

D.LAW, INC.

Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)

emil@d.law

David Yeremian (SBN 226337)

d.yeremian@d.law

Enoch J. Kim (SBN 261146)

e.kim@d.law

Arianna N. Razi (SBN 356930)

a.razi@d.law

450 N. Brand Blvd, Suite 840,

Glendale, CA 91205

Telephone: (818) 962-6465

Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff REBECCA URQUIZO,
on behalf of herself and others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY

REBECCA URQUIZO, on behalf of
herself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS OF
MONTEREY COUNTY, a California
non-profit corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24CV002929

CLASS ACTION

Assigned for All Purposes To:

Hon. Thomas W. Wills

Dept.: 15

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARILY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT**

*[filed concurrently with Plaintiff's Notice of
Motion and Motion; Declarations of Enoch J.
Kim, Michael Sutherland, Jarrett Gorlick, and
Rebecca Urquizo; and [Proposed] Order]*

Date: December 12, 2025

Time: 08:30 a.m.

Dept.: 15

Original Complaint filed: July 12, 2024

First Amended Complaint: August 26, 2024

Trial Date: None Set

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	I.	INTRODUCTION	1
2	II.	STATUS OF THE LITIGATION.....	2
3	A.	Procedural History	2
4	B.	Investigation.....	2
5	C.	Settlement Efforts	3
6	III.	SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS	4
7	IV.	CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES ONLY IS APPROPRIATE	7
8	A.	There Is a Numerous and Ascertainable Class.....	7
9	B.	There Is a Well-Defined Community of Interest	8
10	C.	The Named Plaintiff's Claims Are Typical	9
11	D.	Adequacy of Class Counsel and Class Representative	9
12	E.	Predominance and Superiority	9
13	V.	THE THREE STEP APPROVAL PROCESS	10
14	VI.	THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND ADEQUATE	11
15	A.	The Settlement is the Result of Serious, Informed, Non-Collusive Negotiations.	12
16	B.	Extent of Discovery and Stage of Proceedings.....	12
17	C.	The Strength of Plaintiff's Case and the Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Any Litigation.	15
18	D.	The Risk of Maintaining Class Action Status Through Trial.	16
19	E.	The Presence of a Governmental Participant	16
20	F.	The Amount Offered in Settlement is Fair Given the Potential Value of the Claims.....	16
21	G.	A Balance of Risk Factors and <i>Kullar</i> Analysis Support Approval	16
22	H.	Experience and Views of Counsel	16
23	VII.	THE CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE	18
24	VIII.	THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE PROVIDES ADEQUATE NOTICE TO THE CLASS MEMBERS.....	18
25			
26			
27			
28			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IX.	THE STIPULATED AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.	19
X.	ACTION REQUESTED AS A PART OF THE MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>B.W.I. Custom Kitchens v. Owens-Illinois, Inc.</i> (1987) 191 Cal.App.3d 1341	9
<i>Cartt v. Superior Court</i> , 50 Cal.App.3d 960, 974 (1975)	19
<i>Class Plaintiffs v. City Of Seattle</i> , 955 F.2d 1268, 1276 (1992)	12
<i>Classen v. Weller</i> (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 27	9
<i>Daar v. Yellow Cab Company</i> , 67 Cal. 2d 695, 704 (1967)	7
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (1996). 48 Cal.App.4th 1794	11
<i>In Re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litigation</i> 172 F.R.D. 119, 123 (SDNY 1997)	9
<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i> (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116	11, 17
<i>Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429, 439-441	7, 12
<i>Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.</i> 339 U.S. 306 (1950)	19
<i>Prince v. CLS Transp., Inc.</i> , 118 Cal. App. 4th 1320, 1328 (2004)	7
<i>Reyes v. Board of Supervisors of San Diego County</i> 196 Cal. App. 3d 1263, 1271 (1987)	8
<i>Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.</i> , 29 Cal. 3d 462 (1981)	7
<i>Rosack v. Volvo of America Corp</i> , 131 Cal. App. 3d 741, 753 (1982)	9
<i>Vasquez v. Superior Court</i> , 4 Cal. 3d 800, 805-9 (1971)	7, 8
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> , 91 Cal.App.4th 224 (2001)	9, 12

STATUTES

<u>Business & Professions Code</u> § 17200	2
<u>Labor Code</u> § 203	2
<u>Labor Code</u> § 204	2
<u>Labor Code</u> § 221	2

1	<u>Labor Code</u> § 226.....	2
2	<u>Labor Code</u> § 226.7.....	2
3	<u>Labor Code</u> § 510.....	2
4	<u>Labor Code</u> § 1174.....	2
5	<u>Labor Code</u> § 2802.....	2
6	<u>Labor Code</u> § 2699.....	2, 16
7	OTHER AUTHORITIES	
8	<u>Manual for Complex Litigation (Second)</u> (1993)	11
9	<u>5 Newberg on Class Actions</u> § 13:45 (5 th ed.)	12
10	<u>5 Newberg on Class Actions</u> § 17:1 (5 th ed.)	18
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Rebecca Urquizo (“Plaintiff”) seeks preliminary approval of a putative class and representative action settlement with Defendant Boys & Girls Clubs of Monterey County (“Defendant”) (Plaintiff and Defendant collectively referred to herein as “the Parties”) on behalf of herself and a proposed class of all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt hourly employee who worked for Defendant during the Class Period, which is the period from July 12, 2020 through June 18, 2025 (“Class” or “Class Members”). After participating in mediation, the Parties reached a settlement in the gross amount of \$260,000.00 to resolve the foregoing action, subject to this Court’s final approval.

