

BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.
Mehrdad Bokhour, CA Bar No. 285256
mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (310) 975-1493; Fax: (310) 675-0861

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
Joshua S. Falakassa, CA Bar No. 295045
josh@falakassalaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (818) 456-6168; Fax: (888) 505-0868

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

JAIME RAMIREZ, on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOLDEN GLASS, INC., a Delaware
Corporation; and DOES 1-50, inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 30-2024-01421622-CU-OE-CXC

Assigned to Hon. Melissa R. McCormick

**DECLARATION OF JOSHUA
FALAKASSA IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

**[Cal. Rule Court 3.769; Cal. Lab. Code
§ 2699(s)(2)]**

Date: April 16, 2026

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Dept.: CX105

- 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

I, Joshua Falakassa, say and declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law, duly licensed to practice before all the Courts of the State of California, and I am the principal of Falakassa Law, P.C., and I serve as attorney of record, along with Mehrdad Bokhour of The Bokhour Law Group, P.C., for Plaintiff Jaime Ramirez (“Plaintiff”) and the Putative Class.

2. I am familiar with the file in this matter, and if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the following facts of my own personal knowledge.

3. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

4. I have been a member, in good standing, of the State Bar of California since 2013. I am admitted to practice before all California state courts and the United States District Court of California for the Northern, Central District, and Eastern Districts. I have litigated class action and Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) representative action cases in various courts across California.

5. I am a 2013 graduate from the University of California, Berkeley, School of Law (“Boalt Hall”), where I completed courses in Labor Law, Employment Discrimination, and Labor/Employment arbitration. During law school, I served as a summer associate at Sanford, Wittels, and Heisler LLP, a boutique plaintiffs’ side employment law firm focusing on FMLA wage and hour class action litigation and other public interest lawsuits. As a second-year law student, I served as a summer associate at the San Francisco office of Littler Mendelson, P.C. I aided employers in defending wage and hour class action lawsuits filed under California and federal law.

6. From August 2018 to January 2019, I was an associate at the Paul Haines Law Group, where I actively managed a caseload of more than 50 class and representative PAGA action lawsuits in California and federal courts.

7. Thereafter, as principal of Falakassa Law, P.C., I have handled nearly 100 employee vs. employer litigation matters, including more than 40 class action wage/hour and PAGA cases. Over the last few years, my practice has almost entirely consisted of representing employees, the majority

1 of which has included class action and representative action wage and hour matters. In total, I have
2 handled upwards of 90 class action and representative action wage/hour cases.

3 8. I was selected as a “Super Lawyer Rising Star” in Employment Litigation during the
4 years 2017 through 2025, a distinction that is reserved for the top 2.5 % of lawyers in the practice
5 area. I have also been recognized by Topverdicts.com for achieving Top 1, Top 20 and Top 50 wage
6 and hour class and/or PAGA action settlements in California in 2021-2024.

7 9. Through a contested but productive mediation, Plaintiff and Defendant Golden Glass,
8 Inc. (“Defendant”) (collectively, the “Parties”) entered into a Class Action and PAGA Settlement
9 Agreement resolving the wage and hour claims of the Settlement Class (“Settlement Agreement”
10 and/or “Settlement”), and Class Notice which is attached as **Exhibit “A”** to the Declaration of
11 Mehrdad Bokhour in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action
12 Settlement.

13 10. The Settlement Agreement seeks to fully release and discharge Defendant from the
14 claims brought against it in this matter in exchange for Defendant’s agreement to pay \$542,500 on a
15 non-reversionary, non-claim made basis (each Settlement Class Member will receive his/her share of
16 the Net Settlement Amount without having to submit a claim form or taking action, except for those
17 who opt-out).

