

KENNETH H. YOON (State Bar No. 198443)
STEPHANIE E. YASUDA (State Bar No. 265480)

YOON LAW, APC

751 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Suite 102

Pasadena, California 91103

Telephone: (213) 612-0988

Facsimile: (213) 947-1211

kyoon@yoonlaw.com

syasuda@yoonlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Jeslyn Barrios

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

JESLYN BARRIOS, and KARINA ZAYAS,
individually, and on behalf of the State of
California and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TRI-STATE COMMUNITY HEALTHCARE
CENTER, a California corporation;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STC28332

[Assigned for all purposes to Hon. Samantha
P. Jessner, Dept. 7]

**DECLARATION OF KENNETH H.
YOON IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF
CLASS AND PAGA ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Final Approval Hearing:

Date: June 11, 2026

Time: 10:00 am

Dept.: 7

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

I, Kenneth H. Yoon, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California. I am a member of Yoon Law, APC, attorneys of record for Plaintiff Jeslyn Barrios (“Plaintiff Barrios”). The facts set forth in this declaration are within my personal knowledge or based on information and belief, and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify as follows.

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT

2. On February 24, 2026, the Court preliminarily approved the Amended Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”) entered into between Plaintiffs Jeslyn Barrios and Karina Zayas (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) and Defendant Tri-State Community Healthcare Center (“Defendant”).

3. As of the date of filing the accompanying Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Motion for Final Approval”), one (1) Class Member has requested exclusion from the Settlement and none have objected to any aspect of the Settlement, including the request for attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses to Class Counsel, the Class Representative Service Payments to Plaintiffs, payment for the settlement administration fees and expenses to Phoenix Settlement Administrators, or allocation of the settlement money.

WORK PERFORMED BY CLASS COUNSEL

4. I have been actively engaged in this litigation since even before our law firm initiated this action in October 2024, along with my co-counsel.

5. I was involved in all aspects of this lawsuit, including the drafting of the initial and subsequent complaints, reviewing informal discovery productions, creating a litigation strategy, reviewing client documents, reviewing and analyzing class-wide time and payroll documents, preparing for the mediation session in this case, conferring with Plaintiff Barrios regarding case status and strategy, the negotiating of the settlement, the drafting of the

1 settlement agreement, notice, proposed order, the drafting of the motion for preliminary
2 approval of class action settlement, reviewing the work of attorneys and attending court
3 hearings. I was involved in determining the case prosecution strategy as well as determining
4 specific tactics at various points in the case. I also spent time investigating the litigation history
5 and active disputes against the company.

6 6. As outlined herein, the parties have conducted sufficient discovery and
7 investigation during the course of this litigation and the related litigation. Class Counsel
8 analyzed payroll documents for the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees for the purpose
9 of prosecuting the case and estimating the total damage exposure, including the amount of
10 wages owed and penalties at issue. This information was used in analyzing liability, damages,
11 and valuation issues in connection with all phases of the litigation, and ultimately with the
12 mediation and settlement negotiation process.

13 7. Overall, throughout the litigation, Yoon Law, APC performed an exhaustive
14 investigation into the claims at issue, including: (1) determining Plaintiff Barrios' suitability as
15 a putative class representative; (2) evaluating all of Plaintiff Barrios' potential claims; (3)
16 researching similar wage and hour class actions and PAGA actions to the claims brought, the
17 nature of the positions, and the type of employer; and (4) attorney review of the voluminous
18 data. The extensive document and data exchanges have allowed Class Counsel to appreciate the
19 strengths and weaknesses of the claims against Defendant, estimate the potential total exposure,
20 and evaluate the benefits of the proposed Settlement.

21 8. The proposed Settlement was preliminary approved by the Court as a fair,
22 adequate, and reasonable resolution of this lawsuit. Since then, Class Counsel's work has
23 continued and has included, and is not limited to, monitoring the administrator in the notice and
24 settlement administration process.

25 9. As set forth more fully in the accompanying Motion for Final Approval, Class
26 Counsel seek attorneys' fees in the amount of \$245,000.00, which represents one third (1/3) of
27 the \$735,000.00 Gross Settlement Amount, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and the
28 Notice. This amount is commensurate with: (1) the risk Class Counsel and PAGA Counsel took

in commencing this action; (2) the time, effort, and expense dedicated to the case; (3) the skill and determination Class Counsel have shown; (4) the results Class Counsel have achieved throughout the litigation; and (5) the value of the settlement Class Counsel have achieved for the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees.