Pursuant to California Rules of Court 3.769(d) and (e), Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court grant preliminary approval of the proposed settlement agreement between the Parties, the terms of which are set forth in the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement” or “Settlement”). (*See* Declaration of Enoch J. Kim (“Kim Decl.”), **Exhibit 1**). The Settlement Agreement was reached after the Parties engaged in formal and informal discovery and investigation, participated in mediation with a skilled mediator, and negotiated at arms-length through experienced counsel on both sides.

As discussed below, the proposed Settlement Agreement satisfies all criteria for preliminary approval under California law, falls well within the range of reasonableness, and is in the best interests of the Class. Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court: (1) grant preliminary approval of the Settlement; (2) conditionally grant certification of the proposed Class solely for the purposes of Settlement, (3) approve the appointment of Apex Class Action LLC (“Apex”) as Administrator, (4) authorize the Administrator to send the Court Approved Notice of Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval (“Class Notice”), attached to the Settlement Agreement as Exhibit A, to the Class Members, (5) appoint Plaintiff as the Class Representative and Plaintiff’s Counsel as Class Counsel, (6) and schedule a final fairness and approval of settlement hearing.

II. STATUS OF THE LITIGATION

A. Procedural History

On July 12, 2024, Plaintiff Rebecca Urquizo commenced a Class Action by filing a Complaint alleging nine causes of action against Defendant for (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages, (2) Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Under Labor Code § 510, (3) Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7, (4) Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7, (5) Reimbursement of Necessary Expenditures Under Labor Code § 2802, (6) Violation of Labor Code § 226(a), (7) Failure to Keep Required Payroll Records Under Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5, (8) Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, and (9) Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* (the “Action”). (Kim Decl., ¶ 3.)

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiff Rebecca Urquizo gave timely written notice to Defendant and California’s Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) by sending her PAGA Notice on June 20, 2024 (LWDA-CM-1035203-24). (Kim Decl., ¶ 4.) Plaintiff subsequently filed her First Amended Class Action Complaint (“Operative Complaint”), which adds a claim for penalties under PAGA, Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* on August 26, 2024. (*Id.*)

Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to pay all wages due by requiring Class Members to work off the clock, failed to provide meal and rest breaks and premium wages for non-compliant meal and rest breaks, failed to furnish accurate wage statements, failed to timely pay wages including final wages, failed to keep required payroll records, and failed to reimburse necessary business expenses. (Kim Decl., ¶ 5.) Defendant strongly denies violating any laws or failing to pay any wages and contends it complied with all applicable laws. (*Id.*)

B. Investigation

Before filing the lawsuit, my firm conducted a thorough investigation and researched the facts and circumstances underlying the pertinent issues and applicable law. (Kim Decl., ¶ 6.) This required thorough discussions and interviews between Class Counsel and Plaintiff, in addition to the above-described research into the various legal issues involved in the case. (*Id.*) After filing the lawsuit, Class Counsel conducted a thorough investigation of the facts and claims giving rise to the action, including (1) meeting and conferring with defense counsel and conducting formal and

1 informal discovery; (2) reviewing and analyzing records and data, as well as employment-related
2 policies; (3) reviewing Plaintiff's personnel file and other documentation; (4) interviewing Plaintiff
3 regarding Defendant's policies and workplace; (5) researching the applicable law and potential
4 defenses; (6) constructing damage models based on interpretations of California law and the facts
5 and numbers provided by Defendant; and (7) reviewing information provided by Defendant in
6 response to informal discovery and in advance of the mediation. (*Id.*) The Parties conducted their
7 own evaluations of the potential recoveries based on the claims alleged in the Action, including
8 consulting experts. (*Id.*)

9 Defendant, for its part, vigorously contested liability, the amount of claimed damages, and
10 the propriety of class certification. (Kim Decl., ¶ 7.) After analyzing the relevant documents and
11 other gathered data, Class Counsel believed that this case was appropriate for resolution via
12 mediation. (*Id.*) Given the high level of risk present for both sides, the Parties elected to mediate
13 Plaintiff's claims and explore the possibility of settlement. (*Id.*)

14 **C. Settlement Efforts**

15 On June 2, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation with mediator Henry
16 Bongiovi, a respected and highly experienced mediator in wage and hour class actions and were able
17 to reach an agreement on general settlement terms. (Kim Decl., ¶ 8.) During mediation, counsel for
18 Plaintiff and Defendant discussed all aspects of the case, including the risks of litigation and the risks
19 to both Parties of proceeding with a class certification motion, as well as the law on unpaid wages,
20 meal periods, rest periods, wage statements, and final pay. (*Id.*) Following a full day of mediation,
21 the mediator issued a mediator's proposal. (*Id.*) The Parties accepted the mediator's proposal and
22 agreed to general settlement terms to resolve the lawsuit. (*Id.*) The Parties continued to work together
23 negotiating the long form settlement terms following mediation, as set forth in the Settlement
24 Agreement. (*Id.*)

25 Based on their own independent investigations and evaluations, Class Counsel is of the
26 opinion that the Settlement with Defendant for the consideration and terms set forth herein,
27 considering the representative and class claims, and the risk of loss, is fair, reasonable, and adequate
28 in light of all known facts and circumstances, and is in the best interests of the Class. (*Id.* at ¶ 9.)

