked by timely submitting evidence to the Settlement Administrator. (S.A. ¶ 69).

/ / /

/ / /

E. Timing of Settlement Disbursements

Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Defendants are required to fund the Settlement Amount, plus its share of payroll taxes owed on the Individual Class Payments, over the course of two equal payments, as follows: (a) by the later of December 1, 2026 or fifteen (15) calendar days after the Effective Date, , and (b) by the later of June 1, 2027 or fifteen (15) calendar days after the Effective Date. (S.A. ¶ 71). The payments are delayed to give Defendants sufficient time to gather the funds. Within 10 days after receiving each payment, the Settlement Administrator shall mail amounts equal to 50% of the Individual Class Payments to the Participating Class Members, Individual PAGA Payments to the Aggrieved Employees, payment to Class Counsel for the Attorneys' Fees and Costs Award, any Service Payments to the Class Representatives, payment to the LWDA for PAGA Penalties, and Settlement Administration Costs. (S.A. ¶ 72).

Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees shall have 180 calendar days after mailing by the Settlement Administrator to cash each settlement check. If a check is not cashed within the 180-day period, the check will be voided, and a stop-payment will be issued. The Settlement Administrator shall issue all unclaimed funds to the California State Controller's Office in the name of the Participating Class Member or Aggrieved Employee. (S.A. ¶ 74).

As required by CMO ¶ G(3)(c)(i), Plaintiffs' Counsel explains the reasoning for this method of distribution at Mankin Decl. ¶¶ 56-61.

F. Tax Treatment

The Parties agree that 10% of the Individual Class Payments will be allocated as wages subject to withholding of all applicable local, state and federal taxes and the remaining 90% will be allocated for interest and penalties (pursuant to, *e.g.*, California Labor Code §§ 203, 210, 226, 2699 etc.) from which no taxes will be withheld. (S.A. ¶ 50(d)). The Individual PAGA Payments will be classified entirely as civil penalties and shall be reported as required on an IRS Form 1099. (S.A. ¶ 50(h)).

/ / /

/ / /

G. PARTICIPATING CLASS MEMBERS' RELEASE OF CLAIMS

In exchange for these payments, the Settlement Agreement at ¶ 30 defines the "Released Class Claims" as follows:

> all claims stated in the Complaint, or that reasonably could have been alleged based upon the facts stated in the Complaint including claims arising out the following alleged violations: (a) failure to pay minimum wages, (b) failure to pay overtime wages, (c) failure to provide meal periods, (d) failure to provide rest breaks, (e) failure to reimburse business expenses, (f) failure to timely pay final wages, (g) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and (h) unfair and unlawful competition, as well as claims for restitution and other equitable relief, liquidated damages, or penalties and any other benefit, wages, penalties, or other amounts claimed on account of the allegations or the primary rights asserted in the Complaint.

Additionally, as required by CMO ¶ G(3)(e)(iii), the "time period governing the Released Class Claims shall be the Class Period." (S.A. ¶ 30).

It is understood and agreed that the Settlement Agreement will not release any person, party or entity from claims, if any, by Class Members for any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period.

H. AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' RELEASE OF CLAIMS

The Settlement Agreement at ¶ 31 also defines the "Released PAGA Claims" as follows:

> all PAGA claims alleged in the Complaint, or that reasonably could have been based on the facts stated in the Complaint and in the relevant LWDA notice letters including all PAGA claims seeking civil penalties premised upon: (a) failure to pay minimum wages, (b) failure to pay overtime wages, (c) failure to provide meal periods, (d) failure to provide rest breaks, (e) failure to reimburse business expenses, (f) failure to pay vested vacation, (g) failure to timely pay wages each period, (h) failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, (i) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and (j) all other claims for civil penalties recoverable under PAGA based on the facts or claims alleged in the LWDA notice letters and Complaint.

