John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Arrash T. Fattahi (SBN 333676)
arrash.fattahi@wilshirelawfirm.com
Arman A. Salehi (SBN 351112)
arman.salehi@wilshirelawfirm.com
Trenten N. Bilodeaux (SBN 332692)
trenten.bilodeaux@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

EVAN ROMER, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SNAP ONE, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24CV455135; Related Case No.: 25CV460211

[Assigned for All Purposes to the Honorable Theodore C. Zayner, Dept. 19]

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Final Approval Hearing:
Date: December 16, 2026
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Dept.: 19

Action Filed: December 27, 2024

TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on December 16, 2026, at 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in Department 19 of the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, located at Old Courthouse, 161 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Plaintiff Evan Romer ("Plaintiff") will and hereby does move this Court for an Order:

1. Granting final approval of the proposed Settlement Agreement and entering judgment thereon, which resolves both this Action and the related PAGA Action (Case No. 25CV460211);
2. Awarding Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the amount of $40,000.00 and reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of $18,539.23;
3. Awarding Plaintiff a Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of $10,000.00;
4. Awarding $4,750.00 to Phoenix Class Action Administration ("Phoenix") for its settlement administration expenses; and
5. Approving allocation of $5,000.00 as civil penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), 65% of which ($3,250.00) will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and 35% of which ($1,750.00) will be distributed to PAGA Members based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period.

This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Arrash T. Fattahi, the Declaration of Connor Tevenan, on all records and documents on file, together with such oral and documentary evidence that may be presented at the hearing on this matter.

/ / /

/ / /

[*Signature on the following page*]

Dated: November 13, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

By: _____

John G. Yslas
Arrash T. Fattahi
Arman A. Salehi
Trenten N. Bilodeaux
Attorneys for Plaintiff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 6

II. THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL 7

A. A Presumption of Fairness Exists 7

B. The Strength of Plaintiff's Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial 8

C. The Amount Offered in Settlement 9

D. The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings 9

E. The Experience and Views of Counsel 10

F. The Presence of a Government Participant 10

G. The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement 11

III. THE REQUESTED FEE AWARD IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED 12

A. The Requested Fee Award is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Percentage-of-Recovery Method 12

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

C. Class Counsel's Rates Are Similar to Those Approved by California Courts in Comparable Cases. 15

IV. THE REQUESTED LITIGATION EXPENSES PAYMENT IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED 16

V. THE REQUESTED CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE PAYMENT IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED 16

VI. THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED 17

VII. CONCLUSION 18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp., 85 Cal.App.4th 1135 (2000) 8

Bronshteyn v. State of California, LASC No. 19SMCV00057 (2023) 15

Chavez v. Netflix, Inc., 162 Cal.App.4th 43 (2008) 13

Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC, 175 Cal.App.4th 785 (2009) 16

Dunk v. Ford Motor Co., 48 Cal.App.4th 1794 (1996) 7

Golba v. Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc., 238 Cal.App.4th 1251 (2015) 16

Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc., 4 Cal.5th 260 (2018) 8, 13

Ketchum v. Moses, 24 Cal.4th 1122 (2001) 13

Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc., 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016) 12, 13

Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc., 231 Cal.App.4th 860 (2014) 14

Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc., 82 Cal.App.4th 19 (2000) 11

Melnyk v. Robledo, 64 Cal.App.3d 618 (1976) 13

Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles, 186 Cal.App.4th 399 (2010) 9

PLCM Group, Inc. v. Drexler, 22 Cal.4th 1084 (2000) 13

Roos v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc., 241 Cal.App.4th 1472 (2015) 12

Serrano v. Priest, 20 Cal.3d 25 (1977) 13

Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co., No. 08-CV-821-IEG, 2010 WL 2196104 (S.D. Cal. June 1, 2010) 13

Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases, 171 Cal.App.4th 495 (2009) 13

Tran v. Golden State FC LLC, LASC No. BC699931 (2022) 15

Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp., 290 F.3d 1043 (9th Cir. 2002) 14

Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc., 91 Cal.App.4th 224 (2001) 8, 13

Wren v. RGIS Inventory Specialists, No. C-06-05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011) 13

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Evan Romer ("Plaintiff") seeks final approval of a non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount of $120,000.00. The Amended Joint Stipulation of Settlement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement"), which resolves both this Action and Plaintiff's related representative action, Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 25CV460211 (the "PAGA Action"), provides that the deductions will be made from the Gross Settlement Amount as follows:

1. Attorneys' fees up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount;
2. Litigation costs up to $20,000.00 (Plaintiff requests $18,539.23);
3. A Class Representative Service Payment up to $10,000.00;
4. Settlement administration expenses up to $4,750.00; and
5. Civil penalties in the amount of $5,000.00 for claims under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), 65% of which ($3,250.00) will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), and 35% of which ($1,750.00) will be distributed to PAGA Members based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. *See* Settlement §§ 3.2.5, 3.2.5.1; *see also* Declaration of Connor Tevenan ("Tevenan Decl.") at ¶ 14.