1 Class Counsel is also of the opinion that the total consideration and payment set forth in this
2 Settlement Agreement is adequate in light of the uncertainties surrounding the risk of further
3 litigation, the possibility of losing class certification, that the PAGA claim could be deemed
4 unmanageable, and the defenses that Defendant has asserted and/or could assert as to the substantive
5 merit of the claims. (*Id.*) Based on the settlement negotiations, which were extensive and conducted
6 in good faith and at arm's length between attorneys with substantial experience litigating wage and
7 hour class action cases, the Settlement was the product of a non-collusive settlement process and
8 compromises in the interest of reaching a full and complete settlement. (*Id.*) As a result, Class
9 Counsel has determined that the Settlement set forth in this Settlement Agreement is in the best
10 interests of the Class. (*Id.*)

11 **III. SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS**

12 Under the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement, Defendant has agreed to pay
13 \$260,000.00 (Two Hundred Sixty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents) ("Gross Settlement Amount"
14 or "GSA") on a non-reversionary basis to settle and release all claims asserted by Plaintiff in the
15 Operative Complaint on behalf of the proposed Class. (Kim Decl., ¶ 10, Exhibit 1, Settlement
16 Agreement, ¶ 1.22.) The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments,
17 employees' taxes and required withholdings, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA
18 Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class
19 Representative Service Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment. (*Id.*) The Gross
20 Settlement Amount does not include the employer's share of payroll taxes, which will be paid by
21 Defendant in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.1.)

22 The Settlement Agreement defines the "Class" as all persons employed by Defendant in
23 California and classified as a non-exempt hourly employee who worked for Defendant during the
24 Class Period, which is the period from July 12, 2020 through June 18, 2025. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1.5, 1.12.)
25 Based on its records, Defendant estimates that, as of the date of the Settlement Agreement, (1) there
26 are approximately 214 Class Members and approximately 13,000 total Workweeks from July 12,
27 2020, through June 18, 2025, and (2) there were approximately 134 Aggrieved Employees who
28 worked approximately 2,900 Pay Periods from June 20, 2023 through June 18, 2025. (*Id.* at ¶ 8.) If

the number of Total Workweeks encompassed within the Class Period exceeds 13,000 by more than 10% (i.e., 14,300 Workweeks), then Defendant will have the option to increase the Gross Settlement Amount by a pro-rata dollar value equal to the number of Workweeks in excess of 14,300 Workweeks or terminate the Class Period and PAGA Period on the date when the total Workweeks equals 14,300. (*Id.*)

The Settlement Agreement also defines “Aggrieved Employees” as all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt hourly employee who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period, which is the period from June 20, 2023 through June 18, 2025. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 1.4, 1.32.)

The “Net Settlement Amount,” available for distribution to Participating Class Members is the Gross Settlement Amount less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11.) The remainder is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments. (*Id.*) These amounts are detailed as follows:

- Class Counsel Fees Payment: Up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, or **\$86,666.67**, to Class Counsel as attorneys’ fees for the litigation and resolution of this Action. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.2.);
- Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment: Up to **\$25,000.00** for reimbursement of reasonable expenses incurred to prosecute the Action. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 3.2.2.);
- Class Representative Service Payment: Up to **\$5,000.00** to Plaintiff as an award for her service as the Class Representative. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.1);
- Administration Expenses Payment: Up to **\$6,990.00** to the Administrator for its fees and costs to administer the Settlement. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.3.); and
- PAGA Penalty Payment: **\$26,000.00** for settlement of claims for civil penalties under

1 PAGA, with 35% allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments (\$9,100.00) to be paid on a
2 pro-rata basis to the Aggrieved Employees and 65% allocated to the LWDA (\$16,900.00)
3 to be paid to the LWDA (“LWDA PAGA Payment”) (Kim Decl., ¶ 11, Exhibit 1, Settlement
4 Agreement, ¶ 3.2.5.)

5 If the Court approves the above allocations from the Gross Settlement Amount, the Net
6 Settlement Amount is estimated to be **\$110,343.33** (Kim Decl., ¶ 12.) Each Class Member’s share
7 of the Net Settlement Amount (“Individual Class Payment”) will be calculated by (a) dividing the
8 Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class
9 Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class
10 Member’s Workweeks. (Kim Decl., ¶ 12, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.4.) For the
11 approximately 214 Class Members (if no exclusions), the average Individual Class Payment, using
12 a straight average, is **\$515.62**. (Kim Decl., ¶ 12.) If the Court approves a lesser amount for any of
13 the above requested allocations from the Net Settlement Amount, none of the Gross Settlement
14 Amount would revert to Defendant. (Kim Decl., ¶ 12, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.1.)
15 Instead, the remainder will be added to the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Participating
16 Class Members. (*Id.*)

17 Not later than fifteen (15) days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement,
18 Defendant will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel
19 spreadsheet. (Kim Decl., ¶ 13, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 4.2.) Using best efforts to perform
20 as soon as possible, and in no event later than fourteen (14) days after receiving the Class Data, the
21 Administrator will sent to all Class Members identified in the Class Data, via first-class United States
22 Postal Service (“USPS”) mail, the Class Notice with Spanish translation substantially in the form
23 attached to the Settlement Agreement as Exhibit A. (Kim Decl., ¶ 13, Exhibit 1, Settlement
24 Agreement, ¶ 7.4.2.) The Class Notice includes a summary of the case and settlement terms and
25 provides Class Members with detailed instructions on how to exclude themselves, object to the
26 settlement, and challenge the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods attributed to each
27 Class Member per Defendant’s records. (Kim Decl., ¶ 13, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, Exhibit
28 A, Class Notice). Class Members will have sixty (60) days from the mailing of the Class Notice (plus

an additional fourteen (14) calendar days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to opt out of the Settlement, object to the Settlement, or challenge the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods (“Response Deadline”). (Kim Decl., ¶ 13, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶¶ 1.44, 7.5.1, 7.6, 7.7.2.)

