Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
Allen Feghali (SBN 301080)
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125
E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: afeghali@moonlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Gabriel Aguilar

[Additional counsel on following page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET

GABRIEL AGUILAR, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ENVIRONMENTS PLUS, INC.; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 25STCV09110

CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

DECLARATION OF KANE MOON IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

[*Filed with Plaintiffs' Notice of Motion and Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Plaintiff Aguilar, the Declaration of Laura Supanich, the Declaration of Plaintiff Rios, the Declaration of Jodey Lawrence, and [Proposed] Preliminary Approval Order*]

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING:
Date: March 20, 2026
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Dept.: 10
Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger

Action Filed: October 21, 2024
Trial Date: Not set

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.
Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218)
jm@melmedlaw.com
Lynsey D. Johnson (SBN 314287)
lj@melmedlaw.com
1801 Century Park East, Suite 850
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: (310) 824-3828
Fax: (310) 862-6851

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jesus Ramos Rios

DECLARATION OF KANE MOON

I, KANE MOON, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice as such before all Courts of the State of California and am one of the attorneys of record for Plaintiff Gabriel Aguilar ("Plaintiff Aguilar") and the putative Class. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the facts described herein.

CASE BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

2. This is a wage-and-hour class and representative action for alleged Labor Code violations and claims for civil penalties pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"). Plaintiff Aguilar and Plaintiff Jesus Ramos Rios ("Plaintiff Rios") (together with Plaintiff Aguilar, "the Plaintiffs") seek to represent a class of all persons employed by Defendant Environments Plus, Inc. ("Defendant") in California and classified as an hourly, non-exempt employee who worked for Defendant during the Class Period, as set forth in the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice (the "Settlement"). A true and correct copy of the Settlement is attached to the instant Declaration as **Exhibit 1**. The proposed Class Notice is attached to the Settlement as **Exhibit A**.

3. Defendant is a commercial interiors company which provides furniture for corporate offices, including installation, storage, and relocation. Defendant employed Plaintiffs and other non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the Class Period. Plaintiffs contend they and other hourly employees were subjected to the same unlawful labor practices, including failure to pay wages for all hours worked.

4. Plaintiffs' claim for unpaid minimum and overtime wages stem from allegations that Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiffs and other Class Members for off-the-clock work, failed to incorporate all remuneration into employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of paying overtime or sick pay, and rounded employees' time to their detriment. Plaintiffs' meal and rest period claims are based on allegations that due to the nature of their work, Class Members' breaks were often short, late, interrupted, and sometimes missed altogether, and that Defendant did not pay all premium wages for non-compliant breaks. Plaintiffs further bring a claim for unreimbursed necessary business expenses based on allegations that, during the Class Period, Class Members were required to use their personal cellphones for timekeeping

and work communications, use their personal vehicles for errands without mileage or gas reimbursement, and purchase tools for work purposes without reimbursement from Defendant. Finally, Plaintiffs also bring derivative claims for waiting time penalties, wage statement violations, unfair business practices, and civil penalties under PAGA.

5. Because of the foregoing alleged violations of various provisions of the Labor Code, Plaintiff Aguilar filed a class action on October 21, 2024 in the Superior Court of the State of California, for the County of San Mateo, which alleges Defendant systematically: (1) failed to pay minimum wages, (2) failed to pay overtime compensation, (3) failed to provide meal periods, (4) failed to authorize and permit rest periods, (5) failed to indemnify necessary business expenses, (6) failed to timely pay final wages at termination, (7) failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and (8) engaged in unfair business practices. On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff Aguilar filed a doe amendment to correct Defendant's name from Environmental Plus, Inc. to Environments Plus, Inc.

6. Pursuant to PAGA, on October 20, 2024, Plaintiff Aguilar gave written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "LWDA") of the alleged Labor Code violations, with certified mail service on Defendant, and paid the required filing fee. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's PAGA Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**. On December 13, 2024, Plaintiff Aguilar provided an Amended PAGA Notice to the LWDA and to Defendant, correcting the Defendant's name. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Amended PAGA Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. On February 18, 2025, Plaintiff Aguilar timely filed a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint to add a ninth cause of action for civil penalties under PAGA. In compliance with Labor Code section 2699(s)(1), Plaintiff Aguilar subsequently submitted to the LWDA a file-stamped copy of the First Amended Complaint containing the Court-assigned case number. To date, the LWDA has not indicated its intent to investigate the alleged violations or intervene in this Action. On March 28, 2025, this Action was transferred from the County of San Mateo to the County of Los Angeles, where it is currently pending. Defendant's responsive pleading deadline was stayed pending settlement approval. Defendant denies all allegations made in the *Aguilar* Action

7. Plaintiff Rios filed a class action on April 1, 2025, which alleges Defendant and Apple Inc. systematically: (1) failed to pay all minimum wages, (2) failed to pay all overtime wages, (3) failed to pay accrued vacation wages; (4) failed to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums; (5) failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premiums; (6) failed to maintain accurate employment records; (7) failed to pay wages timely during employment; (8) failure to pay all wages earned and unpaid at separation; (9) failed to indemnify all necessary business expenses, (10) failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements, (11) failure to pay sick leave; and (12) violations of California's Unfair Competition Law. On April 1, 2025, Plaintiff Rios gave written notice to the LWDA of the alleged Labor Code violations, with certified mail service on Defendant, and paid the required filing fee. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff Rios' PAGA notice letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**. Defendant and Apple Inc. deny all allegations made in the *Rios* action

8. Pursuant to this Settlement and for purposes of settlement only, the Parties stipulated to filing a Second Amended Complaint (SAC) (the Operative Settlement Complaint) to add Plaintiff *Rios* as a second class representative in the *Aguilar* Action and include all claims alleged in the *Rios* Action. The *Rios* Action is stayed pending settlement approval in this Action, and will be dismissed with prejudice upon final approval of the settlement.

9. Defendant ardently opposes the merits of this case and denies Plaintiffs' factual allegations. Defendant asserts it complied with all its compensation obligations, including compensating Class Members for any and all off-the-clock work and overtime work, and therefore, Plaintiffs and other Class Members were paid all wages owed. Defendant argues it did not fail to incorporate any non-discretionary bonuses into the regular rate of pay for purposes of paying overtime or sick pay, and that bonuses, if paid at all, were discretionary. Defendant argues its time-rounding practice is neutral on its face and in compliance with California law. Defendant maintains compliance with all its meal and rest period obligations. Defendant asserts it complied with all its reimbursement obligations, and that Plaintiffs and other employees were compensated for any and all business expenses necessarily incurred. To the extent employees received wage statements that were allegedly inaccurate, which Defendant disputes, Defendant would assert employees suffered no actual damage or harm as a result. (*See, e.g.*, *Angeles v. U.S. Airways, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19,

2013, No. C 12–05860 CRB) 2013 WL 622032, at *10 ["A plaintiff must adequately plead an injury arising from an employer's failure to provide full and accurate wage statements, and the omission of the required information alone is not sufficient."].) With respect to Plaintiffs' claim for waiting time penalties, which Defendant disputes, Defendant would also argue its good-faith belief that it paid all wages precludes the imposition of waiting time penalties since Plaintiffs cannot prove Defendant's alleged failure to pay all final wages at the time of separation was "willful." (*See, e.g.*, *Pedroza v. PetSmart, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. June 14, 2012, No. ED CV 11–298 GHK (DTBx)) 2012 WL 9506073, *5.) For these reasons, among others, Defendant denies all of Plaintiffs' claims and allegations, and further claims it did not engage in any unfair business practices and denies liability under PAGA. Defendant also maintains the claims are improper for class treatment, in part, due to the individualized and testimony-intensive nature of the wage claims that could bar class certification and/or significantly reduce Defendant's overall liability.

