

1 John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
2 john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
3 Jeffrey C. Bils (SBN 301629)
4 jeffrey.bils@wilshirelawfirm.com
5 Aram Boyadjian (SBN 334009)
6 aram.boyadjian@wilshirelawfirm.com
7 Lisa B. Iturriaga (SBN 339678)
8 lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
9 Andrew Sandoval (SBN 346996)
10 andrew.sandoval@wilshirelawfirm.com
11 **WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**
12 660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
13 Los Angeles, California 90017
14 Telephone: (213) 381-9988
15 Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Thora Magney*

17 [Additional Counsel on following page]

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

THORA MAGNEY and ESHA HICKSON,
individually, and on behalf of all others similarly
situated, and on behalf of the State of California
and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LEVI STRAUSS & CO., a Delaware
corporation; LEVI'S ONLY STORES, INC., a
Delaware corporation; I AM BEYOND, LLC;
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STCV02320

Assigned for all purposes to:
Hon. Timothy Patrick Dillon
Dept. 15

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

Date: December 9, 2025

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept: 15

1 **TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on December 9, 2025 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter
3 as the matter may be heard in Department 15 of the above-entitled Court located at 312 North
4 Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Plaintiffs Thora Magney and Esha Lakita Hickson
5 (“Plaintiffs”) will and hereby do move this Court for an Order:

- 6 1. Granting final approval of the proposed Class and Representative Action
7 Settlement Agreement;
- 8 2. Awarding Class Counsel attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$1,083,250.00 and
9 reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of \$21,996.29;
- 10 3. Awarding Plaintiffs Class Representatives Service Payments in the amount of
11 \$10,000.00 each (\$20,000 total);
- 12 4. Awarding \$25,000.00 to Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions
13 (“Phoenix”) for its settlement administration expenses; and
- 14 5. Approving allocation of \$160,000.00 as civil penalties under the Private
15 Attorneys’ General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), 75% of which (\$120,000.00) will be
16 paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and 25% of
17 which (\$40,000.00) will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees based on the
18 number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period.

19 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion, Memorandum of Points and Authorities,
20 the Declaration of John G. Yslas, the Declaration Enoch J. Kim, the Declaration of Jarrod Salinas,
21 the Declaration of Thora Magney, the Declaration of Esha Hickson, and on all records and
22 documents on file, together with such oral and documentary evidence that may be presented at
23 the hearing on this matter.

24 Dated: November 13, 2025

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

25 By: 
26 Lisa B. Iturriaga
27 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	5
II. THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL.....	6
A. A Presumption of Fairness Exists.....	6
B. The Strength of Plaintiffs’ Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial.....	7
C. The Amount Offered in Settlement.....	8
D. The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings.....	8
E. The Experience and Views of Counsel.....	9
F. The Presence of a Government Participant.....	9
G. The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement.....	9
III. THE REQUESTED FEE AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED...	10
A. The Requested Fee Award is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Percentage-of- Recovery Method.....	10
B. A Lodestar Cross-Check Confirms the Reasonableness of the Requested Fee.....	11
IV. THE REQUESTED COST AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	13
V. THE REQUESTED CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE PAYMENT IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	13
VI. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED.....	14
VII. CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> , 85 Cal.App.4th 1135 (2000)	7
<i>Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.</i> , 162 Cal. App. 4th, 60 (2008)	12
<i>Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC</i> , 175 Cal.App.4th 785 (2009)	13
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 48 Cal.App.4th 1794 (1996)	6
<i>Golba v. Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.</i> , 238 Cal.App.4th 1251 (2015)	13
<i>Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.</i> , 4 Cal.5th 260 (2018)	7, 11
<i>Ketchum v. Moses</i> , 24 Cal.4th 1122 (2001)	11, 12
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l</i> , 231 Cal. App. 4th 860 (2004)	12
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.</i> , 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016)	10, 11
<i>Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc.</i> , 82 Cal.App.4th 19 (2000)	10
<i>Melnik v. Robledo</i> , 64 Cal.App.3d 618 (1976)	11
<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i> , 186 Cal.App.4th 399 (2010)	7, 8
<i>PLCM Group, Inc. v. Drexler</i> , 22 Cal.4th 1084 (2000)	11
<i>Roos v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.</i> , 241 Cal.App.4th 1472 (2015)	11
<i>Serrano v. Priest</i> , 20 Cal. 3d 25 (1977)	11
<i>Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.</i> , No. 08–CV–821–IEG, 2010 WL 2196104 (S.D. Cal. 2010)	11
<i>Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases</i> , 171 Cal. App. 4th 495 (2009)	12
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> 91 Cal.App.4th 224 (2001)	7, 12
<i>Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 290 F.3d 1043 n.6 (9 th Cir. 2002)	12
<i>Wren v. RGIS Inventory Specialists</i> , No. C–06–05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011)	11