IV. CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES ONLY IS APPROPRIATE

Express judicial policy favors maintaining wage and hour actions as class actions. *Prince v. CLS Transp., Inc.* (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1320, 1328; *Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.* (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 462. Any doubt as to the appropriateness of class treatment should be resolved in favor of class certification, subject to later modification if necessary. *Richmond*, 29 Cal. 3d at 473-75.) The decision to certify a class is a procedural one and should be based on the allegations in the operative complaint, and not on the perceived factual or legal merit of the class claims. (*Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 429, 439-41.

To certify a settlement class, the Court must find the two primary requirements for maintaining a class action: (1) there must be an ascertainable class, and (2) there must be a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involving the parties to be represented. *See Vasquez v. Superior Court* (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 805-09; *Daar v. Yellow Cab Company* (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 695, 704. These criteria are met here for the reasons set forth below.

A. There Is a Numerous and Ascertainable Class

Whether a class is ascertainable is determined by examining the class definition, the size of the class, and the means available for identifying class members. *See Vasquez, supra*, 4 Cal. 3d at 821-22; *Reyes v. Board of Supervisors of San Diego County* (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1263, 1271. Class members are “ascertainable” when they may be readily identified without unreasonable expense or time.

Plaintiff contends, and Defendant does not dispute for settlement purposes only, that the numerosity and ascertainability elements are satisfied here. Class Members are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendant in California during the Class Period, which is the period from July 12, 2020 through June 18, 2025. (Kim Decl., ¶ 15.) At the time of executing the Settlement Agreement, Defendant has identified 214 Class Members based on a review of its payroll

and personnel records. (*Id.*)

Therefore, and notwithstanding the foregoing, there is a numerous and ascertainable class.

B. There Is a Well-Defined Community of Interest

A community of interest is established by the predominance of common issues of law and fact. *See Vasquez*, 4 Cal. 3d at 811. The requirement of a community of interest:

[D]oes not depend upon an identical recovery, and the fact that each member of the class must prove his separate claim to a portion of any recovery by the class is only one factor to be considered ... The mere fact that separate transactions are involved does not of itself preclude a finding of the requisite community of interest so long as every member of the alleged class would not be required to litigate numerous and substantial questions to determine his individual right to recover subsequent to the rendering of any class judgment which determined in plaintiffs' favor whatever questions were common to the class.

Id. at 809.

Plaintiff contends, and Defendant does not dispute for settlement purposes only, that common issues of fact and law predominate as to each of the claims alleged by Plaintiff, and the Class is united in its proof. (Kim Decl., ¶ 16.) Because Plaintiff has alleged a single scheme, "the relevant proof [does] not vary among class members" and "clearly presents a common question fundamental to all class members." *See In Re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litigation* (SDNY 1997) 172 F.R.D. 119, 123 (citing *In Re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litigation*, (SDNY 1997) 169 F.R.D. 493, 518). California courts show "no hesitancy" in inferring class-wide causation, class-wide injury, and class-wide damages when a common course of action has been shown. *B.W.I. Custom Kitchen*, 191 Cal. App. 3d at 1350. This inference "eliminates the need for each class member to prove individually the consequences of the defendants' actions to him or her." *Id.* at 1351 (quoting *Rosack v. Volvo of America Corp* (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 741, 753 [emphasis added]).

This action involves, *inter alia*, a determination about Defendant's alleged failure to provide complaint meal and rest periods, failure to pay wages and overtime due to allegedly common off-the-clock work, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to keep required payroll records, failure to pay final wages when required, and failure to provide accurate wage statements. (Kim Decl., ¶ 16.) Plaintiff contends Defendant's practices affected Class Members in the same way and

1 presents questions that are suitable for common adjudication because all Class Members were subject
2 to the same employment policies and practices. (*Id.*) The outcome of litigation in this matter depends
3 upon questions that are common to Class Members. (*Id.*)

4 **C. The Named Plaintiff's Claims Are Typical**

5 A class representative's claims are typical when they arise from the same event, practice, or
6 course of conduct that gives rise to the claims of other putative class members, and if their claims
7 rest on the same legal theories. The class representative's claims must be "typical" but not necessarily
8 identical to the claims of other class members. It is sufficient that the representative is similarly
9 situated so that he or she will have the motive to litigate on behalf of all class members. *Classen v.*
10 *Weller* (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 27, 47; *B.W.I. Custom Kitchens v. Owens-Illinois, Inc.* (1987) 191
11 Cal.App.3d 1341, 1347 ("[I]t has never been the law in California that the class representative must
12 have identical interests with the class members."). Thus, it is not necessary that the class
13 representative should have personally incurred all the damages suffered by each of the other class
14 members. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 228.

15 Plaintiff contends, and Defendant does not dispute for settlement purposes only, that
16 Plaintiff's claims are typical of Class Members' claims because they arose from the same factual
17 basis and are based on the same legal theories. (Kim Decl., ¶ 17.) Thus, Plaintiff's claims are typical
18 of the claims of the putative Class. (*Id.*)

19 **D. Adequacy of Class Counsel and Class Representative**

20 As detailed below, Class Counsel are experienced in class actions, have represented their
21 clients zealously, and have no conflicts of interest. (Kim Decl., ¶ 18.) The Class Representative's
22 interests are aligned with those of the Class Members, as she has suffered the same injuries as the
23 Class Members and has no conflicts of interest. (*Id.*) Plaintiff has not shrunken from this
24 responsibility. (*Id.*) Indeed, Plaintiff has devoted a substantial amount of time and energy to litigating
25 this Action and effectuating a settlement. (*Id.*) Therefore, Class Counsel and the Class Representative
26 are adequate.