<u>DISCOVERY AND INVESTIGATION</u>

10. The Parties agreed to mediate this action with Michael Ludwidg, Esq., an experienced class and PAGA action mediator. In preparation for mediation, the Parties agreed to a protocol for an informal production of documents and information before mediation. Prior to mediation, Plaintiffs obtained from Defendant, through informal discovery, documents and data that were necessary and helpful to evaluate the claims asserted in this action. Defendant produced a statistically sound sample of time and pay records for the putative Class, Plaintiffs' personnel file and time and pay records, and Defendant's written employment policies in effect during the Class Period. Defendant also provided information regarding the estimated number of current and formerly employed Class Members, Workweeks, Aggrieved Employees, and PAGA Pay Periods.

11. In preparation for mediation, Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed all the information Defendant provided, including the sample records and documents regarding Defendant's wage-and-hour policies. Class Counsel retained a statistics expert to analyze the sample records and prepare a damage analysis prior to the mediation. Plaintiffs' expert analyzed the sample time and pay records and prepared an analysis with a reasonable degree of certainty. In conjunction with their extensive factual investigation, Class Counsel also investigated the applicable law regarding the claims and defenses asserted in the litigation.

Accordingly, Class Counsel was able to evaluate the probability of class certification, success on the merits, and Defendant's maximum and realistic monetary exposure for all claims. Thus, Plaintiffs' and his Counsel's familiarity with the facts of the case and the legal issues raised by the pleadings allowed them to act intelligently in negotiating the Settlement.

SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS AND NOTICE TO THE LWDA

12. On May 6, 2025, the Parties participated in a full day of private mediation with Michael Ludwig, Esq. The negotiations were at arm's length and, although conducted in a professional manner, were adversarial. The Parties went into the mediation willing to explore the potential for a settlement of the dispute, but each side was also prepared to litigate their position through trial and appeal if a settlement had not been reached. After a full discussion regarding the strengths and weaknesses of Plaintiffs' claims and Defendant's defenses and with the assistance of the mediator, the Parties reached a resolution, the material terms of which are set out in the Settlement.

13. In compliance with Labor Code section 2699(s)(2), notice of settlement and a copy of the proposed Settlement has been submitted to the LWDA along with a copy of Plaintiffs' preliminary approval motion and the hearing date. A true and correct copy of the LWDA's email confirming receipt thereof is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**. To date, the LWDA has not indicated any objection to the Settlement.

KEY TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

14. GSA and Funding: The Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") is $295,000.00, subject to potential increase under an Escalator Clause, and is non-reversionary. (Settlement, ¶ 3.1.) Defendant will separately pay its employer-side payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of Individual Class Payments. (*Id.*) Defendant shall pay the GSA to the Administrator as follows: the first half, One Hundred Forty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents ($147,500.00) payable within fourteen (14) calendar days after the Effective Date and the second half, One Hundred Forty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents ($147,500.00) payable within thirteen months after the Effective Date.[1] (*Id.* at ¶ 4.2.)

---

[1] The payment schedule in installments is supported by Defendant's motion to seal and confidential declaration, being submitted to the Court prior to the hearing for Preliminary Approval.

15. Escalator Clause: The Settlement provides an escalator clause under which should the number of Workweeks exceed the estimated count of 14,750 by more than 15%, that is, if there are 16,964 or more Workweeks, then Defendant shall have the option in its sole discretion to either: (a) increase the Gross Settlement Amount proportionately for each additional workweek worked by Class Members over 16,964 workweeks; or (b) agree that the Class Period and the PAGA Period shall cut off as of the date the number of workweeks worked by Class Members is up to 16,963. (*Id.* at ¶ 8.1.) Defendant shall inform Plaintiffs' Counsel of its election prior to the hearing for Preliminary Approval. (*Id.*)

16. Class Representative Service Payment: The Settlement includes a payment up to $7,500.00 each payable from the GSA, subject to the Court's approval, to Plaintiffs as the Class Representatives, in addition to the amount they are eligible to receive as a Class Member. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1.14, 3.2.1.) This award is for initiating the Action and providing services in support of the Action, and providing a general release of claims. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.14.) In the event the award finally approved is less, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Participating Class Members. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.1.)

17. Class Counsel Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Costs Payments: The Settlement permits a fee application of not more than one-third of the GSA (currently estimated to be $98,333.33) for reasonable attorneys' fees, plus reimbursement for actual litigation costs not to exceed $20,000.00, payable to Class Counsel from the GSA. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.2.) In the event the amounts finally approved are less, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members. (*Id.*) To date, my firm has incurred $15,652.99 in actual litigation costs, and a true and correct copy of a report showing current costs is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**. Pursuant to a Joint Prosecution and Fee-Sharing Agreement between Moon Law Group, PC ("MLG") and Melmed Law Group, PC ("Melmed"), and as consented to in a signed writing by Plaintiffs, 80% of the attorneys' fees will be provided to MLG and 20% will be provided to Melmed.

18. Administrator Expenses Payment: The Settlement provides an Administrator Expenses Payment to the Administrator, payable from the GSA, in an amount not to exceed $9,000.00, except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.3.) In the event the amount of actual administration costs is less and/or the amount approved by the Court is less than requested, the difference

will be allocated to the Net Settlement Amount. (*Id.*) The Parties jointly selected Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions ("Phoenix") as the neutral entity to administer this Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.2.) A true and correct copy of Phoenix's bid of $7,950.00 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 6**.

19. Aggrieved Employees; PAGA Period: Aggrieved Employees is defined as persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as hourly, non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.4.) For purposes of Settlement, the "PAGA Period" is from October 20, 2023 to the date of preliminary approval, unless Defendant makes an election in its sole discretion pursuant to the Settlement's escalator clause. (Settlement, ¶ 1.31.)

20. PAGA Penalties; Individual PAGA Payments: The Settlement allocates $29,500.00 from the GSA for settlement of the Released PAGA Claims, which will be distributed 65% ($19,175.00) to the LWDA and 35% ($10,325.00) to Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA law governing Plaintiffs' claims. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.34.) Each Aggrieved Employee will be entitled to a pro rata share of the 35% share of the PAGA Penalties directly proportional to their number of PAGA Pay Periods. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.5.1.) This results in an average Individual PAGA Payment of roughly **$83.27** for each of the estimated 124 Aggrieved Employees ($10,325.00 / 124), and a PAGA Pay Period value of roughly **$2.04** for each of the 5,054 estimated Pay Periods in the PAGA Period ($10,325.00 / 5,054).

21. Net Settlement Amount: After deducting the Class Representative Service Payments, the Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payments, the PAGA Penalties allocation, and the Administrator Expenses Payment from the GSA, in the amounts specifically approved by the Court, any difference in the amounts requested and the amounts awarded will be allocated to the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.) Accordingly, the Net Settlement Amount is estimated to be approximately **$123,166.67** for an estimated Class of **215 individuals**.[2]

22. Class Members/Period: The Settlement Class is defined as all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as an hourly, non-exempt employee who worked for Defendant during the Class

[2] The Net Settlement Amount was calculated by deducting the following from the $295,000.00 GSA: $15,000.00 for the Class Representative Service Payments, up to $9,000.00 for the Administrator Expenses Payment, $29,500.00 for the PAGA Penalties to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees, $98,333.33 for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, and up to $20,000.00 for the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. (Settlement, ¶¶ 3.1–3.2.5.)

Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.5.) For purposes of Settlement, the "Class Period" is from October 21, 2020, to the date of preliminary approval is granted, unless Defendant makes an election in its sole discretion pursuant to the escalator clause. (Settlement, ¶ 1.12.)

23. Individual Class Payments: Each Class Member who does not opt-out will be entitled to a pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount that is directly proportional to the number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.4.) The estimated **$123,166.67** Net Settlement Amount results in an average Individual Class Payment of roughly **$572.87** for each of the estimated 215 Class Members ($123,166.67 / 215),[3] and a Class Workweek value of roughly **$8.35** for each of the 14,750 estimated Workweeks in the Class Period ($123,166.67 / 14,750).

24. Tax Allocations: Individual Class Payments will be allocated as 20% as wages and 80% as penalties and interest for tax purposes. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.4.1.) Individual PAGA Payments will be allocated as 100% penalties for tax purposes. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.5.1.)

25. Disbursement and Uncashed Funds: Within 14 days after Defendant funds the first portion of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for Individual Class Payments, Class Representative Service Payments, and the Individual PAGA Payments (to the extent funds are available to cover the full amount of Individual PAGA Payments from the First Installment). (*Id.* at ¶ 4.3.) Within 14 calendar days after Defendant funds the Second Installment of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the balance of any payment not completed from the First Installment (i.e. the Individual PAGA Payments) as outlined above, if applicable. (*Id.*) Class Members will not need to submit any claim form as a condition of receiving individual settlement payments. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.1.) Any funds remaining uncashed after 180 days from issuance will be transmitted to the California State Controller's Unclaimed Property office in the name of each individual who failed to timely cash his or her check. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 4.3.1, 4.3.3.)

---

[3] At this time, the actual amounts to Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees is unknown and will be calculated by the Administrator following preliminary approval and receipt and processing of the Class Data. (Settlement, ¶ 7.4.2.) The high and low range of payments will be provided to the Court in a motion for final approval.

26. Released Class Claims by Participating Class Members: Upon funding of the First Installment of the Gross Settlement Amount, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from any and all claims, rights, demands, liabilities and causes of action, whether known or unknown, that were asserted or that could have been asserted based on the facts alleged in the complaints in the Actions, including the Operative Complaint as amended for settlement purposes, and PAGA letters in the Actions during the Class Period, including but not limited to, all claims under California Labor Code §§ 200-204, 206.5, 210, 216, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 248.5, 248.6, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, 2802, 2804, 2926, 2927 as well as any applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, California Code of Regulations, tit. 8, § 11000 et seq. (including but not limited to §§ 11040, 11050, 11070), the California Unfair Competition Law, California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Civil Code sections 1021.5, 3287 and 3289, and any remedies for any of the claims described herein, including, damages, penalties, restitution, declaratory relief, equitable or injunctive relief, interest, attorneys' fees and costs. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.2.)

27. Released PAGA Claims by PAGA Members and LWDA: Upon full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiffs and the LWDA, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from all claims for PAGA penalties, whether known or unknown, that were asserted or that could have been asserted based on the facts alleged in the complaints in the Actions, including the Operative Complaint as amended for settlement purposes, and PAGA letters in the Actions during the PAGA Period, including but not limited to, all claims under California Labor Code §§ 200-204, 206.5, 210, 216, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 248.5, 248.6, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, 2802, 2804, 2926, 2927 as well as any applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, California Code of Regulations, tit. 8, § 11000 et seq. (including but not limited to §§ 11040, 11050, 11070), the California Unfair Competition Law, California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., violations under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004,

California Labor Code §§ 2698, 2699 et seq., Civil Code sections 1021.5, 3287 and 3289, and any remedies for any of the claims described herein, including, damages, penalties, restitution, declaratory relief, equitable or injunctive relief, interest, attorneys' fees and costs. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.3.)

28. Plaintiffs' Section 1542 Release: Under the Settlement, Plaintiffs have agreed to a general release of any and all claims against the Released Parties, including a release of rights pursuant to California Civil Code section 1542. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.1.1.)

29. Released Parties: "Released Parties" mean Defendant and Apple Inc., any for each of them, their current or former parents, successors, predecessors, affiliates, subsidiaries or related entities, and any of their current or former owners, officers, directors, members, shareholders, managers, managing agents, human resources representatives, employees, agents, contractors, parties from whom it holds contracts and/or has provided contractual goods and/or services, insurers, insurance carriers, representatives, and attorneys. (*Id.* at ¶ 1.41.)

30. Class Notice; Disputes, Requests for Exclusion, Objections: The Class Notice will be mailed in English and Spanish via first-class U.S. mail to the current address of each Class Member. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.4.2.) The proposed Class Notice sets forth, in plain terms, a statement of case, the terms of the Settlement, the approximate amounts of attorneys' fees, costs, PAGA Penalties, and service award being sought, an explanation of how the individual payments are calculated, the Final Approval Hearing information, the procedure for disputing the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to each Class Members, and how Class Members may, should they choose, opt-out or otherwise object to the Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 7.4–7.7.4, Ex. A.)

31. No Related Actions: To the best of my knowledge there is no other pending litigation involving similar claims against Defendant that may be impacted by approval of the Settlement at issue, nor is Defendant aware of any other related court filing impacted by this Settlement.

THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE, AND ADEQUATE

32. Class Counsel have conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of this case. As previously noted, the Settlement at issue was reached through arms'-length negotiations, private mediation, and the assistance of a statistics expert. Based on Defendant's informal class-wide discovery production, on Class

Counsel independent investigation and evaluation, and on their extensive experience in wage-and-hour litigation, Class Counsel are of the opinion that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Furthermore, considering all known facts and circumstances, the risk of significant delay, trial risk, appellate risk, and the defenses Defendant may assert both to certification and on the merits, the Settlement is in the best interest of the Class and LWDA.

33. Based on Class Counsel's review of the time, payroll, and additional data provided by Defendant, on Plaintiffs' expert's analysis of the sample records provided by Defendant, and on information from Plaintiffs, Class Counsel evaluated the estimated maximum and risk-adjusted exposure that Defendant faced. Based on a review of Defendant's records, it is estimated that there are approximately 215 Class Members who collectively worked 14,750 Workweeks during the Class Period, and 124 Aggrieved Employees who collectively worked 5,054 PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period. (*Id.* at ¶ 4.1.) Additionally, there were an estimated 156 former employees falling within the three-year statute of limitations ("SOL") period for waiting time penalties, and Class Members' average hourly and regular rate were estimated to be $26.81 and $27.13, respectively.

Accordingly, we calculated Defendant's potential exposure as follows:[4]

Claim	Relevant Time Period	Rate	Number of Violations	Realistic Recovery
Unpaid Wages (Rounding Issue)	14,750 Workweeks	$26.81 average hourly rate	789 net unpaid hours	**$10,576.55***
Unpaid Wages (Off the Clock)	14,750 Workweeks	$26.81 average hourly rate	35,518 net unpaid hours (assuming 15 minutes per shift) (95% overtime)	**$70,227.52*****

[4] Plaintiffs' claim for unpaid wages is based, in part, on allegations that Defendant failed to incorporate nondiscretionary bonuses into Plaintiffs' and Class Members regular rate of pay. However, after a review of the records Plaintiffs' Counsel and Plaintiffs' expert determined there was insufficient support to establish a class-wide claim. As a result, the unpaid wages claim based on Defendant's failure to incorporate nondiscretionary bonuses into the regular rate of pay was determined to have negligible, if any, value.