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs Thora Magney and Esha Lakita Hickson (“Plaintiffs”) seek final approval of a non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount of \$3,095,000.00. The Class and Representative Action Settlement Agreement (“Settlement”) provides that the deductions will be made from the Gross Settlement Amount:

1. Attorneys’ fees in the amount of up to \$1,083,250.00;
2. Litigation costs in the amount of up to \$40,000.00;
3. Class Representatives Service Payments of up to \$10,000.00 each Plaintiff;
4. Settlement administration expenses of up to \$25,000.00; and
5. Civil penalties in the amount of \$160,000.00 for claims under the Private Attorneys’ General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), 75% of which (\$120,000.00) will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA), and 25% of which (\$40,000.00) will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. *See* Settlement § 8; *see also* Declaration of Jarrod Salinas (“Salinas Decl.”), at ¶ 14.

After all deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount will be distributed to 3,762 Class Members as of the filing of this Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (the “Motion”) (“Participating Class Members” or “Settlement Class Member”) based on the number of weeks worked during the Class Period. Salinas Decl. at ¶¶ 11, 12.

The proposed Settlement is a product of diligent efforts, litigation, arm’s length negotiations, and informal discovery that resulted in the best possible outcome for the Class. By resolving this matter now, Class Members will receive a guaranteed recovery without risk of nonpayment, delay, or an adverse judgment at trial.

There are no objections to the Settlement and one (1) request for exclusion. *Id.* at ¶¶ 8-10. The Participating Class Members will receive an average settlement payment of \$474.42, with the highest payout reaching \$1,873.91. Salinas Decl. at ¶ 13. Aggrieved Employees will receive an average settlement payment of \$18.71, with the highest payout reaching \$37.96. *Id.* at ¶ 14. Plaintiff Magney’s estimated Individual Class Payment and her Individual PAGA

1 Payment totals \$387.48. *Id.* at ¶¶ 13, 14. Plaintiff Hickson’s estimated Individual Class Payment
2 and her Individual PAGA Payment totals \$198.13. *Id.* at ¶¶ 13, 14. In light of the Class’s
3 favorable response, and the facts and law set forth below as well as in the motion for preliminary
4 approval, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court now enter an Order: (1) granting final
5 approval of the Settlement; (2) entering final judgment; (3) requiring distribution of individual
6 settlement shares to Participating Class Members; and (4) approving payments for attorneys’
7 fees, litigation costs, the Class Representatives Service Payments, Settlement Administration
8 Expenses, and civil penalties under PAGA.

9 **II. THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL**

10 In deciding whether to grant final approval of a class action settlement, California courts
11 consider whether the settlement is “fair, adequate, and reasonable.” *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*,
12 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996). In evaluating whether a settlement is fair, adequate, and
13 reasonable, courts evaluate the following factors: (1) the strength of the plaintiff’s case; (2) the
14 risk, expense, complexity and duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class
15 action status through trial; (4) the amount offered in settlement; (5) the extent of discovery
16 completed and the stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7) the
17 presence of a governmental participant; and (8) the reaction of class members to the proposed
18 settlement. *Id.*

19 **A. A Presumption of Fairness Exists**

20 While the burden is on the proponent to demonstrate that a proposed settlement is fair,
21 adequate, and reasonable, “a presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached
22 through arm’s length bargaining; (2) investigation is sufficient to allow counsel and the court
23 to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of
24 objectors is small.” *Id.* at 1802.

25 At preliminary approval, Plaintiffs presented evidence that this Settlement is entitled to
26 a presumption of fairness because: (1) it was reached through arm’s length bargaining with the
27 assistance of an experienced mediator; (2) Plaintiffs conducted a thorough investigation through
28 informal discovery and an analysis of Class Members’ time and payroll records; and (3)

1 Plaintiffs’ Counsel is experienced in similar litigation. *See* Declaration of John G. Yslas in
2 Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Yslas
3 MPA Decl.”) filed March 21, 2025 at ¶¶ 7, 11-16, 25-37; *see also* Declaration of Enoch J. Kim
4 in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Kim
5 MPA Decl.”) filed on March 21, 2025 at ¶¶ 6-7, 12-19. One (1) of the Class Members have
6 opted out and none have objected. *See* Salinas Decl. at ¶¶ 8-10. Therefore, the Court can
7 confidently conclude that a presumption of fairness exists.