After all deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount will be distributed to 24 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. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 11.

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.

As of the filing of this Motion, there have been no objections to the Settlement and no requests for exclusion. Tevenan Decl. at ¶¶ 8-9. Phoenix received one dispute regarding the number of Workweeks credited to a Class Member. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 10. Participating Class

Members will receive an estimated average Individual Class Payment of $1,737.95, with the highest estimated Individual Class Payment being $4,073.16. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 13. The 19 PAGA Members will receive an estimated average Individual PAGA Payment of $92.11, with the highest estimated Individual PAGA Payment being $125.69, and the lowest estimated Individual PAGA Payment being $4.83. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 14. In light of the favorable response from the Class, and the facts and law set forth below as well as in the motion for preliminary approval, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court now enter an Order: (1) granting final approval of the Settlement; (2) entering final judgment; (3) requiring distribution of individual settlement shares to participating Class Members; and (4) approving payments for Class Counsel Fees, Class Counsel Expenses, the Class Representative Service Payment, the Administrator's costs, and civil penalties under PAGA.

II. THE SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL

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

A. A Presumption of Fairness Exists

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

At preliminary approval, Plaintiff presented evidence that this Settlement is entitled to a

presumption of fairness because: (1) it was reached through arm's length bargaining with the assistance of an experienced mediator; (2) Plaintiff conducted a thorough investigation through informal discovery and an analysis of Class Members' time data and payroll records and policy documents pertaining to Plaintiff's claims; and (3) Class Counsel is experienced in similar litigation. *See* Declaration of Arrash T. Fattahi in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Fattahi MPA Decl.") filed March 2, 2026, at ¶¶ 7-9, 39-52. As of the filing of this Motion, no Class Members have opted out and none have objected. *See* Tevenan Decl. at ¶¶ 8-9. Therefore, the Court can confidently conclude that a presumption of fairness exists.

B. The Strength of Plaintiff's Claims, and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation as a Class Action Through Trial

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

Here, Plaintiff presented sufficient information at preliminary approval regarding the number of Class Members and an estimate of the maximum value of each of the claims alleged. *See* Fattahi MPA Decl. at ¶¶ 16-28. Plaintiff has also described in detail the risks the Class faced in litigation and the strengths and weaknesses of each of the claims. *See id.* Defendant denied Plaintiff's allegations, and Plaintiff noted potential difficulties in obtaining class certification and succeeding on the merits at trial. *See id*. The factual record here is sufficiently developed to allow the Court to independently satisfy itself "that the consideration being received for the

release of the class members' claims is reasonable in light of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and the risks of the particular 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 for a $120,000.00 Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") to be distributed among the 24 Class Members who did not opt out as of the date of this filing. Tevenan Decl. at ¶¶ 11-12. The GSA will be used to pay Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and litigation costs, Plaintiff's Class Representative Service Payment, and the fees and expenses of Phoenix Class Action Administration ("Phoenix") for its administration of the Class Notice and settlement funds. *Id*. at ¶ 12. The Settlement also allocates $5,000.00 from the GSA to civil penalties under PAGA. *See* Settlement Agreement at § 3.2.5; *see also* Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 12. After all deductions are made, the Net Settlement Amount available to Participating Class Members for their Individual Class Payments is estimated to be $41,710.77, which will be distributed to Participating Class Members according to the number of Workweeks they worked for Defendant during the Class Period. *See* Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 12; Settlement Agreement at § 3.2.4. Defendant will separately pay the employer-side payroll taxes, which are not deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 15; Settlement Agreement at § 3.1. Funds from any Individual Class Payment or Individual PAGA Payment checks that remain uncashed after the void date will be transmitted to the Court-approved cy pres recipient, Kids In Need of Defense ("KIND"). Settlement Agreement at § 4.4.3.

The Administrator has calculated a total of 2,130 Workweeks in the Class Period. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 11. As a result, the estimated average Individual Class Payment for Participating Class Members is $1,737.95, the highest estimated Individual Class Payment is $4,073.16, and the lowest estimated Individual Class Payment is $39.17. *Id*. at ¶ 13. Weighing the potential value of the class claims against the risk and expense of trial, the Settlement provides substantial 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

Plaintiff filed this Action on December 27, 2024, and filed the related PAGA Action on