27 **E. Predominance and Superiority**

28 Plaintiff contends that individual issues do not predominate over those common to the Class.

1 (Kim Decl., ¶ 19.) As explained, *supra*, Plaintiff alleges there are common issues of law and fact
2 given that Plaintiff and all Class Members were subjected to the same policies and pay practices
3 during the relevant time period. (*Id.*) Plaintiff and Class Members seek meal and rest premiums,
4 unpaid wages and overtime, and penalties for work performed as non-exempt employees for
5 Defendant. (*Id.*) Plaintiff alleges that these issues are suitable for common adjudication because all
6 Class Members were allegedly subject to the same employment policies, and Plaintiff contends the
7 practices applied uniformly to all Class Members. (*Id.*) While Defendant contends that Defendant's
8 policies and procedures were compliant, and to the extent these policies were not compliant, these
9 policies were not uniformly administered by supervisors and managers, Defendant does not contest
10 conditional certification purely for purposes of settlement. (*Id.*)

11 Plaintiff contends, and Defendant does not dispute for settlement purposes only, that class
12 resolution is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the
13 controversy, as there is little interest or incentive for Class Members to individually control the
14 prosecution of separate actions. (Kim Decl., ¶ 20.) Although the alleged injuries resulting from
15 Defendant's policies and practices are potentially real and significant, the cost of individually
16 litigating each such case against Defendant would easily exceed the value of any relief that could be
17 obtained by any one Class Member individually. (*Id.*) If Class Members are forced to litigate their
18 claims individually, it would potentially result in over 214 individual actions against Defendant, each
19 for relatively small amounts. (*Id.*) Hence, an individual suit would prove uneconomical for potential
20 plaintiffs because litigation costs would dwarf a potential recovery. (*Id.*)

21 **V. THE THREE STEP APPROVAL PROCESS**

22 California Rule of Court 3.769 requires court approval of the settlement of class action
23 lawsuits. Preliminary approval is merely the first of three steps that comprise the approval procedure
24 for settlements of class actions. *See* Manual for Complex Litigation, Second § 30.44 (1993); *Dunk*
25 *v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801. The second approval step is the dissemination
26 of notice of the settlement to all Class Members. *Id.* The third step is a final settlement approval
27 hearing, at which evidence and argument concerning the fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of
28 the settlement may be presented, and Class Members may be heard. *Id.*

1 The determination of whether a settlement should be preliminarily approved requires “basic
2 information about the nature and magnitude of the claims in question and the basis for concluding
3 that the consideration being paid for the release of those claims represents a reasonable compromise.”
4 *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133. However, the record need not
5 contain an explicit statement of the maximum theoretical amount that the class could recover. *See*
6 *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal. App. 4th 399, 409 (“*Kullar*
7 does not,... require any such explicit statement of value; it requires a record which allows “an
8 understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the
9 litigation.”). “If the proposed settlement appears to be the product of serious, informed, non-collusive
10 negotiations, has no obvious deficiencies, does not improperly grant preferential treatment to class
11 representatives or segments of the class, and falls within the range of possible approval, then the
12 court should direct that notice be given to the Class Members of a formal fairness hearing, at which
13 evidence may be presented in support of and in opposition to the settlement.” *Manual for Complex*
14 *Litigation*, Second § 30.44, at 229.

15 In deciding whether to approve a proposed class action settlement, the Court must find that a
16 proposed settlement is “fair, adequate, and reasonable” and falls within the “range of approval.”
17 *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801-02. The trial court considers all relevant factors, such as “the strength
18 of plaintiffs’ case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of
19 maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery
20 completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and views of counsel, the presence of a
21 governmental participant, and the reaction of the Class Members to the proposed settlement.” *Id.* The
22 Settlement satisfies all of these requirements.

23 **VI. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, ADEQUATE, AND REASONABLE**

24 The Court’s decision to preliminarily approve a settlement is granted great deference as an
25 exercise within its broad discretion. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224,
26 234-235. As a matter of public policy, courts both encourage the use of the class action device and
27 favor settlement over continued litigation. *See, e.g., Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 429,
28

1 434 (“Courts have long acknowledged the importance of class actions as a means to prevent a failure
2 of justice in our judicial system.”); *Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle* (1992) 955 F.2d 1268, 1276
3 (“[S]trong judicial policy . . . favors settlements, particularly where complex class action litigation
4 is concerned.”). Applying the above factors, the proposed Settlement provides a substantial benefit
5 to the Class. It is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and should be preliminarily approved.

6 **A. The Settlement is the Result of Serious, Informed, Non-Collusive Negotiations.**

7 The proposed settlement was reached as a result of arm’s-length negotiations after the
8 completion of pertinent discovery and the exchange of necessary Class Data. (Kim Decl., ¶ 22.) The
9 negotiations have been, at all times, adversarial and non-collusive in nature. (*Id.*) See, 5 Newberg on
10 Class Actions § 13:45 (5th ed.) (due to the preference of settlement over litigation, “a court will
11 presume that a proposed class action settlement is fair when certain factors are present, particularly
12 evidence that the settlement is the product of arms-length negotiation, untainted by collusion.”).
13 Although Plaintiff steadfastly maintains that her claims are meritorious, Plaintiff acknowledges that
14 there were substantial risks and uncertainty in proceeding with litigation. (*Id.*) As discussed below,
15 Defendant presented multiple defenses to Plaintiff’s claims, both on the merits and with respect to
16 class certification. (*Id.*) Thus, while Plaintiff was prepared to litigate these claims through class
17 certification, and ultimately trial, success was far from certain. (*Id.*) Assistance from a well-respected
18 mediator ensured negotiations between the Parties were non-collusive and well-informed. (*Id.*)