8 **B. The Strength of Plaintiffs’ Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and**
9 **Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial**

10 Courts are not required to ensure that a settlement maximizes the value of released claims
11 with mathematical precision. “[T]he test is not the maximum amount plaintiffs might have
12 obtained at trial on the complaint, but rather whether the settlement is reasonable under all of
13 the circumstances.” *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 250 (2001),
14 disapproved of on other grounds by *Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.*, 4 Cal.5th 260,
15 269-270 (2018); *see also 7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.*, 85
16 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1150 (2000) (“the merits of the underlying class claims are not a basis for
17 upsetting the settlement of a class action; the operative word is ‘settlement.’”). The relevant
18 circumstances include the strengths and weaknesses of plaintiffs’ claims and the risks they faced
19 in litigation. *7-Eleven*, 85 Cal.App.4th at 1146.

20 Here, Plaintiffs presented sufficient information at preliminary approval regarding the
21 number of class members and an estimate of the maximum value of each of the claims alleged.
22 *See* Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶¶ 16-24. Plaintiffs have also described in detail the risks the Class
23 faced in litigation and the strengths and weaknesses of each of the claims. *See id.* Plaintiffs
24 noted potential difficulties in obtaining class certification and succeeding on the merits at trial.
25 *See id.* The factual record here is sufficiently developed to allow the Court to independently
26 satisfy itself “that the consideration being received for the release of the class members’ claims
27 is reasonable in light of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and the risks of the particular
28 litigation.” *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles*, 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 410

(2010).

C. The Amount Offered in Settlement

The Settlement provides a \$3,095,000.00 Gross Settlement Amount (“GSA”) to be distributed among the 3,762 Class Members who did not opt out as of the date of this filing. Salinas Decl. at ¶¶ 5, 8-11. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees and costs, Plaintiffs’ Class Representatives Service Payments, and Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions (“Phoenix”) for its administration of the Class Notice and settlement funds. *Id.* at ¶ 12. The Settlement also allocates \$160,000.00 from the Gross Settlement Amount to civil penalties under PAGA. *See* Settlement at § 8; *see also* Salinas Decl. ¶¶ 12, 14. After all deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount will be \$1,784,753.71, which will be distributed to Participating Class Members according to the number of weeks they worked for Defendant during the Class Period. *See* Settlement at § 5; *see also* Salinas Decl. ¶¶ 12, 13.

The Settlement Administrator has calculated a total of 244,500 workweeks in the Class Period. Salinas Decl. at ¶ 11. As a result, the average recovery for Participating Class Members is \$474.42, and the highest payout is \$1,873.91. *Id.* at ¶ 13. Weighing the potential value of the class claims against the risk and expense of trial, the Settlement provides sufficient relief in light of the potential risks associated with seeking a class judgment.

D. The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings

Class Counsel sufficiently investigated the alleged claims, applicable law, and potential defenses. *See* Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 13; *see also* Kim MPA Decl. at ¶ 7. Specifically, Class Counsel assessed the value of the claims using data and documents provided by Defendants in informal discovery, which included policy documents and timekeeping and payroll records. *See* Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 13. Following a complete analysis of this information, the Parties attended mediation on October 21, 2024 with an experienced mediator. Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 7; *see also* Kim MPA Decl. at ¶ 6. The Parties were able to reach an agreement and spent the next several months negotiating the terms of the Settlement. Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶¶ 7, 11; *see also* Kim MPA Decl. at ¶ 6.

1 **E. The Experience and Views of Counsel**

2 Plaintiffs are represented by Wilshire Law Firm, PLC and D.Law, Inc. Declaration of
3 John G. Yslas in Support of Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement
4 (“Yslas MFA Decl.”) at ¶ 3; Declaration of Enoch J. Kim in Support of Motion for Final
5 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Kim MFA Decl.”) at ¶ 1. Class
6 Counsel prosecute wage and hour cases, including class and representative actions. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4,
7 5. Class Counsel has litigated many wage and hour cases and have successfully resolved cases
8 involving similar issues presented in this matter. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶¶ 4-17; Kim MPA Decl.
9 at ¶¶ 12-19. Class Counsel has negotiated a settlement here that they believe is fair, reasonable,
10 and adequate based on their prior experience litigating these types of cases. Yslas MFA Decl.
11 at ¶ 22.