The CMO, at ¶¶ G(3)(e)(iv) and G(9)(d)(i), also requires that the "release of claims for PAGA penalties shall bind only the named plaintiff and the State of California." The Settlement Agreement strictly complies with this requirement. (*See* S.A. ¶ 31 ["The Released PAGA Claims shall bind only Plaintiffs and State of California"] and S.A. ¶ 54 ["Upon the Effective Date and Defendants' full funding of the Settlement Amount and separate amount of payroll taxes, Plaintiffs, in their individual capacities and on behalf of the State of California and LWDA, shall completely release and discharge the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims for the PAGA Period"]).

Moreover, even if an Aggrieved Employee requests exclusion from the Class settlement, that individual will still be subject to the Released PAGA Claims and will receive a pro-rata share of PAGA Penalties. (S.A. ¶ 55; CMO ¶ G(9)(c)).

IV. PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS IS APPROPRIATE FOR PURPOSES OF SETTLEMENT

California Rule of Court 3.769(d) provides that the Court may make an order approving certification of a provisional settlement class at the preliminary approval stage. It is well-established that trial courts should use a "lesser standard of scrutiny" for determining the propriety of certifying a settlement class, as opposed to a litigation class. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1807 at n.19; *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com.* (9th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 615, 633 ("[C]ertification issues raised by class action litigation that is resolved short of a decision on the merits must be viewed in a different light."); *Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor* (1997) 521 U.S. 591, 620 ("Confronted with a request for settlement-only class certification, a district court need not inquire whether the case, if tried, would present intractable management problems . . . for the proposal is that there be no trial."). As discussed below, for the purposes of this settlement only, Plaintiffs request that this Court provisionally certify the Class, as defined above, under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

A. ASCERTAINABILITY AND NUMEROSITY

In determining whether a class is ascertainable, the court considers "(1) the class definition, (2) the size of the class, and (3) the means available for identifying the class members." *Reyes v. San Diego County Board of Supervisors* (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 1263, 1271; *Medrazo v. Honda of N. Hollywood* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 89, 101 (proposed settlement class is ascertainable if the class members can be objectively identified and given notice of the litigation without unreasonable time or expense). According to Defendants' records, there are approximately 400 Class Members that are easily identifiable and fall within the defined Class. Thus, Plaintiffs' proposed Class meets the ascertainability and numerosity requirements.

B. WELL-DEFINED COMMUNITY OF INTEREST

1. Commonality

To justify certification, the class proponent must show that questions of law or fact common to the class predominate over the questions affecting the individual members. *Arenas v. El Torito Rests., Inc*. (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 723, 732. Plaintiffs contend that the Class was subjected to common policies and practices relating to payment of wages, meal/rest breaks, and so on. While the Parties dispute whether a class would be appropriate if the litigation were to continue, they agree to class certification for the purposes of this settlement only.

2. Typicality

Typicality "focuses on whether there exists a relationship between the Plaintiff's claims and the claims alleged on behalf of the class." *See* Herbert B. Newberg & Alba Conte, *Newberg on Class Actions* ("*Newberg*") § 3:13 (4th ed. 2002). Tthe Parties dispute whether Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the Class for the purposes of any continued litigation of the Action, but agree for the purposes of this settlement only, that Plaintiffs assert typical claims regarding Defendants' pay policies, meal and rest break practices, wage statements, and the provisions governing the timely and complete payment of wages that are at the core of the lawsuit.

3. Adequacy of Representation

The proposed class representative must establish that he or she will adequately represent the proposed class. *Barboza v. West Coast Digital GSM, Inc.* (2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 540, 546. Plaintiffs are adequate to represent the class because they was employed by Defendants during the Class Period, experienced the same wage and hour practices as the rest of the Class, understood their duties as the Class Representatives, have been willing to undergo the risks of litigation, and have no conflict of interest. (*See* Brown Decl. and Amster Decl.).

Adequacy may be established by the fact that counsel are experienced practitioners. See *Local Joint Exec. Bd. v. Las Vegas Sands, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2001) 244 F.3d 1152, 1162. Here, Plaintiffs are represented by Class Counsel with extensive experience in wage and hour class actions like this matter. (Mankin Decl. ¶¶ 2-6; Carlson Decl. ¶¶ 3-9; Han Decl. ¶¶ 2-7).