Meal Period Violations	14,750 Workweeks	$26.81 average hourly rate	69,315 unique meal break violations	**$278,750.27****
Rest Period Violations	14,750 Workweeks	$26.81 average hourly rate	35,318 rest break violations (assuming 50% break violations for break-eligible shifts)	**$94,687.56*****
Unreimbursed Business Expenses Violations	14,750 Workweeks	$50 / Class Member	Based on Expert Analysis of Records	**$5,817.00*****
Labor Code § 203	Based on approx. 156 terminated employees within the 3-year SOL	$26.81 average hourly rate / 30-day max.	Assumes 10 hours / day	**$62,754.10******
Labor Code § 226	Based on approx. 124 employees within the 1-year SOL	$50 per initial pay period / $100 per subsequent pay periods / $4,000 employee max.	Based on 5,054 pay periods within the 1-year SOL	**$24,800.00******
PAGA	Based on 5,054 pay periods within the 1-year SOL	$100 per pay period	Based on 5,054 pay periods within the 1-year SOL	**$25,270.00******
Total				**$572,883.80**

* These figures are discounted based on a 50% probability of prevailing at class certification and on the merits.
** These figures are discounted based on a 15% probability of prevailing at class certification and on the merits.
*** These figures are discounted based on a 10% probability of prevailing at class certification and on the merits.
**** These figures are discounted based on a 5% probability of prevailing at class certification and on the merits [5]

[5] It is reasonable to apply discounts to account for risks at certification and trial, in part, because the Judicial Council of California found that only 21.4% of all class actions were certified either as part of a settlement *or* as part of a contested certification motion. (*See* Findings of the Study of California Class Action Litigation, 2000-2006, available at http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/class-action-lit-study.pdf.) Further, the likelihood that Defendant could assert viable legal defenses would likely further reduce its overall exposure.

34. As discussed above, Plaintiffs' unpaid wages claim is due to allegations that Defendant implemented an unlawful policy during the statutory period whereby Class Members were not paid based on actual hours worked but rather on rounded hours, resulting in unpaid minimum, overtime, and double-time wages. A review of Defendant's pay and time records demonstrates that Defendant rounded Class Members' time to the nearest quarter hour. Plaintiffs' expert reviewed the sample records Defendant produced and thus determined that Defendant's rounding practice resulted in a gross 1,848 unpaid hours. However, Defendant argues its rounding policy is in accordance with California law and neutral on its face as some employees were overpaid due to rounding. After accounting for any overpaid hours, Plaintiffs' expert determined there were a net 789 unpaid hours, resulting in $21,153.09 unpaid wages. Although I believe there is merit to this claim, I acknowledge there is risk with certifying this claim and proof on the merits. Therefore, for purposes of settlement, I applied a 50% discount to the maximum exposure figure; accordingly, I arrived at **a realistic damage estimate of $10,576.55 for the rounding claim**.

35. Plaintiffs' unpaid wages claim is based on allegations that Defendant failed to pay all minimum and overtime wages due to off-the-clock work performed during meal periods. Plaintiffs also claim they were required to carry their personal phones, including during meals, and that their meal periods were regularly interrupted by having to respond to calls. Therefore, Class Counsel estimated Class Members spent an average 15 minutes off the clock work per shift. Accordingly, Class Counsel and data expert estimated Defendant failed to pay Class Members for approximately 17,759 hours, 95% of which should have been paid at the overtime rate. From this, and in light of the average rates of the Class Members, Defendant's estimated maximum potential liability is $702,275.22. Defendant contends that all time worked was compensated, that Class Members were not permitted to work off-the-clock, that no work was required during meal periods, and that this claim is highly individualized and not susceptible to class-wide treatment. I acknowledge that "off-the-clock" claims are difficult to be tried on a class wide basis because there is no apparatus that can be used to prove this claim—there are no records to be used as evidence. In light of these defenses, and for purposes of settlement, I discounted the maximum potential liability by 90%. **Plaintiffs' realistic recovery estimate for the unpaid wages claim due to off-the-clock work is therefore $70,227.52.**

36. Plaintiffs' meal period claim is based on allegations that Defendant did not provide or maintain sufficient meal period practices, such that Class Members were not always permitted or able to take meal periods and/or were sometimes subjected to late, short and/or interrupted meal periods without compensation in lieu thereof. The sample of time and corresponding payroll records for the putative Class indicated that Defendant either failed to provide a meal period or provided a short and/or untimely meal period 69,315 times throughout the Class Period, resulting in a 100% violation rate. Class Counsel and its data expert then calculated that, in light of these violations and the average hourly rate of the putative Class, that Defendant had a potential liability of $1,858,335.15 (69,315 unique violations x $26.81 avg. hourly rate). Defendant nonetheless contends that many meal breaks were taken and, where a violation appears, it was a result of the Class Member voluntarily choosing to forego a meal period, to take it after the end of the fifth hour, or to stop his or her break early to return to work. Indeed, the majority of apparent violations are for unrecorded meals on shifts between 5-6 hours (85.2% violation rate). Moreover, certification and proof of this claim would require declarations from Class Members and obtaining such declarations potentially would reveal that each Class Member had a different experience with respect to meal periods. In light of these defenses, and for purposes of settlement, Class Counsel believe it reasonable to apply an 85% discount to the potential liability. **Plaintiffs' realistic recovery estimate for the meal period claim is therefore $278,750.27.**

37. The rest break claim is based on the allegation that Defendant did not provide or maintain sufficient rest break practices, such that Class Members were regularly required to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day, or a major fraction thereof, without authorization or permission to take a ten-minute, continuous and uninterrupted rest period or without compensation in lieu thereof. The precise number of rest break violations could not be calculated since Defendant neither documented, nor is required to document, when Class Members took their required rest breaks. Therefore, in preparation for mediation, Class Counsel assumed a 50% violation rate for shifts greater than or equal to 3.5 hours in length and, based on the average hourly rate of the putative Class, calculated Defendant's potential liability to be $946,875.58 (35,318 unique rest break violations x $26.81 per hour). Defendant nonetheless contends rest periods do not have to be recorded, that Class Members voluntarily chose to forego some rest breaks and, significant for purposes of class certification, that this claim is individualized in nature and therefore would require declarations

indicating the majority of Class Members experienced issues as to rest breaks. In light of these defenses, and for purposes of settlement, I discounted Defendant's potential liability by 90%. **Plaintiffs' realistic recovery estimate for the rest break claim is therefore $94,687.56.**

38. The unreimbursed business expenses claim is based on the allegation that Defendant did not reimburse Class Members for all expenses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of duties, including expenses incurred for the use of personal cellphones and vehicles and the purchase of tools. The precise value of all necessary business expenses Class Members incurred could not be calculated. Therefore, in preparation for mediation, Class Counsel estimated Defendant owed approximately $50.00 to each Class Member in the statutory period and that Defendant's potential liability is $58,178.00 Defendant contends it complied with all its reimbursement obligations, that it provided Class Members with tools free of charge, and further, that the reimbursement claim would be difficult to certify, given the individualistic nature of this claim. In light of these defenses, and for purposes of settlement, I discounted Defendant's potential liability by 90%. **Plaintiffs' realistic recovery estimate for the unreimbursed expenses claim is therefore $5,817.80.**

39. With respect to Plaintiffs' derivative claims for statutory and civil penalties, Plaintiffs estimates Defendant's maximum potential recovery, prior to risk-adjustment, is $2,256,482.00, which breaks down as follows: **$1,255,082.00** for waiting time penalties for approximately 156 terminated Class Members in the 3-year SOL; a **$496,000.00** penalty for inaccurate wage statements based on approximately 124 Class Members in the 1-year SOL; and **$505,400.00** for PAGA penalties based on 5,054 Pay Periods and the Court assessing a $100.00 penalty for each pay period containing a violation. However, I believe it would be unrealistic to expect the Court to award the full exposure amount given the discretionary nature of awarding penalties and given Defendant's defenses, including without limitation, that any failure to pay all final wages at the time of separation was not willful or intentional and that to the extent Plaintiffs received wage statements that were allegedly inaccurate, Plaintiffs suffered no actual resulting damage or harm. Moreover, I understand the individualized and testimony-intensive nature of the wage claims could bar class certification or otherwise significantly reduce Defendant's overall liability for statutory and civil penalties. Furthermore, considering the underlying wage claims are realistically estimated to be $572,883.80, awarding

such a disproportional amount in penalties would also raise Due Process concerns. Weighing these factors, I applied a 95% discount to each penalty (resulting in **$62,754.10** for waiting time penalties, **$24,800.00** for inaccurate wage statement penalties, and **$25,270.00** for PAGA penalties) and accordingly arrived at **a realistic recovery estimate of $112,824.10 for statutory and civil penalties**.