12 **F. The Presence of a Government Participant**

13 The LWDA has received the required notice of this Settlement. Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶
14 12; *see also* Supplemental Declaration of Antonia McKee in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for
15 Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“McKee Suppl. MPA Decl.”) at
16 ¶ 19. On January 30, 2024, former named Plaintiff Brianna Romero provided notice to the
17 LWDA of her intention to file a PAGA claim. Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 3. On March 14, 2024,
18 Plaintiff Esha Hickson provided notice to the LWDA of her intention to file a PAGA claim.
19 Yslas MPA Decl. at ¶ 4; Kim MPA Decl. at ¶ 3. The Settlement provides for the payment of
20 \$160,000.00 in civil penalties, 75% of which (\$120,000.00) will be paid to the LWDA, and 25%
21 of which (\$40,000.00) will be paid to PAGA Members based on the number of pay periods
22 worked during the PAGA Period. *See* Salinas Decl. at ¶ 14; *see also* Settlement at § 8. Plaintiffs
23 submitted a copy of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement to the LWDA. Yslas
24 MPA Decl. at ¶ 12, Exhibit 2; McKee Suppl. MPA Decl. at ¶ 19, Exhibit 4. The LWDA has not
25 responded to or objected to the Settlement. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶ 23.

26 **G. The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement**

27 Class Members’ reaction to the Settlement has been favorable. A court may properly
28 infer that a class action settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate when few class members

1 object to or opt out of it. *Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc.*, 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 51 (2000).

2 When the Court granted preliminary approval, it also approved the method of providing
3 notice to Class Members. Following a search of the National Change of Address database,
4 Phoenix mailed the Class Notice to all Class Members on July 25, 2025. Salinas Decl. at ¶¶ 4,
5 5. The Class Notice informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, the amount of their
6 individual settlements and how those amounts were calculated, their right to either participate
7 in the Settlement, opt out of it, object to it, or dispute the amount of their individual settlement
8 payment, the procedures and deadlines to submit an opt out, objection, or dispute, and the date,
9 time, and place of the hearing on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval and instructions to be
10 heard at the hearing. *Id.* at ¶ 5, Exhibit A. Here, in response to the Class Notice, one (1) Class
11 Member opted out, and none objected as of the date of the filing of this Motion. *Id.* at ¶¶ 8, 9.
12 Class Members’ favorable response to the Settlement further supports final approval.

13 **III. THE REQUESTED FEE AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE**
14 **APPROVED**

15 There are two primary methods of determining a reasonable attorney fee in the context
16 of class action litigation. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 489 (2016). The
17 percentage-of-recovery method calculates the fee as a percentage of a common fund recovered
18 on behalf of the class. *Id.* The lodestar method calculates the fee by multiplying the number of
19 hours reasonably expended by counsel by a reasonable hourly rate, which amount then may be
20 adjusted based on other factors. *Id.* In *Laffitte*, the California Supreme Court held that trial
21 courts have the discretion to choose between the two calculation methods. *Id.* at 504. Trial courts
22 also have the discretion to blend the two fee calculation methods, using one method to “cross-
23 check” the reasonableness of the other’s result, but a cross-check is not required. *Id.* 506.

24 **A. The Requested Fee Award is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Percentage-**
25 **of-Recovery Method**

26 The ultimate purpose of the percentage-of-recovery method is to “spread the attorney fee
27 among all the beneficiaries of the fund.” *Id.* at 503. The California Supreme Court recognized
28 that the percentage-of-recovery method has many advantages, “including relative ease of

1 calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better approximation of
2 market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement is provides counsel to seek an
3 early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging the litigation [citation] . . .” *Id.*

4 The requested fee award (35% of the GSA) is consistent with the average fee award in
5 class actions. *See, e.g., Roos v. Honeywell Int’l, Inc.*, 241 Cal.App.4th 1472 (2015) (fee award
6 of 37.5% was not an abuse of discretion), disapproved of on other grounds by *Hernandez v.*
7 *Restoration Hardware, Inc.*, 4 Cal.5th 260, 287 (2018); *Wren v. RGIS Inventory Specialists*, No.
8 C–06–05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826, at *29 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011) (approving fee award of
9 42%); *Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.*, No. 08–CV–821–IEG, 2010 WL 2196104, at *8
10 (S.D. Cal. June 1, 2010) (approving fee award of one-third and noting that the typical fees
11 awarded in wage and hour class action cases ranges from 33.33% to 40%). Therefore, the
12 percentage-of-recovery method should be utilized to approve the requested fee.