19 **B. Extent of Discovery and Stage of Proceedings**

20 As stated above, the Parties engaged in substantial formal and informal discovery before the
21 Settlement was reached to allow them to fully evaluate the class claims and Defendant’s defenses.
22 (*Id.* at ¶ 23.) This litigation has reached the stage where the Parties have a clear view of their
23 respective strengths and weaknesses. (*Id.*)

24 **C. The Strength of Plaintiff’s Case and the Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely
25 Duration of Any Litigation.**

26 Plaintiff’s claims are based on Defendant’s alleged failure to pay wages (including overtime),
27 failure to provide meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to pay final
28 wages when required, failure to provide accurate wage statements, and largely derivative claims

under the UCL and PAGA. (*Id.* at ¶ 24.)

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members at least minimum wages for all hours worked and proper overtime wages for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. (Kim Decl., ¶ 25.) Plaintiff alleges Plaintiff and Class Members were instructed by management to record rounded hours, and management heavily discouraged Class Members from recording accurate hours worked when it would result in Class Members earning overtime pay. (*Id.*) Plaintiff also alleges that Defendant's timekeeping policies failed to account for pre-shift, post-shift, and work from home activity conducted by Plaintiff and Class Members, such as going to the store to obtain supplies needed for programs, staying after their shifts whenever children were still at the facilities, and preparing programs to run during their shifts. (*Id.*)

Defendant contends that it had no knowledge of any off-the-clock work and that it paid for all reported hours worked. (Kim Decl., ¶ 26.) Defendant also argues that, given its written policies and practices, any unrecorded hours are likely subject to individualized inquiry and unlikely to be certified. (*Id.*) Given the difficulty in certifying this claim, Class Counsel applied a significant discount to damages based on this theory. (*Id.*)

Plaintiff also alleges that Defendant failed to provide proper meal breaks to Plaintiff and Class Members. (Kim Decl., ¶ 27.) Plaintiff alleges Defendant required that Plaintiff and Class Members to eat with kids and remain responsible for them during meal periods, and their meal periods were often interrupted with work demands. (*Id.*) Further, Plaintiff alleges that Plaintiff and Class Members were instructed by management to falsify their timecard correction forms. (*Id.*) Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that Plaintiff and Class Members were instructed to record rounded hours and record full, timely meal periods even when they took their meal periods late or were unable to take a meal period. (*Id.*)

Defendant contends that Class Members were afforded meal periods in accordance with California law, and that Plaintiff and Class Members freely and expressly waived any and all meal periods that they did not take. (Kim Decl., ¶ 28.) Defendant further contends that the meal break claim requires individualized inquiries, which would preclude class certification. (*Id.*) If Defendant's contentions are proven true and prevail in trial, the likely outcome would be no recovery for the Class

Members on the meal break claim. (*Id.*)

Plaintiff also contends that Defendant did not provide Class Members with paid 10-minute rest breaks for every four hours or a major fraction thereof. (Kim Decl., ¶ 29.) Plaintiff alleges that Class Members were required to work through their rest breaks to keep up with work demands and overcome understaffing. (*Id.*) Plaintiff alleges that rest breaks Plaintiff and Class Members did receive were often interrupted. (*Id.*)

Defendant contends that Class Members were afforded rest periods in accordance with California law, and that Plaintiff and Class Members freely and expressly waived any and all rest periods that they did not take. (Kim Decl., ¶ 30.) Considering that, unlike meal periods, rest breaks need not be recorded, these violations would likely be difficult to prove at trial and potentially depress the damages ultimately awarded. (*Id.*) Therefore, Class Counsel applied significant and appropriate discounts to the rest break claim. (*Id.*)

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant required Plaintiff and Class Members to use their personal home internet and computer when working from home, purchase supplies such as pens, pencils, stickers, crayons, and markers, and incur mileage for occasions when Class Members drove personal vehicles for work purposes while on the clock, for which they were not reimbursed. (Kim Decl., ¶ 31.) Defendant maintained that it reimbursed Plaintiff and Class Members for all known business-related expenses and that individualized issues relating to this claim would preclude class certification. (*Id.*)

As for the wage statement and waiting time penalties claims, Defendant contends that it furnished complete and accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and Class Members. (Kim Decl., ¶ 32.) Defendant further contends that these claims are merely derivative of the underlying claims and that Plaintiff and Class Members would be unable to first establish liability for the underlying claims for the reasons described above. (*Id.*) Defendant also contends that even if they could first establish liability for the underlying claims, Plaintiff and Class Members would be unable to establish that Defendant's conduct was willful and knowing as required by the relevant statutes since Defendant acted in good faith to provide accurate wage statements and pay all wages due to Plaintiff and Class Members. (*Id.*) Thus, Defendant contends that the wage statement and waiting

time penalties claims to have little to no value. (*Id.*)

Similarly, Defendant contends that the PAGA claim is also derivative of the underlying claims in the Action and ultimately fails because the underlying claims have no merit. (Kim Decl., ¶ 33.) Defendant also contends that even if Plaintiff and Class Members could establish Labor Code violations, the Court has the discretion to award less than the maximum civil penalty amount and would award substantially less civil penalties here because Defendant acted in good faith to comply with the relevant wage and hour laws and any violations were minor and technical in nature. (*Id.*)