40. Using these estimated figures, Plaintiffs predicted **the realistic (risk-adjusted) recovery for all claims, including penalties, is $572,883.80**. This means **the $295,000.00 gross settlement figure represents roughly 51.5% of the total realistic recovery**. This is an excellent result for the Class, particularly because, under the Settlement, Class Members will receive timely and guaranteed relief, avoiding the risk of not being able to recover anything.

41. With regards to the PAGA claims, the Settlement is a fair and reasonable resolution that satisfies PAGA's dual statutory purposes of deterrence and punishment, on the one hand, and providing Aggrieved Employees with genuine and meaningful relief, on the other. As a result of this litigation, Defendant has incurred legal expenses, engaged in informal class-wide discovery, and participated in mediation. Defendant will also pay civil penalties to the LWDA under the Settlement, assuming final settlement approval is granted. (Settlement, ¶ 3.2.5.) Not including its own attorneys' fees and costs as well as the employer's share of payroll taxes, Defendant will pay $295,000.00 to resolve this matter—of which $29,500.00 is allocated toward the PAGA claims and will be distributed, in compliance with Labor Code section 2699 as 65% ($19,175.00) to the LWDA and 35% ($10,325.00) to Aggrieved Employees—and the release obtained under the Settlement does not preclude Aggrieved Employees from pursuing any individual claims they may have against Defendant or the other Released Parties. Moreover, Class Counsel are of the opinion that because the issues here are fairly contested, there is a possibility of the Court not awarding the PAGA penalties even if Plaintiffs prevailed on the merits due to the largely discretionary nature of awarding PAGA penalties. In other words, were this matter to go to trial, any award granted would be at the discretion of the Court and subject to a substantial reduction.

42. Further, Class Counsel took into account the risk of not being able to proceed on a representative basis due to the potential manageability issues and that even if Plaintiffs prevailed at trial, penalties would likely be limited due to the largely discretionary nature of awarding PAGA penalties and

in light of other defenses available to Defendant. Thus, it is entirely possible that even if Plaintiffs would be successful at trial, which first assumes they are first able to certify the claims and defeat the manageability issues presented at litigation – a significant risk - Plaintiffs could be awarded substantially less than what was obtained through the Settlement. In sum, the $29,500.00 PAGA Penalties under the Settlement constitutes genuine and meaningful relief.

43. Here, the Settlement represents a substantial recovery when considered against the risk and uncertainties involved in continued litigation, the burdens of proof necessary to certify the claims and establish liability, and the probability of appeal. While Plaintiffs are confident in the merits of their claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each cause of action. Plaintiffs also recognize that proving the amount owed to each Class Member would be an expensive, time-consuming, and uncertain proposition.

44. The Settlement obviates the significant risk that this Court may deny certification of all or some of Plaintiffs' claims. Class Counsel took into account the risk of not prevailing at trial due to low or no participation by Class Members. Indeed, the individualized and testimony-intensive nature of the claims could bar manageability of the representative claims or otherwise significantly reduce any recovery whatsoever. For example, the rest period and unreimbursed expense claims are testimony-driven claims and assume a 100% violation rate, which would not likely be demonstrated at trial, as it assumes either the participation of all employees (which would be difficult given the reality that many, if not all, employees would be unwilling to participate due to fear of retaliation), or alternatively, the use of surveys or statistical data as a surrogate (which would still require the participation of a majority of employees to establish a sound representation of all non-exempts). Even assuming employees would be willing to participate, obtaining declarations would potentially reveal that each individual employee had a different experience, particularly that non-exempt employees worked in a variety of positions, from administrative to in-field installation.

45. Furthermore, even if Plaintiffs were able to pursue their claims on a class-wide basis and obtain certification of all or some of the claims, continued litigation would be expensive, involving a trial and possible appeals, and would substantially delay and reduce any recovery by the Class. Although the Parties have engaged in a significant amount of investigation, informal discovery, and class-wide data analysis, they have not conducted extensive formal discovery. Moreover, preparation for class certification and a trial

would remain for the Parties as well as the prospect of appeals in the wake of a disputed class certification ruling for Plaintiffs and/or any summary judgment ruling. As a result, the Parties would incur considerably more attorneys' fees and costs through trial. In sum, this Settlement avoids the risks, burdens, and the accompanying expense of further litigation.

46. The proposed $295,000.00 Settlement represents a substantial recovery when compared to the reasonably forecasted recovery for the Class. When considering the risks of litigation, the uncertainties involved in continued litigation, the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability, and the probability of appeal, it is clear the Settlement amount is within the "ballpark" of reasonableness, and that preliminary settlement approval is appropriate. (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc*. (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133; *see Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of L.A.* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408–09 [holding that *Kullar* does not require "an explicit statement of the maximum amount the plaintiff class could recover if it prevailed on all its claims," but instead, only an "understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the litigation"].)

THE SERVICE PAYMENTS TO PLAINTIFFS ARE REASONABLE

47. Throughout this litigation, Plaintiffs, who were former employees of Defendant, have cooperated immensely with my office and has taken many actions to protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiffs provided valuable information regarding their hours worked, and what duties were performed during those hours. Plaintiffs also provided information regarding meal periods taken and missed by Plaintiffs and other Class Members. Plaintiffs participated in decisions concerning this action, assisted in preparation for the mediation, and provided my office with the names and contact information of potential witnesses in this action. Before we filed this case, Plaintiffs worked with my office to determine the viability of their claims. Plaintiffs also provided information and documents relating to their employment by Defendant. The information and documentation provided by Plaintiffs was instrumental in establishing the wage-and-hour violations alleged in this action, and the recovery provided for in the Settlement would have been impossible to obtain without their participation.

48. At the same time, Plaintiffs faced many risks in adding themselves as the named Plaintiffs in this matter. Plaintiffs faced actual risks with their future employment, as putting themselves on public record

in an employment lawsuit could also very well affect their likelihood for future employment. For example, a search of Plaintiffs' names will reveal this action, and as a result, many employers may likely forego hiring Plaintiffs in learning they sued a former employer.

49. In turn, Class Members can now participate in a settlement, reimbursing them for wage violations they may have never known about or been willing to pursue on their own. If each Class Member would have tried to pursue legal remedies on their own, that would have resulted in each having to expend a significant amount of their own monetary resources and time, not to mention limited judicial resources, which were obviated by Plaintiffs putting themselves on the line on behalf of the Class.