18 11. Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will not oppose Class
19 Counsel’s request for a reasonable award of Attorney’s Fees not to exceed one-third of the Gross
20 Settlement Amount, Class Counsel’s reasonable litigation Costs not to exceed \$30,000,
21 Administrator’s Expenses Payment not to exceed \$8,000, PAGA penalties of \$20,000 (of which
22 \$13,000 or 65% will be paid to the LWDA and the remaining \$7,000 or 35% will be paid to the
23 PAGA Members), and a Class Representative Service Payment not to exceed \$10,000 to Plaintiff, as
24 follows:

	Total Amount
<i>Gross Settlement Amount</i>	\$542,500
Class Counsel Fees Payment	\$180,833
Litigation Costs	\$30,000
Administrator’s Expenses Payment	\$8,000
PAGA payment to LWDA (65% of 20K allocation)	\$13,000

PAGA payment to PAGA Members	\$7,000
Class Representative Service Payment	\$7,500
<i>Net Settlement Amount</i>	\$296,167

12. As further detailed in the Declaration of Mehrdad Bokhour, the reasonableness of the settlement is apparent from the fact that the proposed settlement is 65% of Plaintiff's estimate of the risk-adjusted class damages and penalties. For these reasons, Plaintiff submits that the agreed-upon settlement is fair and reasonable.

13. 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 Plaintiff and his counsel believe 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 Defendant prevailed on any of their defenses, the employees may not have received any substantial monetary recovery.

14. The Settlement will result in a fair payment to each Settlement Class Member based on the number of Weeks Worked during the Class Period. As set forth hereinabove, Plaintiff and his counsel have diligently investigated the claims and defenses on behalf of the Settlement Class Members and worked to achieve a resolution of the claims to maximize the recovery by avoiding further expenditure of Attorneys' Fees and Costs. After evaluating the significant risks attendant with further litigation described above and weighing them against the benefits of a known compromise and settlement as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, settlement on the terms agreed to is believed to be in the best interest of Plaintiff and the Settlement Class, and is a fair and reasonable resolution of the claims alleged.

15. Plaintiff's counsel brought to bear a great deal of collective experience in negotiating the settlement of this case. As detailed herein, Plaintiff's counsel engaged in necessary informal discovery, investigation, sampling, and expert evaluation, making it possible to exercise informed

1 judgment throughout the settlement process, including significant document review (e.g., documents
2 pertaining to Defendant's policies and procedures, personnel documents, wage statements, time
3 records, among others) and conducted an extensive analysis and extrapolation of the sampling of
4 class-wide data provided by Defendant.

5 16. Based on our experience in other cases, including wage and hour matters, I believe my
6 office, along with The Bokhour Law Group, P.C., are qualified to evaluate the class claims and
7 viability of defenses in this class action. In this case, the recovery for each Settlement Class Member
8 is reasonable, fair, and adequate, and a settlement at this time is in the best interest of the Settlement
9 Class. The Settlement provides each Settlement Class Member with compensation for the alleged
10 violations when viewed in relation to the costs and risks inherent in obtaining class certification and
11 proceeding to trial.

12 17. Plaintiff's counsel, as well as Defendant's counsel, fully endorse the terms and
13 conditions of the Settlement as set forth in the above-mentioned Settlement Agreement.

14 18. Of course, the Settlement Amount represents a compromise figure, taking into account
15 the various risks surrounding class certification and the merits of Defendant's asserted defenses.
16 Nevertheless, the Settlement provides for fair and adequate payments to the Settlement Class
17 Members, with no reversion to Defendant.

18 19. When this case was taken on a contingency fee basis, with our firm agreeing to assume
19 responsibility for all litigation costs, the ultimate result was far from certain. In the course of this
20 litigation, we paid all costs, including the filing fees, mediation costs, and expert costs. There was
21 never a guarantee that our firms would recoup these expenditures.

22 20. It is our experience that attorneys' fee awards of one-third of a common fund
23 settlement are the standard in California. Plaintiff's counsel agreed to seek one-third of the Settlement
24 Amount for Attorneys' Fees in this case. Defendant does not oppose this fee request. The fee is further
25 warranted because it is within the range of reasonableness typically awarded in class actions. Our
26 firm's Costs will not exceed \$30,000 and will be based on the actual amount incurred at the time of
27 final approval.

28 21. In compliance with California Rules of Professional Conduct section 1.5.1, Plaintiff

1 signed a fee split agreement that provides fees will be allocated between Class Counsel as follows:
2 fifty percent (50%) to the Bokhour Law Group, P.C., and fifty percent (50%) to the Falakassa Law,
3 P.C.

4 22. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Court grant preliminary
5 approval of the Settlement as being fair, reasonable, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class,
6 as well as preliminarily approve the requested attorneys' fees and costs, and service award to the
7 Class Representative.

8 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true and
9 correct on this 19th day of February 2026, in Los Angeles, California.

10
11 By: 
12 Joshua Falakassa
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28