Defendant generally denies all claims alleged in the Action and further denies that class and/or representative treatment is appropriate for any purpose other than this Settlement and that it complied with all applicable laws. (Kim Decl., ¶ 34.) However, after careful consideration, Defendant has concluded that further litigation would be protracted and expensive and that it is desirable that the Action be fully and finally settled in the manner and upon the terms and conditions herein. (*Id.*)

As stated above, while Plaintiff and Class Counsel contend the claims asserted in the Action have merit, they also acknowledge the expense, delay, and risks of continued litigation. (Kim Decl., ¶ 35.) Although the Parties engaged in significant formal and informal discovery in advance of mediation, the Parties still had significant discovery to complete had the matter not been settled. (*Id.*) This would have required the expenditure of substantial time and resources by both Parties that would have very likely spanned several years. (*Id.*) Even if Plaintiff were to certify the class, the Parties would incur considerably more attorney fees and costs through a possible decertification motion, trial, and possible appeal. (*Id.*) This Settlement avoids those risks and the accompanying expense. (*Id.*)

D. The Risk of Maintaining Class Action Status Through Trial.

Plaintiff had not yet filed her motion for class certification, and as such, the extent to which Plaintiff's proposed class was certifiable is somewhat speculative. (Kim Decl., ¶ 36.) Absent a settlement, there was a risk that there would not be a certified class at the time of trial, or if there were, it could consist of a significantly smaller group of employees than the proposed Settlement Class, resulting in less overall recovery. (*Id.*)

1 Finally, in class actions, decertification is always a possibility, and there is always a risk that
2 a trial of this magnitude can become unmanageable. (Kim Decl., ¶ 37.) Cases like *Duran v. U.S.*
3 *Bank Nat. Assn.* (2014) 59 Cal. 4th 1, 34 addresses the complexity of using statistical samples in
4 class actions and demonstrates that decertification is a real risk that Class Counsel must consider.
5 (*Id.*) A class trial would have also required expert witnesses, the accrual of extensive litigation costs,
6 and the commitment of extensive further time and financial resources. (*Id.*) Finally, given the
7 complexity and unsettled nature of the issues, it is likely that any outcome at trial would have resulted
8 in a lengthy and costly appeal. (*Id.*) An appeal would result in further delay for the Class Members
9 who have already waited years for resolution in this matter. (*Id.*) Risk and legal uncertainty must be
10 dealt with in any litigation, and this Settlement was the product of a compromise accounting for those
11 risks and uncertainties. (*Id.*)

12 **E. The Presence of a Governmental Participant**

13 Class Counsel will be submitting the Settlement Agreement and this Motion to the LWDA
14 concurrently with the filing of this Motion pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(1)(2). (Kim Decl., ¶ 38.)

15 **F. The Amount Offered in Settlement is Fair Given the Potential Value of the**
16 **Claims.**

17 If the Court approves the requested allocations from the Gross Settlement Amount of
18 \$260,000.00 as addressed above, the Net Settlement Amount is estimated to be **\$110,343.33**. (Kim
19 Decl., ¶ 12.) There are approximately 214 total Class Members. (*Id.*) If there are no exclusions from
20 the Class, the average gross Individual Class Payment, per Class Member, using a straight average,
21 is **\$515.62**. (*Id.*)

22 Based on an analysis of Plaintiff's time and pay records and a sampling of time and pay
23 records for the Class, Plaintiff estimated the potential realistic exposure for the main claims as
24 follows: \$64,667.00 for the unpaid wages claims, including minimum and overtime wages, due to
25 off the clock work; \$47,050.80 for meal period violations; \$134,412.00 for rest period violations;
26 \$27,790.00 for wage statement penalties; \$60,338.40 in waiting time penalties; \$321.00 for
27 reimbursement for necessary business expenditures; and \$29,180.00 for PAGA penalties. (Kim Decl.,
28 ¶¶ 41-63.) As such, the total estimated realistic exposure Defendant could face is \$363,759.20. (*Id.*)

at ¶ 66.)

The Gross Settlement Amount of \$260,000.00 represents a recovery for the Class of approximately 71.48% of the total realistic exposure Plaintiff estimated that Defendant could face on the primary claims in this case. (*Id.*) Plaintiff and Class Counsel submit that this is an excellent result in the face of uncertainty and the prospects of protracted and contested litigation through class certification, summary judgment, and trial, and particularly in light of all of the factors described above. (*Id.*)

G. A Balance of Risk Factors and *Kullar* Analysis Support Approval

In deciding whether to approve the settlement, the Court must balance these risk factors against an “understanding of the amount in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the litigation.” *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 130, 133; *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408-09. The court “must stop short of the detailed and thorough investigation that it would undertake if it were actually trying the case” *Munoz*, at 408. Plaintiff’s counsel used the comprehensive data and documents provided to perform an analysis of the potential exposure Defendant faced on Plaintiff’s main class-wide claims, establishing the realistic range of outcomes in this case. As noted above, the Gross Settlement Amount represents a recovery of approximately 71.48% of the estimated total realistic exposure facing Defendant. (Kim Decl., ¶ 66.)

There was a very real prospect that nothing would be recovered by the Class if litigation continued and class certification were ultimately denied. At the same time, further litigation would require the expenditure of significant time and financial resources, and there is always the possibility of adverse developments in the law and the likelihood of extended battles in both the trial court and the courts of appeal. Settlement is a prudent compromise that benefits the Class Members promptly.