50. This class action would not have been possible without the aid of Plaintiffs, who put their own time and effort into this litigation and placed themselves at risk for the sake of the Class. The requested enhancement award to Plaintiffs for their service as the Class Representatives is a relatively small amount of money considering the time and effort put into the litigation and compared to enhancements granted in other class actions. The requested enhancement award is therefore reasonable to compensate Plaintiffs for their active participation in this lawsuit, in addition to his general release of claims, both known and unknown, and waiver of section 1542 rights.

MY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

51. I received a B.A. in History in 1998 from UCLA, and my J.D. from Loyola Marymount Law School in 2006. I became an Active Member of the State Bar of California in June 2007 and have been an Active Member in good standing continuously since then. I have been selected to Super Lawyers each year from 2019 to 2023.

52. I co-founded Moon & Yang, APC—now Moon Law Group, PC—in March 2010. My practice is focused exclusively on advocating for the rights of employees in wage-and-hour litigation, almost entirely in class and/or representative actions.

53. For the past decade, I have built my practice to have an emphasis on employment and related civil litigation cases and have both prosecuted and defended employment-related litigation cases. I have been heavily, successfully, and continuously involved in active litigation and trial work, and have conducted bench and jury trials on behalf of both employees and employers in wage-and-hour cases.

54. My current billing rate is $950.00 per hour, which is my usual hourly rate in wage-and-hour litigations. A $950.00 per hour rate is reasonable considering my years of experience practicing in the highly specialized area of employment and labor law and my Laffey Matrix rate (The Laffey Matrix, http://www.laffeymatrix.com/see.html [last visited Feb. 24, 2026].) The Laffey Matrix is a "well-established objective source for rates that vary by experience" used by the District of Columbia. (*In re HPL Tech., Inc. Sec. Litig.* (N.D. Cal. 2005) 366 F. Supp 2d 912, 921.) A true and correct copy of the Laffey Matrix is attached hereto as **Exhibit 7**. California Courts have adjusted the Laffey Matrix rate upwards based on "locality pay differentials" and the location of counsel's office in California to determine whether counsel's rates are reasonable. (*See, e.g.*, *id.* [applying a 9% upward adjustment to the Laffey Matrix rate based on an approximate difference of 9% between the locality pay differential of the District of Columbia and San Francisco, California, where counsel's office was located].) To determine the locality pay differential, the Court in *In re HPL Technologies, Inc.* utilized the locality pay differentials within the federal courts. (*Id.* at pp. 921–22.) Using the same method here and based on my firm's location in Los Angeles, California, the locality pay differential of the Los Angeles-Long Beach area is 36.47% and the locality pay differential of the Washington-Baltimore-Arlington area is 33.94%, which results in a difference of approximately 2.53%. (*Compare* Judiciary Salary Plan of Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA, Effective January 12, 2026, *with* Judiciary Salary Plan of Washington-Baltimore-Arlington, Effective January 12, 2026.) True and correct copies of the Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA and Washington-Baltimore-Arlington salary plans are attached hereto as **Exhibit 8** and **Exhibit 9**, respectively. Based on my 19+ years of experience out of law school, my Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.53% adjustment is $971.98 per hour ($948 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.53% x $948)). Accordingly, my current billing rate of $950.00 per hour is reasonable.

55. I am experienced in prosecuting and defending employment matters, particularly class actions and PAGA representative actions. My firm has focused a substantial percentage of its practice on wage, hour, and working conditions violations. In addition to the present case, I am also class counsel for other wage-and-hour class action lawsuits pending in various California counties, including in state and federal courts. The following is a list of some of our recent class action settlements that have received preliminary and final

approval: *Aparicio v. Lineage Logistics, LLC* (LASC No. BC722764) (class size approx. 155; lead counsel); *Black v. Mission Healthcare Servs., Inc*. (LASC No. 19STCV04602) (class size approx. 1,000; lead counsel); *Campa v. Bloomingdeals, Inc*. (LASC No. BC700366) (class size approx. 1,500; lead counsel); *Garcia v. Comfy U.S.A. Apparel, Inc.* (LASC No. BC709630) (class size approx. 210; lead counsel); *Gomez v. H Mart Cos., Inc.* (LASC No. BC671525) (class size approx. 2,500; co-counsel); *Jones v. Citiguard, Inc.* (LASC No. BC664890) (class size approx. 587; lead counsel); *Jones v. Fitness Alliance, LLC* (Riverside No. PSC1404079) (class size approx. 1,000; lead counsel); *Lagos v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Corp.* (LASC No. BC682972) ($750,000 for 79 class members; lead counsel); *Mark Brulee et al. v. DAL Global Servs., LLC* (C.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2018, No. CV 17-6433 JVS(JCGx)) 2018 WL 6616659, at *10 (class size approx. 2,650; lead counsel) (in approving my hourly rate in that case, the Court found: "Class Counsel's declarations show that the attorneys are experienced and successful litigators. Other courts have approved the attorneys' current rates for the Moon & Yang, APC attorneys"); *Martinez v. Bail Hotline Bail Bonds, Inc.* (LASC No. BC700131) (class size approx. 173; lead counsel); *Montoya v. Golden 1 Credit Union* (Sacramento No. 34-2018-00228252) (class size approx. 1,900; lead counsel); *Onofre v. Caitac Garment Processing, Inc*. (LASC No. BC702283) (class size approx. 750; lead counsel); *Rodriguez v. Rossmoyne, Inc.* (LASC No. BC699137) (class size approx. 220; lead counsel); *Sison v. Cha Hollywood Med. Ctr., L.P.* (LASC No. BC6441 29) (class size approx. 2,100; co-counsel); *Slaughter v. ACA Sec. Stems, LP* (LASC No. BC699137) (class size approx. 300; lead counsel); *Taylor v. Sherman's Delicatessen & Bakery, LLC* (LASC No. BC722765) (class size approx. 515; lead counsel); *Vargas v. AMS Paving, Inc*. (LASC No. BC722767) (case size approx. 260; lead counsel); *Vertti v. Bagcraft Papercon III, LLC* (LASC No. 19STCV12729) (class size approx. 260; lead counsel); and *Wallick v. Campbell Soup Supply Co., LLC* (San Joaquin No. STK-CV-UOE-2021-0000865) (class size 435; lead counsel).

ALLEN FEGHALI'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

56. Allen Feghali is a Senior Partner at Moon Law Group, PC. He received his B.A. in Global and International Studies in 2011 from UC Santa Barbara, and his J.D. from University of La Verne College of Law in 2014. Mr. Feghali became an Active Member of the State Bar of California in December 2014 and

has been an Active Member in good standing continuously since then. He was selected by Super Lawyers as a "Southern California Rising Star" in 2020–2023.

57. Mr. Feghali began working at Moon Law Group, PC in May 2015, and his practice focuses on advocating for the rights of employees at the trial-court and appellate level. Prior to approximately June 2018, with the exception of a handful of cases, his practice focused on individual FEHA and wrongful termination claims, as well as individual wage-and-hour claims. In June 2018, Mr. Feghali became heavily involved in the firm's class action practice.

58. Mr. Feghali's current billing rate is $900.00 per hour, which is his usual hourly rate in wage and hour litigations. Based on Mr. Feghali's 11+ years of experience out of law school, his Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.53% adjustment is $971.98 per hour ($948 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.5% x $948)). (*See* Ex. 7.) As compared to the Laffey Matrix rate and when considering his experience, Mr. Feghali's billing rate of $900.00 per hour is reasonable.

59. During Mr. Feghali's tenure with Moon Law Group, PC, he has played a critical role in obtaining outstanding results for employees who have been wronged by their employers. Mr. Feghali's litigation experience includes, but is not limited to:

(a) In March 2021, Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in the matter of *Rivera, et al. v. Clearpath Federal Credit Union* (LASC No. 19STCV33504), which resulted in a certification order on all causes of action following contested briefing in a wage-and-hour class action.