4. Superiority

Certification of the Class for settlement purposes is superior here because there will be a global resolution of all claims at once, which fosters judicial economy. Class certification for settlement purposes is also vastly superior to litigation of numerous individual claims because most of the claims are too small to litigate outside of the class context.

V. THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT, WHICH IS FAIR, ADEQUATE, AND REASONABLE

A. CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS ARE SUBJECT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL UNDER THE CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT

The law favors settlements. *Bush v. Superior Court* (1992) 10 Cal.App.4th 1374. This is particularly true in class actions where substantial resources can be conserved by avoiding the time, cost, and rigors of formal litigation. However, a class action may not be dismissed, compromised, or settled without the Court's approval. Cal. R. Ct. 3.769(a). The California Rules of Court set forth the procedures for court approval of a class action settlement: (1) the Court preliminarily approves the settlement; (2) class members receive notice as directed by the Court; and (3) the Court conducts a final approval hearing to inquire into the fairness of the proposed settlement. *See* Cal. R. Ct. 3.769(c), (e-g).

The decision to approve or reject a proposed settlement lies within the Court's sound discretion. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 234-35. And the Court's ultimate duty is to determine whether the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable. *Dunk,* 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801 (setting forth the "fair, adequate, and reasonable" standard).

Thus, at the preliminary approval stage, the Court need only determine that the settlement falls within the "range of possible judicial approval," so that notice to the class and the scheduling of the fairness hearing are worthwhile. *See Newberg* § 11:25. The Court should grant preliminary approval if there are no "grounds to doubt its fairness or other obvious deficiencies . . . and [the settlement] appears to fall within the range of possible approval." *Manual For Complex Litigation* (Third) § 30.41 (1995); see *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1802. A "presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached through arm's-length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small." *Dunk*, *supra* (citing *Newberg* § 11:41). As shown below, the settlement falls well within the range of approval because there are no grounds to doubt its fairness.

B. THE SETTLEMENT IS THE RESULT OF SERIOUS, INFORMED, NON-COLLUSIVE NEGOTIATIONS

The settlement was the product of extensive arm's length negotiations between counsel and was facilitated by an experienced wage-and-hour class action mediator. Though cordial and professional, the settlement negotiations were adversarial and non-collusive in nature. The settlement reached is the product of substantial effort by the parties and their counsel. Although Plaintiffs and their counsel believed that there was a possibility of certifying the claims, they recognized the potential risk, expense, and complexity posed by litigation, such as unfavorable decisions on class certification, summary judgment, at trial and/or on the damages awarded, and/or on an appeal that can take several more years to litigate. In addition, if Defendants prevailed on any of the defenses, the employees may not have received any monetary recovery.

C. THE EXTENT OF THE INVESTIGATION WAS MORE THAN SUFFICIENT TO PERMIT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT

Plaintiffs thoroughly investigated and evaluated the factual and legal strengths and weaknesses of this case before reaching the settlement. As described above, the settlement was reached after extensive investigation and research, thorough calculations and risk evaluation, and a substantial exchange of information prior to mediation. *See Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co.* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 410 (approving settlement where "considerable information [exists] from which to assess the strength of the class claims" and litigation risks).

D. THE SETTLEMENT IS A REASONABLE COMPROMISE OF CLAIMS

To evaluate a settlement, the parties must provide the trial court with "basic information about the nature and magnitude of the claims in question and the basis for concluding that the consideration being paid for the release of those claims represents a reasonable compromise." *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133.

However, *Kullar* does not require review of the outer reaches of possible exposure without considering actual risks of certification, decertification, dispositive motions, and trial, rather only a record which allows "an understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the litigation." *Munoz*, 186 Cal.App.4th at 408-9. Thus, a settlement is not judged against what might have been recovered had a plaintiff prevailed at trial, nor does the settlement have to provide 100% of the damages sought to be fair and reasonable. *Wershba,* 91 Cal.App.4th at 250 ("Compromise is inherent and necessary in [settlement] … even if the relief afforded by the proposed settlement is substantially narrower than it would be if the suits were to be successfully litigated, this is no bar to a class settlement because the public interest may indeed be served by a voluntary settlement in which each side gives ground in the interest of avoiding litigation.")