March 3, 2025. Fattahi MPA Decl. at ¶¶ 4-5. On March 20, 2025, Defendant filed Notices of Related Cases in both actions. *Id.* at ¶ 6. Class Counsel sufficiently investigated the alleged claims, applicable law, and potential defenses. *See* Fattahi MPA Decl. at ¶¶ 7-8. Specifically, Class Counsel assessed the value of the claims using data and documents provided by Defendant in informal discovery, which included policy documents and timekeeping and payroll records. *Id*. Following a complete analysis of this information, the Parties attended mediation on July 9, 2025, with an experienced mediator. *Id.* at ¶ 9. The Parties spent the next several months negotiating the terms of the Settlement, which was finalized in February of 2026. *Id.* at ¶ 10. Plaintiff filed the Motion for Preliminary Approval on March 2, 2026. At the initial hearing on March 18, 2026, the Court continued the motion to April 15, 2026, and directed the Parties to designate a cy pres recipient and to make certain modifications to the Class Notice. On April 3, 2026, Plaintiff filed the Declaration of Lisa B. Iturriaga in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Iturriaga PA Decl."), attaching the fully executed Amended Joint Stipulation of Settlement, which designates KIND as the cy pres recipient, and the amended Class Notice. Iturriaga PA Decl. at ¶¶ 2-9, Exhibits 1-2. On April 15, 2026, the Court granted preliminary approval, and on April 27, 2026, the Court entered its Second Revised Order Granting Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order").

E. The Experience and Views of Counsel

Plaintiff is represented by Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. Declaration of Arrash T. Fattahi in Support of Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Fattahi MFA Decl.") at ¶ 3. Class Counsel prosecutes wage and hour cases, including class and representative actions. *Id*. at ¶¶ 4, 5. Class Counsel has litigated many wage and hour cases and has successfully resolved cases involving similar issues presented in this matter. *Id*. at ¶¶ 4-17. Class Counsel has negotiated a settlement here that they believe is fair, reasonable, and adequate based on Class Counsel's prior experience litigating these types of cases. *Id*. at ¶ 26.

F. The Presence of a Government Participant

The LWDA has received the required notice of this Settlement. On December 27, 2024,

Plaintiff provided notice to the LWDA of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support. Fattahi MPA Decl. at ¶ 4. The Settlement provides for the payment of $5,000.00 in civil penalties, 65% of which ($3,250.00) will be paid to the LWDA, and 35% of which ($1,750.00) will be paid to PAGA Members based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. *See* Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 14; *see also* Settlement Agreement at §§ 3.2.5, 3.2.5.1. Class Counsel submitted the proposed Settlement to the LWDA before filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Fattahi MPA Decl. at ¶ 11, Exhibit 3. Plaintiff also submitted the Amended Joint Stipulation of Settlement and amended Class Notice to the LWDA on April 3, 2026. Iturriaga PA Decl. at ¶ 10, Exhibit 3. The LWDA has not responded to or objected to the Settlement. Fattahi MFA Decl. at ¶ 27.

G. The Reaction of Class Members to the Proposed Settlement

Class Members' reaction to the Settlement has been favorable. A court may properly infer that a class action settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate when few class members object to or opt out of it. *Lealo v. Beneficial California, Inc.*, 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 51 (2000).

When the Court granted preliminary approval, it also approved the method of providing notice to Class Members. Following a search of the National Change of Address database, Phoenix mailed the Class Notice to all 24 Class Members by first-class U.S. mail on May 19, 2026. Tevenan Decl. at ¶¶ 4-5. The Class Notice informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, the amount of their individual settlements and how those amounts were calculated, their right to either participate in the Settlement, opt out of it, object to it, or dispute the amount of their individual settlement payment, the procedures and deadlines to submit an opt out, objection, or dispute, and the date, time, and place of the hearing on Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval and instructions to be heard at the hearing. *Id.* at Exhibit A. None of the Class Notices were returned to Phoenix or remain undeliverable. Tevenan Decl. at ¶¶ 6-7. In response to the Class Notice, Phoenix has received no requests for exclusion from Class Members, no objections from any Class Members, and one dispute from a Class Member regarding the number of Workweeks credited to him or her, as of the date of the filing of this Motion. The deadline to request exclusion, object, or dispute Workweeks was July 20, 2026. *Id*. at ¶¶ 8-10.

Defendant confirmed that the Class Member was only a remote worker for the dates provided, and the Class Member's Workweeks and Pay Periods were not changed. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 10. Because Phoenix received no Requests for Exclusion, the Exclusion List attached to the Tevenan Declaration as Exhibit C identifies no Class Members. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 8. Class Members' favorable response to the Settlement further supports final approval.

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

There are two (2) primary methods of determining a reasonable attorney fee in the context of class action litigation. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 489 (2016). The percentage-of-recovery method calculates the fee as a percentage of a common fund recovered on behalf of the class. *Id*. The lodestar method calculates the fee by multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by counsel by a reasonable hourly rate, which amount then may be adjusted based on other factors. *Id*. In *Laffitte*, the California Supreme Court held that trial courts have the discretion to choose between the two (2) calculation methods. *Id*. at 504. Trial courts also have the discretion to blend the two (2) fee calculation methods, using one method to "cross-check" the reasonableness of the other's result, but a cross-check is not required. *Id*. at 506.