(b) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Dawson, et al. v. GoHealth, LLC, et al.* (No. CGC-19-577790), which was argued and taken under submission by the Court on February 3, 2022.

(c) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Brown v. NTI-CA, Inc., et al.* (No. 21STCV04397).

(d) Mr. Feghali was part of a team that prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of *Thong, et al. v. Outlook Resources, Inc., et al.* (No. 19STCV44400), which was granted in part and denied in part in October 2022.

(e) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing which resulted in a remand order in the matter of *Andrade v. Rehrig Pacific Corp.* (C.D. Cal. April 22, 2020, No. CV 20-1448 FMP (RAOx)) 2020 WL 1934954, where defendant removed a wage-and-hour class alleging that Plaintiffs' claims were pre-empted by the Labor Management Relations Act.

(f) Mr. Feghali briefed, argued, and won the matter of *Lee, et al. v. The Christian Herald, U.S.A., Inc.* (Cal. Ct. App. Dec. 12, 2017, No. B266853) 2017 WL 6333905, at *1. There, the Court of Appeal reversed a dismissal of an individual defendant following the trial court's granting of a demurrer without leave to amend relating to alter ego allegations.

(g) Mr. Feghali prepared the briefing which resulted in a remand order in the matter of *Sotelo v. Belfor USA Group, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. March 13, 2018, No. 2:17–cv–09056–RSWL–MRWx) 2018 WL 1352910. Defendants there sought to remove the case based on the inclusion of a "sham defendant," but the court agreed with Mr. Feghali's briefing which argued that the individual defendant, who was alleged to have harassed the Plaintiffs under FEHA, was a proper defendant.

(h) Mr. Feghali has been the lead counsel, or co-lead counsel, in individual cases that settled for $850,000.00, $375,000.00, and $250,000.00. In addition to the foregoing, Mr. Feghali has resolved or assisted in the resolution of approximately 100 cases which has resulted in millions of dollars of unpaid wages being returned to low-wage employees.

(i) Mr. Feghali was part of a team that prepared the briefing in a contested class certification motion in the matter of Hernandez v. CR Laurence, Inc., et al. (No. 20STCV32372), which was granted, in part, and denied, in part, in February 2024.

60. Since June 2018, Mr. Feghali's practice has shifted to almost exclusively representing employees in wage-and-hour class and representative actions. His fee has been approved by Courts throughout the state. He has participated as lead, or co-lead counsel, in the litigation and resolution of over 100 wage-and-hour class actions, including obtaining preliminary and final approval of settlements. A selection of settled cases wherein Mr. Feghali served as lead or co-lead class counsel includes the following: *Barahona v. Methodist Hosp. of Cal*. (No. 20STCV09876) ($5,000,000); *Stanley Black & Decker Wage and*

Hour Cases (No. JCCP5218) ($3,500,000); *Vazquez v. St. Mar 2.0 Inc.* (No. 37-2021-00042702-CU-OE-CTL) ($2,250,000); *Duncan v. Infineon Technologies Americas Corp*. (No. 21STCV16872) ($2,500,000); *Aquino v. Coast King Packing, LLC* (No. 21CV002448) ($2,300,000); *Martinez, et al. v. Curative LLC* (No. 21STCV20778) ($1,500,000); *Calderon v. Installed Building Products* (No. 37-2021-00035844-CU-OE-CTL) ($1,500,000); *Majdoub v. Argent Hotel Mgmt.* (No. CGC-20-582921) ($1,800,000); *Fuentes v. Covid Clinic, Inc*. (No. CIVSB2106806) ($1,526,317.57); *Rahman, et al. v. Gate Gourmet, Inc*. (No. 3:20-cv-03047) ($3,850,000); *Pagoulatos v. Coast Hills Credit Union* (No. 20CV02801) ($1,100,000); *Hammers v. Redwood Oil Co., Inc*. (No. SCV-269625) ($1,180,000); *Cuadras v. R.C. Wendt Painting, Inc*. (No. BC705964) ($1,400,000); *Zaragoza v. The Roman Catholic Bishop of Fresno* (No. 22CV-00282) ($1,500,000); *Garcia v. San Jose Water Co.* (22CV396328) ($1,200,000); *Garcia v. Tri-Valley Plastering, Inc*. (No. 22CECG00591) ($1,250,000); *Garcia v. Tapia Enter., Inc*. ($2,137,651 for 507 class members); *Cha v. Center Point, Inc*. (No. CIV2102081) ($1,000,000); *Sison v. Cha Hollywood Med. Ctr., L.P*. (No. BC644129) (2,137 class members); *Lagos v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Corp.* (No. BC682972) ($750,000 for 79 class members); and *Montoya v. Golden 1 Credit Union* (No. 34-2018-00228252) ($1,250,000).

HYUNJIN KIM'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

61. Until recently, Hyunjin Kim was an associate attorney at Moon Law Group, PC. Ms. Kim represents employees in all aspects of employment litigation, including wage and hour class and representative actions involving claims related to overtime and minimum wages, meal and rest break violations, improper wage statements, PAGA, and unfair business practices.

62. Ms. Kim received her Bachelor of Science in Food Science and Nutrition from Seoul National University in South Korea and her Juris Doctorate from Georgetown University Law Center. Ms. Kim has been a member in good standing with the California State Bar since November 2022. Additionally, Ms. Kim is a member in good standing in the United States District Court for the Central District.

63. Ms. Kim's billing rate was $675.00 per hour, which was her usual hourly rate in wage and hour litigations. Based on Ms. Kim's nearly 3 years of experience, her Laffey Matrix rate with a 2.5% adjustment is $484.83 per hour ($473 Laffey Matrix rate + (2.5% x $473)). (See Ex. 67.)

As compared to the Laffey Matrix rate and when considering her experience, Ms. Kim's billing rate of $675.00 per hour is reasonable.

64. Ms. Kim's litigation experience includes, but is not limited to:

(a) Ms. Kim prepared the appellate supplemental brief for Sanchez v. MC Painting, in the Fourth Appellate District in the Court of Appeal of the State of California, No. D078817, on the issue of the enforceability of the defendant's arbitration agreement as to the plaintiff's PAGA claim.

(b) Ms. Kim successfully remanded a case from the United States District Court for the Central District of California to the San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No., CIVSB2132323.

65. Furthermore, a selection of settled class actions that have received preliminary and/or final settlement approval and PAGA-only approved settlements in which Ms. Kim assisted includes the following: *Alkaddomui v. Fremont Automotive Acquisition* (Alameda County No. RG21106760) ($137,500 for 240 aggrieved employees); *Arriaga v. Airline Tech Reps, LLC, et al.* (Los Angeles County No. 21STCV45061) ($550,000.00 for approx. 289 class members); *Avila v. QRM Corp. et al.* (San Diego County, No. 37-2022-00012692-CU-OE-CTL) ($400,000.00 for approx. 150 class members); *Guerra v. Buffalo Spot 2 AZ, LLC, et al.* (Los Angeles County No. 22STCV16054) ($260,000.00 for approx. 615 class members); *Guillen v. Kerr Corporation* (Orange County, No. 30-2021-01217243-CU-OE-CXC) ($550,000.00 for 232 class members); *Herrera v. The Lloyd Pest Control Co.* (San Diego County No. 37-2018-0005210-CU-OE-CTL) ($150,000.00 for approx. 574 aggrieved employees); *Irons v. Sumitomo Electric Interconnect Products, Inc.* (San Diego County, No. 37-2021-00035431-CU-OE-CTL) ($825,000 for approx. 363 class members); *Martinez v. High Desert Auto Supply, Inc.* (San Bernardino County No. CIVSB2206780) ($450,000.00 for approx. 163 class members); *Phakhailathvone v. Orange Crush Athletics, et al.* (Sacramento County, No. 34-2021-00308178-CU-OE-GDS) ($400,000.00 for 1,333 class members); *Porter Brown v. Acrisure of California, LLC* (Orange County No. 30-2022-01276438-CU-OE-CXC) ($3,997,500.00 for approx. 1,185 class members); *Scott v. Polly's Inc., et al*. (Los Angeles County No. 21STCV09769) ($185,000.00 for approx. 1,853 aggrieved employees); *Vazquez v. St. Mar 2.0*

Incorporated, et al. (San Diego County No. 37-2021-00042702-CU-OE-CTL) ($2,250,000 for 3,003 class members); *Yaqub v. Spoelstra LLC* (San Bernardino County, No. CIVSB2132322) ($250,000.00 for 161 class members).