Here, Defendants raised significant legal and factual defenses that weigh in favor of the reasonableness of the proposed Settlement. In addition to disputing the merits of Plaintiffs' claims, Defendants strongly disputed that Plaintiffs could obtain class certification, arguing a lack of commonality of the legal claims and injuries. Defendants further argued that it complied with the applicable law and that any purported deviations therefrom were individualized in nature, thereby limiting Plaintiffs' ability to certify the class. Thus, while Plaintiffs assert that this is a suitable case for certification, they realize that there is always a significant risk associated with class certification proceedings, which could limit the claims they could pursue on a class basis.

Considering the uncertainties of protracted litigation, this negotiated settlement reflects the best practicable recovery for the Class. While the total Settlement Amount is, of course, a compromise figure, the potential risks and opportunities of both parties were effectively weighed and considered by the parties, resulting in a fair and equitable settlement.

Based upon data obtained through formal and informal discovery, Plaintiffs' counsel estimated the following through the date of settlement: (1) 350 Class Members, (2) 220 *former* Class Members for Labor Code § 203, (3) 16,000 workweeks, (4) 72,000 shifts worked, and (4) approximately 3,000 wage statements during the PAGA Period. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 25).

From these numbers, and by applying violations rates derived from analysis of extensive documents and data from Defendants, Plaintiffs calculated the following maximum amounts assuming all claims were entirely successful at trial: class damages and penalties of $3,006,7474, and PAGA penalties of $1,195,500. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 49). Then, by applying risks at class certification and on the merits, and when considering other factors (such as evidentiary burdens of proof), Plaintiffs calculated the risk-adjusted award at trial for the class claims to be $1,013,188 and for PAGA as $124,300. (Mankin Decl. ¶ 49). As required by CMO ¶ G(3)(a)(i and ii), the full analysis of the maximum and risk-adjusted values is contained in the Mankin Decl. at ¶¶ 25-49 (and, for the sake of brevity, that information is not duplicated in this Motion).

Thus, the reasonableness of the settlement is apparent from the fact that the proposed settlement is 49.3% of the risk-adjusted class damages and penalties. And, for that reason and the others discussed in this Motion, the Parties submit that this settlement is fair and reasonable.

E. PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL IS EXPERIENCED IN WAGE-AND-HOUR LITIGATION

The view of attorneys conducting the litigation is entitled to significant weight deciding whether to approve a settlement. *Ellis v. Naval Air Rework Facility* (N.D. Cal. 1980) 87 F.R.D. 15, 18; *Kullar,* 168 Cal.App.4th at 128 (court must consider "the experience and view of counsel"). Plaintiffs' Counsel are highly experienced in Class/PAGA litigation, having repeatedly been named "Super Lawyer" in employment litigation (a distinction awarded to only 5% of litigators), having achieved large settlements and verdicts, including one of the largest PAGA awards in California's history, collecting over $250 million for its clients, having tried class and PAGA cases against Fortune 100 companies, among other things. (Mankin Decl. ¶¶ 2-6; Carlson Decl. ¶¶ 3-9). Plaintiffs' counsel, operating at arm's length, weighed the strengths and risks of this case, and are of the view that this is a fair and reasonable settlement considering the nature of the claims, realistic risk adjusted value, the complexities of the case, state of the law, and uncertainties of class certification and litigation.

F. The Class Notice Conforms to All Applicable Statutes and Rules

The proposed Notice should be approved, as it fully informs the Class Members of the nature of the lawsuit and each Class Member's rights under terms of the Settlement Agreement and applicable law. The way the Class Notice shall be disseminated ensures that all or nearly all of the Class Members shall be properly notified of the proposed settlement.

The proposed Notice and proposed plan for the Administrator to mail the Notice to the last known address of all class members complies with all the requirements of Cal. Rule of Court 3.769(f) and 3.766(b). The proposed Notice includes: (1) the material terms of the settlement; (2) the proposed attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and the costs of administration; (3) details about the final fairness hearing and how class members may elect to exclude themselves or make an objection; (4) how class members can obtain additional information; and (5) each Class Members' Individual Class and PAGA Payments. *See* Class Notice (Exhibit B to Mankin Decl.).