10. Our current lodestar reflects the efficiencies achieved by attorneys experienced in this field. The chart below shows hours spent by each attorney at their 2026 rate on this case:

Attorney	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Kenneth H. Yoon	77.1	\$1,150	\$88,665.00
Stephanie E. Yasuda	3.6	\$900.00	\$3,240.00
Total:	80.7		\$91,905.00

11. I am aware of the rates of other class action law firms, and the above rates reflect what I understand as a market participant are reasonable market rates for lawyers of our experience. I believe the work performed in this particular case, the backgrounds of our firm, as well as the individual backgrounds, training, and experience of the attorneys who worked on this matter, in litigating and trying class actions, and in particular, wage-and-hour matters, support these hourly rates of compensation for the work performed by Class Counsel. Attorneys at my firm have been previously approved at prior billing rates in other matters throughout in various state and federal courts. I have been approved at my previous rate of \$1,075.00 per hour, and my 2026 billing rate as a part-time arbitrator is \$1,150.00 per hour. Stephanie E. Yasuda (“Ms. Yasuda”) has been approved at her 2025 rates, which was \$875.00 per hour.

ADEQUACY OF COUNSEL

12. I received my J.D. from Loyola Law School in 1998. During law school, I interned for the Honorable Harvey Schneider, Superior Court Judge, as well as the Honorable Terry J. Hatter, Jr., United States District Court Judge. I have received an AV rating by Martindale-Hubbell. I have been recognized in the *Daily Journal’s* Top 75 Labor & Employment Lawyers in California for 2014 and 2019.

13. I obtained my undergraduate degree from UCLA in Economics in 1995. As part

1 of my undergraduate coursework, I obtained formal education in mathematics, computer
2 programming, statistics, and sufficient accounting coursework to sit for the CPA exam. My
3 formal education is critical in my present ability to litigate successfully wage and hour
4 litigation, especially with formulations of damages estimates, with analysis of computer systems
5 and algorithms for purposes of identifying class-wide issues. Further, my formal education with
6 computer systems and databases provides the background to intelligently understand the
7 databases that maintain so much of the relevant information in wage and hour litigation. I
8 believe that my formal education in mathematics, statistics and computer science provide me
9 the background knowledge to litigate wage and hour class actions with better understanding
10 than those counsel without such background. I believe that without this type of inherent
11 knowledge (knowledge not based on reliance on expert consultants), I could not have as
12 effectively represented Plaintiff Barrios and the Class nor my other clients in other wage and
13 hour litigation.

14 14. My firm's primary focus is employment law. I have handled a number of wage
15 and hour matters, including class actions. I have a practice that encompasses cases in the
16 California Superior Courts and Courts of Appeal and the United States District Courts for the
17 Central, Northern, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, before the United States Court
18 of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the United States Supreme Court.

19 15. I have been approved as class counsel in countless class actions over the past 25
20 plus years, including cases based upon contested certification motions and based upon a
21 settlement. The following are some of the matters in which I have been approved as class
22 counsel that have been granted final approval: *Briggs v. Custom Building Products, Inc.*, Los
23 Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 343656; *Rangel v. United Title Company, et al.*, Los
24 Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 347222; *Bernandez, et al. v. Roscoe's House of Chicken*
25 *N Waffles*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 351467; *Campbell v. Applebee's*
26 *International, Inc., et al.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2007-00064259-CU-OE-CTL;
27 *CVS Pharmacy Wage and Hour Cases*, Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4539;
28 *McBride v. Ensign United States Drilling (California), Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case

1 No. BC 400742; *Javier, et al. v. Davita Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC
2 400811, *Napoto v. DHL Express (USA), Inc., et al.*, Northern District of California Case No
3 2009-CV-09-01551-JL; *Lugliani v. Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P., et al.*, Central
4 District of California Case No. SACV 10-1303-JAK(VBKx). I argued and was one of the
5 counsel of record in three wage and hour matters that have resulted in influential 9th Circuit
6 opinions: *Abdullah v. U.S. Security Associates, Inc.*, 731 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 2013), *Urbino v.*
7 *Orkin Services of California, Inc.*, 726 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2013) and *Hamilton v. Wal-Mart*
8 *Stores, Inc.*, 39 F.4th 575 (9th Cir. 2022) (holding manageability does not apply to PAGA). I
9 also argued before the Court of Appeal and was one of the counsel of record on the wage and
10 hour matter *Nieto v. Fresno Beverage Co., Inc.*, 33 Cal. App. 5th 274 (2019). I tried a wage and
11 hour class action to verdict in federal court: *Hamilton v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, Case No. 5:17-
12 cv-01415 (C.D. Cal. April. 12, 2019) (jury awards class \$6M in meal break suit). That verdict
13 was subsequently affirmed.

14 16. Ms. Yasuda received her J.D., *cum laude*, Order of the Coif, in 2009 from
15 Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, where she graduated in the top ten percent (10%) of her
16 class. She was admitted to practice in California the same year. Ms. Yasuda has been employed
17 with Yoon Law, APC since March 2011, and has been selected as a “Super Lawyer” by
18 California Super Lawyers Magazine for the years 2020 through 2025 after having been
19 recognized as a Rising Star by that publication for the years 2018 and 2019. She is admitted to
20 practice in the Courts of the State of California, all United States District Courts of California,
21 the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and the United States Supreme Court.
22 Ms. Yasuda served as class counsel in a number of class actions that have been granted final
23 approval, including *De la Cruz v. Abercrombie & Fitch Co.*, Orange County Superior Court
24 Case No. 30-2007-00036240, and *O’Tool v. Helmerich & Payne Int’l Drilling Co.*, Ventura
25 Superior Court Case No. 56-2010-00367507-CU-OE-VTA; *Dieguez v. Payday Loan Stores of*
26 *California, Inc. et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC532356; *McDougle v. Ensign*
27 *United States Drilling Company (California), Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court Case No. S-
28 1500-CV-279842-LHB; *Navarro-Salas et al. v. Markstein Beverage Co. et al.*, Sacramento