13 **B. A Lodestar Cross-Check Confirms the Reasonableness of the Requested Fee**

14 Although *Laffitte* makes clear that a lodestar cross-check is not required, Class Counsel’s
15 lodestar supports the reasonableness of the requested fee. The lodestar is determined by
16 multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by the reasonable hourly rate. *PLCM*
17 *Group, Inc. v. Drexler*, 22 Cal.4th 1084, 1095 (2000). The lodestar figure may then be adjusted,
18 based on consideration of factors specific to the case, in order to fix the fee at the fair market
19 value for the legal services provided.” *Id.* The factors that can be considered include “the nature
20 of the litigation, its difficulty, the amount involved, the skill required in its handling, the skill
21 employed, the attention given, the success or failure, and other circumstances in the case.”
22 *Melnyk v. Robledo*, 64 Cal.App.3d 618, 623-624 (1976) (citations omitted). Additionally, Courts
23 utilize “multipliers” to account for the risk of taking on cases where there is no guarantee of
24 recovery, uncertainties as the amount that will be recovered, uncertainty as to the cost of
25 litigating the case (both in effort and expenses), and uncertainty about how much time will pass
26 before the recovery is obtained. *Ketchum v. Moses*, 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-33 (2001); see also
27 *Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal. 3d 25, 48-49 (1977) (approving the adjustment of the lodestar figure
28 based on factors specific to the case to ensure fair market value for legal services provided on

1 a contingency basis). Application of that rule is particularly appropriate where the case is
2 brought to redress important rights of vulnerable persons. *Ketchum*, 24 Cal.4th at 1133.

3 Generally, “[m]ultipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even higher.” *Wershba v. Apple*
4 *Computers, Inc.*, 91 Cal.App.4th at p. 255 (2001); *see also Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing*
5 *Cases*, 171 Cal. App. 4th 495, 512 (2009) (applying a 2.52 multiplier on a cross-check in an
6 antitrust class action); *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal. App. 4th, 60 (2008) (applying a 2.5
7 multiplier on a lodestar cross-check); *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043, 1051 n.6 (9th
8 Cir. 2002) (“most” common fund cases apply a multiplier of 1.0-4.0); *Laffitte v. Robert Half*
9 *Int’l*, 231 Cal. App. 4th 860, 881-82 (2004) (affirming a 2.13 multiplier after finding that “2 to
10 4” is a reasonable range for multipliers on a cross-check). Here, the application of a modest 2.41
11 multiplier supports Class Counsels’ fee request of \$1,083,250.00. Yslas MFA Decl., ¶¶ 19-20.

12 The risk factors present in this case favor the application of a 2.41 multiplier. *Id.* at ¶ 20.
13 To begin, Class Counsel have singularly assumed the risk and costs of litigation purely on a
14 contingency basis. *Id.* And, while Plaintiffs are confident in the merits of their claims, a
15 legitimate controversy exists as to each cause of action posing an actual risk that Plaintiffs may
16 not succeed at class certification and/or trial. Yslas MFA Decl., ¶ 20. Any of these obstacles
17 could have prevented recovery completely, meaning Class Counsel would have been left with
18 no compensation for all the time and money invested in litigating this case. *Id.* Despite these
19 risks, Class Counsel took this case on a contingency basis so that Class Members (a particularly
20 vulnerable group of hourly paid workers) could be compensated for their unpaid wages. *Id.*
21 Consequently, Class Counsel was precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases which
22 could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain. *Id.* Moreover, Class Counsel’s
23 hourly rates are comparable to those charged by other class action counsel. Yslas MFA Decl. at
24 ¶ 17; Kim MFA Decl. at ¶¶ 7-25. The total hours expended on this action were reasonable and
25 in line with comparable cases. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶ 17. Class Counsel spent 493.4 hours in
26 prosecuting this action, which were divided among the attorneys working on this case according
27 to skill level. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶¶ 17-20; Kim MFA Decl. at ¶¶ 7-31. Multiplying the total
28 hours expended by Class Counsel by their reasonable hourly rates yields a lodestar of