The Court has wide discretion in approving the means of providing notice, so long as the class representative "provide(s) meaningful notice in a form that should have a reasonable chance of reaching a substantial percentage of class members." *Archibald v. Cinerama Hotels*, (1976) 15 Cal.3d 853, 861. The Notice Packet will be disseminated directly to the Class Members by first class mail by the Settlement Administrator, since Defendants have the last known addresses of all class members and the Settlement Administrator will perform a skip trace and update those addresses for any Notice Packets that are returned and re-send the same.

The Notice satisfies the requirements of Rule of Court 3.766 and affords Class Members with all due process protections required by the U.S. Constitution. Moreover, the contents of the Notice comply with Cal. R. Ct. 3.766(d), because the Notice includes, without limitation (1) a detailed explanation of the case, including the basic contentions or denials of the parties; (2) a statement that the court will exclude the member from the class if the member so requests by a specified date; (3) a procedure for the member to follow in requesting exclusion from the class; (4) a statement that the judgment, whether favorable or not, will bind all members who do not request exclusion; and (5) a statement that any member who does not request exclusion may, if the member so desires, enter an appearance through counsel. The 45-day deadline to opt-out or object is also reasonable, as it provides Class Members sufficient time to do so and, if they so choose, to seek independent legal advice in the interim. If a Class Member does not opt-out, he or she will automatically be sent a settlement check.

G. THE NON-REVERSIONARY "CHECKS CASHED" DISTRIBUTION ENSURES MAXIMAL RECOVERY FOR CLASS MEMBERS

The fact that each member who does not opt out of the Settlement shall be mailed a check ensures that every Class Member will be paid unless they affirmatively act to request exclusion. Moreover, the Settlement Amount is non-reversionary, which means that no settlement funds will revert to Defendant; instead, if any checks are uncashed by the deadline, the funds will be transferred to the State Controller's Office subject to approval of the Court. Such terms are favored by Courts and demonstrate that there was no collusion between counsel for the parties and that the Settlement is fair and favorable to the Class Members.

H. THE ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS ALLOCATION IS FAIR

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Class Counsel is seeking reimbursement of up to $30,000 in litigation costs, along with attorneys' fees equal to one-third of the Settlement Amount. See, *e.g.*, *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th. 480 (approving 1/3 fee in the amount of $6.33 million at a 2.13 lodestar multiplier, and holding that when class action litigation establishes a monetary fund for the benefit of the class members, the trial court may determine the amount of a reasonable fee by choosing an appropriate percentage of the fund created); *Stuart v. RadioShack Corp*. (N.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2010) 2010 WL 3155645 (approving fee 1/3 from settlement amount of $4.5 million since 1/3 was "well within the range of percentages which courts have upheld as reasonable in other class action lawsuits").

Once the Court grants preliminary approval and Notice is disseminated, Plaintiffs' counsel will submit a comprehensive request for attorneys' fees and costs with their request for final approval of settlement.

/ / /

I. THE REQUESTED SERVICE AWARD REQUEST IS FAIR AND APPROPRIATE

The Settlement Agreement provides an incentive award payment of $10,000 to each Class Representative. This request is reasonable given the recovery Class Members will receive on average, as well as the time and effort they devoted to this case. Their efforts included: (1) providing factual background for the litigation; (2) providing documents and information about Defendants' compensation plan; (3) participating in phone calls to discuss litigation and settlement strategy; (4) making themselves available throughout the litigation to assist with analyzing the claims and defenses; (5) helping Class Counsel prepare for the mediation; and (6) reviewing the settlement documents. The Class Representatives also assumed significant risk in bringing this litigation – had they lost, they could have been ordered to pay Defendants' costs.