County Superior Court Case No. 34-2015-00174957-CU-OE-GDS; *Hoffman v. Blattner Energy, Inc.*, USDC Case No. 5:14-cv-02195-DMG-DTB; and *Porrás et al. v. DBI Beverage, Inc. et al.* Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 1-14-CV-266154. She also served as one of class counsel in *Hamilton v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, Case No. 5:17-cv-01415 (C.D. Cal. April. 12, 2019) (jury awards class \$6 million in meal break suit), and was a principal drafter of the appellate papers in the aforementioned *Hamilton* and *Nieto* appeals.

17. Yoon Law, APC has taken on this matter on a contingency basis.

18. My firm's only relationship with Plaintiff Barrios is the attorney-client relationship in this matter.

LITIGATION COSTS AND EXPENSES INCURRED BY COUNSEL

19. To date, counsel have borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained by Plaintiff Barrios and the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees. Yoon Law, APC has incurred and expects to incur litigation costs and expenses as reflected below:

Cost	Amount
Court Services (OneLegal) and Filing Fees	\$1,715.86
CaseAnywhere	732.26
Mediation Fees	2,250.00
Expert Consultant	1,000.00
Postage	14.75
Legal Research	40.76
Duplication and Court Copies (PACER)	17.20
Travel (mileage)	8.20
Anticipated costs	200.00
TOTAL	\$5,979.03

This amount combined with the amount from Wilshire Law Firm is less than the \$35,000.00 included in the Class Notice, thus, the Class has been fairly appraised and due process satisfied in this regard.

20. As part of the above chart, I included an anticipated additional \$200.00 in costs through final approval and the final compliance hearing. This specifically includes continuing

CaseAnywhere monthly fees.

SERVICE PAYMENT TO THE CLASS REPRESENTATIVE

21. In recognition of her effort and work serving as the class representative, the parties agreed to, and the Settlement provides for, a Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of \$15,000.00 to Plaintiff Barrios. The requested service payment is fair and appropriate. Plaintiff Barrios took it upon herself to take on significant risk and personal burden from which the entire Settlement Class benefitted. She placed her name on a public filing which is this lawsuit, and her name was the name at the top of the Class Notice. Often unrecognized is the significant financial risk a plaintiff in a PAGA action or class action must undertake for the benefit of the entire set of aggrieved employees. Upon judgment rendered against any plaintiff as a representative of the State, a judgment for costs are likely to be borne solely by the named plaintiff, not the State. In class actions, there is risk of costs as well. Here, Plaintiff Barrios bore the risk of a judgment being entered against her for costs in the event this matter had been lost.

22. Plaintiff Barrios also experienced hardship in connection with this action. As stated in Plaintiff's declaration filed in support of preliminary approval, Ms. Barrios struggled to juggle work, single motherhood and schooling while this case was ongoing.

23. To date there have been no objections to the requested Class Representative Service Payment. Plaintiff Barrios took it upon herself to take on the burden of significant risk from which the entire Class benefitted. Class Members did not have to file individual lawsuits, did not have to face the risk of potential retaliation, and will not have to face the potential risk of struggling to obtain future employment. Similarly, Class Members are not giving a broad release as will Plaintiff Barrios. In short, Plaintiff Barrios has sacrificed a significant amount of time, effort, and sacrificed her own rights in bringing about benefits to the Class. For such reasons, Plaintiff Barrios and Class Counsel respectfully request that this Court find the Class Representative Service Payment in the requested amount to Plaintiff Barrios is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

///

///

1 **FAIRNESS OF THE SETTLEMENT**

2 24. I submit that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. In addition, the
3 Settlement is in the best interests of Plaintiff Barrios and the other Class Members and
4 Aggrieved Employees. I further submit that the Settlement is within the accepted range of
5 recoveries for this type of litigation, given the inherent risk of litigation, the risk of appeals, and
6 the costs of further litigation. I believe the Settlement serves PAGA's purpose of augmenting
7 LWDA's enforcement mechanisms. I heard the former California Labor Commissioner and
8 more recently from other staff of the current Division of Law Standards Enforcement and U.S.
9 Department of Labor, that these agencies believe use and availability of penalty remedies is a
10 tool for the greater goal to recover wages for workers rather than solely for penalties for the
11 state. This PAGA Penalty allocation is part of a broader Agreement that places most the funds
12 in the hands of the workers, which I believe is consistent with the purpose of PAGA.

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

15 Executed this 14th day of May, 2026, at Pasadena, California.

16
17 /s/ Kenneth Yoon

18 Kenneth H. Yoon
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28