H. Experience and Views of Counsel

Experienced counsel, operating at arm’s length, have weighed the strengths of the case, examined all the issues and risks of litigation, and endorsed the proposed settlement. Class Counsel are experienced in class actions, have represented their clients zealously, and have no conflicts of interest. (Kim Decl., ¶¶ 9, 18, 72-77.) Class Counsel submits that the Settlement is fair, adequate,

and reasonable in view of the risks and other considerations addressed and is well-suited for final approval upon completion of the administration process. (Kim Decl., ¶ 9.)

VII. THE CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE

“At the conclusion of a class action, the class representatives are eligible for a special payment in recognition of their service to the class.” 5 Newberg on Class Actions § 17:1 (5th ed.).

Plaintiff is entitled to a reasonable service payment for her efforts and initiative in bringing and helping to prosecute this action. (Kim Decl., ¶ 68.) Plaintiff spent significant time apprising herself of her rights, deciding whether remedial action should be taken and how it should be taken, searching for attorneys, and contacting Class Counsel, who spent many hours with Plaintiff discussing the case and the law. (*Id.*)

Both before and after the filing of this lawsuit, Plaintiff conferred with Class Counsel to discuss every aspect of her case. (Kim Decl., ¶ 69.) Plaintiff provided Class Counsel with information about Defendant and about the industry generally, produced and reviewed documents, identified witnesses, consulted with Class Counsel regarding litigation strategy, participated in the mediation process, monitored the progress of the litigation with Class Counsel, and reviewed and signed the Settlement Agreement. (*Id.*)

In light of the foregoing, Class Counsel believes that the \$5,000.00 Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff is fair and reasonable. (*Id.*)

VIII. THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE PROVIDES ADEQUATE NOTICE TO THE CLASS MEMBERS.

To be deemed proper, a notice must provide the Class Members with sufficient information to make an informed decision as to whether to accept or object to the settlement. *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.* (1950) 339 U.S. 306, 314. The notice must apprise the Class Members of the pendency of the action; reasonably convey information regarding the settlement and the Class Members’ rights, entitlements, and obligations; and afford Class Members the opportunity to present their objections. *Id.*

The proposed Class Notice includes a summary of the case and settlement terms and provides

1 Class Members with detailed instructions on how to exclude themselves, object to the settlement,
2 and challenge the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods attributed to each Class Member
3 per Defendant's records. (Kim Decl., ¶ 13, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement Exhibit A, Class
4 Notice.)

5 The standard for determining the adequacy of notice is whether it has "a reasonable chance
6 of reaching a substantial percentage of the class members." *Cartt v. Superior Court* (1975) 50
7 Cal.App.3d 960, 974. Here, the Class Notice will be sent via first-class USPS mail to each of the
8 Class Members based on Defendant's records. (Kim Decl., ¶ 13, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶
9 7.4.2.) Not later than fifteen (15) days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement,
10 Defendant will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel
11 spreadsheet. (Kim Decl., ¶ 13, Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 4.2.) Not later than fourteen (14)
12 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will mail the Class Notice (Kim Decl., ¶ 13,
13 Exhibit 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 7.4.2.)

14 **IX. THE STIPULATED AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS ARE**
15 **REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.**

16 Class Counsel respectfully requests, without opposition from Defendant, an award of
17 attorneys' fees of \$86,666.67 (up to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount) and reasonable
18 litigation costs not to exceed \$25,000.00, subject to approval by the Court. (Kim Decl., ¶ 11, Exhibit
19 1, Settlement Agreement, ¶ 3.2.2.)

20 Class Counsel submits it has the requisite experience, knowledge, and resources to serve as
21 Class Counsel and to zealously represent the Class. (Kim Decl., ¶¶ 72-77.) Class Counsel has
22 incurred substantial hours in prosecuting this action on a contingency basis and will not receive any
23 compensation for their efforts until recovery is obtained for the Class. (Kim Decl., ¶ 67.) In addition,
24 Class Counsel's efforts in reaching the Settlement on behalf of the Class will confer a significant
25 benefit to the Class. (*Id.*) As such, the requested Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel
26 Litigation Expenses Payment are reasonable.

1 **X. ACTION REQUESTED AS A PART OF THE MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY**
2 **APPROVAL**

3 The Parties respectfully request this Court, as part of the preliminary approval process, to
4 grant the following relief and make the following orders:

- 5 1. Review and approve the Settlement Agreement;
- 6 2. Review and approve the Class Notice, attached to the Settlement Agreement as **Exhibit A**;
- 7 3. Consider and determine that the proposed class action settlement as set forth in the
8 Settlement Agreement preliminarily appears fair, reasonable, and adequate;
- 9 4. Enter an order conditionally certifying the action as a class action for settlement purposes
10 only and preliminarily approving the proposed class action settlement and the Settlement Agreement;
- 11 5. Approve and appoint D.Law, Inc. to serve as Class Counsel for settlement purposes;
- 12 6. Approve and appoint Apex as the Administrator to handle the notice and claims procedures
13 as set forth in the Settlement Agreement;
- 14 7. Approve the proposed settlement's allocation of funds to claims made under PAGA;
- 15 8. Order Defendant to disclose to Apex the Class Member's name, last-known mailing
16 address, Social Security number, and number of Class Period Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods,
17 as set forth in the Settlement Agreement;
- 18 9. Order Apex to mail the Class Notice to Class Members; and
- 19 10. Set a date for the Final Approval Hearing.

20 Dated: November 18, 2025

 D.LAW, INC.

21 By


22 Emil Davtyan
23 David Yeremian
24 Enoch J. Kim
25 Arianna N. Razi
26 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Class