1 \$448,165.50. Yslas MFA Decl. at ¶¶ 17-20; Kim MFA Decl. at ¶¶ 7-31. The hours expended by
2 each attorney were reasonable and not duplicative and reflect the extensive investigation and
3 analysis that was required to achieve this Settlement. *Id.*; *Id.*

4 Considered against the risks of continued litigation, and the importance of advocating
5 for employment rights and a speedy recovery, the relief provided under the Settlement
6 represents a very strong result for the Class. Class Counsel's fee request is fair and reasonable
7 and should be approved. Accordingly, Class Counsel respectfully requests the Court approve
8 their \$1,083,250.00 fee request.

9 **IV. THE REQUESTED COST AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE**
10 **APPROVED**

11 The Settlement permits Class Counsel to seek reimbursement of litigation costs in an
12 amount up to \$40,000.00. The actual costs incurred are \$21,996.29, as such Class Counsel is
13 seeking reimbursement of \$21,996.29. *Id.* at ¶ 20, Exhibit 1. Since Class Counsel's costs do not
14 exceed the maximum of \$40,000.00, the remaining \$18,003.71 will revert to the Net Settlement
15 Amount. *Id.* These costs were reasonable and necessary to prosecute this case and obtain the
16 results achieved. *Id.*

17 **V. THE REQUESTED CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE PAYMENT IS**
18 **REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED**

19 Plaintiffs also request that they be awarded service payments of \$10,000.00 each for their
20 role in obtaining the Settlement. In evaluating a service payment, the Court may consider: "(1)
21 the risk, both financial and otherwise, the class representative faced in bringing the suit; (2) the
22 notoriety and personal difficulties encountered by the class representative; (3) the amount of
23 time and effort spent by the class representative; (4) the duration of the litigation; and (5) the
24 personal benefit received by the class representative as a result of the litigation." *Golba v. Dick's*
25 *Sporting Goods, Inc.*, 238 Cal.App.4th 1251, 1272 (2015); *Clark v. American Residential*
26 *Services, LLC*, 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804 (2009).

27 Here, Plaintiffs provided a declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary
28 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and a declaration in support of Plaintiffs'

1 Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement detailing the risk they faced
2 in bringing the suit, the notoriety and personal difficulties they encountered, the amount of time
3 and effort they spent on this litigation, the duration of this litigation, and the personal benefit
4 they will receive as a result of the litigation. *See generally* Declaration of Thora Magney in
5 Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed on
6 March 21, 2025, Declaration of Esha Hickson in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval
7 of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed on March 21, 2025 and re-filed concurrently
8 herewith, and Declaration of Plaintiff Thora Magney in Support of Motion for Final Approval
9 of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed concurrently herewith. Plaintiffs should be
10 adequately compensated for their role in obtaining in this Settlement.

11 Additionally, no Class Members objected to the amount of additional compensation
12 sought by Plaintiffs. As such, the award is reasonable in light of the substantial benefits
13 Plaintiffs conferred upon the settlement class.

14 **VI. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND**
15 **SHOULD BE APPROVED**

16 The Parties agreed to hire Phoenix as the Settlement Administrator in this case and the
17 Court approved this choice at preliminary approval. The Settlement Administrator was
18 responsible for updating Class Members' mailing addresses, mailing the Class Notice to each
19 Class Member, responding to Class Member questions, providing weekly status reports, and
20 providing a declaration as to the results of the mailing. *See* Salinas Decl. at ¶ 2. Following final
21 approval, Phoenix's duties will continue in order to calculate and to mail the settlement
22 payments to Class Members, disburse other payments as ordered by the Court, and perform such
23 other duties described in the Settlement. *Id.* The requested amount of \$25,000.00 for services
24 rendered and to be rendered is therefore fair and reasonable.

25 **VII. CONCLUSION**

26 Based on the foregoing, Class Counsel respectfully requests that the Court grant final
27 approval of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement, approve Class Counsel attorneys' fees in
28 the amount of \$1,083,250.00 and reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of \$21,996.29,

1 the Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of \$10,000.00, civil penalties under
2 PAGA in the amount of \$160,000.00, and \$25,000.00 to Phoenix for its settlement
3 administration expenses.

4
5 Dated: November 13, 2025

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

6 By: *Lisa B. Iturriaga*
7 Lisa B. Iturriaga
8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28