CLASS COUNSEL'S EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

66. As demonstrated by the foregoing, my office is qualified to handle this litigation because we are experienced in litigating Labor Code and Wage Order violations in individual, class, and representative actions. The attorneys at my office have been appointed as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous wage-and-hour class and/or PAGA actions in state and federal courts by way of motion for settlement approval. Including myself, Moon Law Group, PC is comprised of approximately 35 attorneys, all of whom are actively and continuously practicing employment litigation, representing almost entirely employee-plaintiffs, in both individual and class and/or PAGA actions, in this Superior Court and other Superior Courts throughout the State, in the Courts of Appeal, and in various federal courts. The attorneys at my firm have a high level of skill and knowledge in wage-and-hour class actions, PAGA representative actions, and labor and employment law generally, the substantiative (state and federal) and procedural law of which is frequently evolving.

67. Moon Law Group, PC has been engaged in the practice of employment and labor law for over a decade, and presently focuses exclusively on plaintiffs' employment law. The firm and its lawyers have tried both bench and jury trials (representing both plaintiffs and defendants) relating to employment matters. As noted above, Moon Law Group, PC has been appointed lead or co-lead class counsel in federal and state courts in California. Also, the firm and its lawyers have successfully settled hundreds of cases during that time, including wage-and-hour class and/or PAGA actions.

68. The foregoing experience of myself and other attorneys of Moon Law Group, PC is helpful in assessing the reasonableness of settlements, such as the one at issue here, and from this experience we concluded that this litigation could not have been settled on better terms than provided under the Settlement.

69. I respectfully submit that the attorneys of Moon Law Group, PC, myself included, are well suited to act as Class Counsel in this action, and we have, and will continue to, vigorously represent the interests of the Class. To my knowledge, we do not have any conflicts of interest with Plaintiffs, other Class

Members, or the proposed Administrator, and we are not related to Plaintiffs. We respectfully request to be appointed as Class Counsel, for settlement purposes.

THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS IS REASONABLE

70. The Settlement provides for attorneys' fees payable to Class Counsel in an amount up to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $98,333.33, subject to potential increase under the escalator clause) and litigation costs up to $20,000.00. (Settlement, ¶ 3.2.2.) The proposed award of attorneys' fees can be justified under either the lodestar method or the percentage/common-fund recovery method. however, we base the proposed fees award on the percentage method, as many of the entries in the time records will have to be redacted to preserve attorney-client and attorney work product privileges.

71. I am informed and believe that the fees and costs provision in the Settlement is reasonable. The fee percentage requested is less than that charged by my office for most employment cases. Moreover, my office invested significant time and resources into the case, with payment deferred to the end of the case, and then, of course, contingent on the outcome.

72. It is further estimated that my office will need to expend at least another 50 to 100 hours to monitor the administration process leading up to the final approval, prepare for final approval, and oversee distribution to the Class following final approval. My office also bears the risk of taking whatever actions are necessary should Defendant fail to pay.

73. The risk to my office has been very significant, particularly if we would not be successful in pursuing this class action. In such instance, we would have been left with no compensation for all the time taken in litigating this case due to the contingency fee arrangement. Indeed, I have taken on a number of class action cases that have resulted in thousands of attorney hours being expended and ultimately having the defendant company going bankrupt during litigation. The contingent risk in these types of cases is very real and occurs regularly. Furthermore, we were precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases which could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain.

74. Because most individuals cannot afford to pay for representation in litigation on an hourly basis, Moon Law Group, PC represents virtually all its employment law clients on a contingency fee basis, including Plaintiffs in this matter. Pursuant to this arrangement, we are not compensated for our time unless

we prevail at trial or successfully settle our clients' cases. Because Moon Law Group, PC is taking the risk that we will not be reimbursed for our time unless our client settles or wins his or her case, we cannot afford to represent an individual employee on a contingency basis if, at the end of our representation, all we are to receive is our regular hourly rate for services. It is essential that we recover more than our regular hourly rate when we win if we are to remain in practice so as to be able to continue representing other individuals in civil rights employment disputes.

75. As of the drafting of this motion, my office has incurred $15,652.99 in expenses litigating this action, and we anticipate accruing additional costs up to final approval. These expenses were reasonably necessary to the litigation and were actually incurred by my office. Moreover, because total litigation costs are below the maximum amount allowed under the Settlement, the difference will revert to Participating Class Members. (*Id.* at ¶ 3.2.2.) Therefore, our costs should be reimbursed in full.

76. My office invested significant time and resources into the case, with payment deferred to the end of the case, and then, of course, contingent on the outcome. My office's efforts have included, and will include following preliminary and final approval, without limitation, the following:

(a) Numerous interviews with Plaintiff Aguilars and review of documents provided by him;

(b) Legal research and investigation regarding Defendant's business and employment practices at numerous points in the litigation;

(c) Preparation and submission of Plaintiff Aguilar's PAGA notice;

(d) Preparation, finalization, and filing of multiple drafts of the original class action complaint and subsequent first amended complaint;

(e) Extensive "meet and confer" correspondence and discussions with Defense Counsel regarding mediation and to obtain relevant documents and information through informal discovery;

(f) Research and preparation of Plaintiffs' mediation brief;

(g) Analysis of the discovery production and preparation of a damages model with the aid of a statistics expert;

(h) Attendance and active participation at a full day of mediation;

(i) Drafting, negotiating, and reviewing multiple drafts of the Settlement and Class Notice;

(j) Preparation of the motion for preliminary approval and the accompanying filings;

(k) Anticipated preparation for and attendance at the preliminary approval hearing;

(l) Anticipated conferring with Defense Counsel and the Administrator regarding the Class Notice mailing, Class responses, and preliminary and final calculations;

(m) Anticipated preparation, finalization, filing, and service of a motion for final approval and accompanying filings;

(n) Anticipated preparation for and anticipated attendance at the final approval hearing, and then monitoring of the distribution of funds following final approval; and

(o) Anticipated responding to Class Member inquiries and communicating with Plaintiffs regarding the case.

77. Through the efforts of my office, the office of co-counsel, and Plaintiffs in this case, a fair and reasonable joint resolution has been reached that includes a gross, non-reversionary payment by Defendant of $295,000.00 to compensate Class Members for the alleged unlawful wage-and-hour practices. I am informed and believe that, without the efforts of my office, the office of co-counsel, or Plaintiffs, the Labor Code and Wage Order violations alleged in the Operative Complaint would have gone completely unremedied.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on February 26, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

____

Kane Moon