The requested service award falls within the range of incentive payments typically awarded to Class Representatives in similar class actions. See, *e.g.*, *Bond v. Ferguson Enterprises, Inc*. (E.D. Cal. 2011) 2011 WL 2648879 (approving $11,250 service awards in class action); *Ross v. US Bank National Association* (N.D. Cal. 2010) 2010 WL 3833922, at *2 (approving $20,000 enhancement award in California wage-and-hour class settlement); *Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing, Inc*. (E.D. Cal. 2010) 266 F.R.D. 415, 493 (approving service awards of $15,000 from a $300,000 settlement fund in a wage/hour class action); *West v. Circle K Stores, Inc*. (E.D. Cal. 2006) 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76558, at *28 (finding service awards "of $ 15,000 each to be reasonable."); *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs*. (N.D. Cal. 2007) 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476, at *52 (finding "requested payment of $25,000 to each of the named Plaintiff is appropriate" in wage and hour settlement).

VI. THE COURT SHOULD APPOINT PHOENIX SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATORS AS THE ADMINISTRATOR

Subject to the Court's approval, the parties agreed to Phoenix Settlement Administrators serving as the Settlement Administrator. Phoenix Settlement Administrators is experienced in administering class action settlements and has provided a flat-fee proposal to administer this settlement for $10,000. (Mankin Decl. ¶¶ 62, 80; Decl. of Michael Moore of Phoenix Settlement Administrators).

VII. TIMELINE AND SCHEDULING A FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

The last step in the approval process is the final approval hearing, whereby proponents of the Settlement may explain and describe its terms and conditions and offer argument in support of approval, and Class Members or their counsel may be heard in support of or in opposition to the settlement. Subject to the Court's approval, the Parties propose that the Court schedule a final approval hearing approximately 160 days after the Preliminary Approval Date, as follows:

January 8, 2026	Preliminary Approval (PA) hearing
February 6, 2026 *(29 days after PA)*	Deadline for Administrator to complete first mailing of the Notice Packet to all Class Members.
March 23, 2026 *(45 days after mailing)*	Deadline for Class Members to submit Requests for Exclusion and Objections to the settlement.
16 court days before Final Approval hearing	Deadline for Plaintiffs to file and serve Motion for Final Approval and application for award of fees, costs and service payments.
9 court days before Final Approval hearing	Deadline for filing of any written opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval, or filing response to an objection.
5 court days before final approval hearing	Deadline for filing of any written reply to opposition Motion for Final Approval
Approx. May 8, 2026 (120 days after PA)	Final Approval Hearing

VIII. CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant the motion for preliminary approval of the settlement.

Dated: December 15, 2025

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

BY: ______________________

Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

PROOF OF SERVICE

Pursuant to CCP §§ 1013(a)(1) and 2015.5)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

I am employed in the County of Riverside, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513, Riverside, CA 92504.

On December 15, 2025, I caused to be served the foregoing document(s) described as follows:

PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

I declare that I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with the U.S. postal service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

[ ] **By Mail** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Riverside, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

[ ] **By Facsimile** I sent this document via fax to all parties as listed on attached service list, on

[ ] **By Overnight Service** I deposited such envelope in a facility regularly maintained by the United Parcel Service for receipt of items for overnight delivery, with overnight delivery expenses prepaid, addressed to the person to be served.

[X] **By Email or Electronic Transmission:** Pursuant to CCP § 1010.6 or an agreement of the parties to accept service by email or electronic transmission, I caused the document(s) to be sent from email address tracie@lmlfirm.com to the persons at the electronic notification address listed in the service list. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was not successful.

[ ] **By Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested** I caused such envelope with postage fully prepaid thereon, to be placed in the United States mail at Riverside, California

[ ] **By Personal Service** I caused said document(s) to be personally served by hand on the parties listed on the attached service list.

[X] **State** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on December 15, 2025, Riverside, California.

[ ] **Federal** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

Tracie Chiarito

Tracie Chiarito, Declarant

SERVICE LIST

Ellen Connelly Cohen, Esq.
Aaron Renfro, Esq.
CALL & JENSEN, APC
610 Newport Center Drive, #700
Newport Beach, CA 92660
949-717-3000
ecohen@calljensen.com
arenfro@calljensen.com
Attorneys for Defendants