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

The ultimate purpose of the percentage-of-recovery method is to "spread the attorney fee among all the beneficiaries of the fund." *Id*. at 503. The California Supreme Court recognized that the percentage-of-recovery method has many advantages, "including relative ease of calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better approximation of market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement it provides counsel to seek an early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging the litigation [citation] . . ." *Id*.

The requested fee award of one-third (1/3) of the GSA is consistent with the average fee award in class actions. *See*, *e.g.*, *Roos v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.*, 241 Cal.App.4th 1472 (2015) (fee award of 37.5% was not an abuse of discretion), disapproved of on other grounds by

Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc., 4 Cal.5th 260, 287 (2018); *Wren v. RGIS Inventory Specialists*, No. C-06-05778 JCS, 2011 WL 1230826, at *29 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011) (approving fee award of 42%); *Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.*, No. 08-CV-821-IEG, 2010 WL 2196104, at *8 (S.D. Cal. June 1, 2010) (approving fee award of one-third and noting that the typical fees awarded in wage and hour class action cases ranges from 33.33% to 40%). Therefore, the percentage-of-recovery method should be utilized to approve the requested fee.

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

Although *Laffitte* makes clear that a lodestar cross-check is not required, Class Counsel's lodestar supports the reasonableness of the requested fee. The lodestar is determined by multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by the reasonable hourly rate. *PLCM Group, Inc. v. Drexler*, 22 Cal.4th 1084, 1095 (2000). "The lodestar figure may then be adjusted, based on consideration of factors specific to the case, in order to fix the fee at the fair market value for the legal services provided." *Id*. The factors that can be considered include "the nature of the litigation, its difficulty, the amount involved, the skill required in its handling, the skill employed, the attention given, the success or failure, and other circumstances in the case." *Melnyk v. Robledo*, 64 Cal.App.3d 618, 623-624 (1976) (citations omitted). Additionally, courts utilize "multipliers" to account for the risk of taking on cases where there is no guarantee of recovery, uncertainties as to the amount that will be recovered, uncertainty as to the cost of litigating the case (both in effort and expenses), and uncertainty about how much time will pass before the recovery is obtained. *Ketchum v. Moses*, 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-33 (2001); *see also Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal.3d 25, 48-49 (1977) (approving the adjustment of the lodestar figure based on factors specific to the case to ensure fair market value for legal services provided on a contingency basis). Application of that rule is particularly appropriate where the case is brought to redress important rights of vulnerable persons. *Ketchum*, 24 Cal.4th at 1133.

Generally, "[m]ultipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even higher." *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal.App.4th at p. 255 (2001); *see also Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases*, 171 Cal.App.4th 495, 512 (2009) (applying a 2.52 multiplier on a cross-check in an antitrust class action); *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 60 (2008) (applying a 2.5

multiplier on a lodestar cross-check); *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043, 1051 n.6 (9th Cir. 2002) ("most" common fund cases apply a multiplier of 1.0-4.0); *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.*, 231 Cal.App.4th 860, 881-82 (2014) (affirming a 2.13 multiplier after finding that "2 to 4" is a reasonable range for multipliers on a cross-check).

Consistent with the Court's April 15, 2026 ruling, Class Counsel submits lodestar information, including hourly rates and hours worked, evidence of actual litigation costs incurred, and the Administrator's invoice. Fattahi MFA Decl. at ¶¶ 23, 25, Exhibit 3; Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 16, Exhibit B. The total hours expended on this action by Class Counsel were reasonable and in line with comparable cases. While it is not necessary to substantiate the fee award with a lodestar in this Action, it should be noted that Class Counsel spent approximately 55.7 hours prosecuting this action, which were divided among the attorneys working on this case according to skill level. Fattahi MFA Decl. at ¶ 23. Multiplying the total hours expended by Class Counsel by their reasonable hourly rates yields a lodestar of $42,550.00. *Id*. at ¶ 23. This amount surpasses the requested fee award of $40,000.00, resulting in a negative multiplier of approximately 0.94 ($40,000.00 / $42,550.00). *Id*. at ¶ 24. This amount does not include the time Class Counsel will spend at the Final Approval Hearing and assisting the Settlement Administrator following final approval. *Id*. Class Counsel dedicated significant resources to this case by dividing the tasks required according to skill level. *Id*. The hours expended by each attorney were not duplicative and reflect the extensive investigation and analysis that was required to achieve this Settlement. This time could have been spent on other potentially lucrative cases. *Id*. Class Counsel's lodestar reflects the efficiencies achieved by attorneys experienced in this field. *Id*. Moreover, Class Counsel has singularly assumed the risk and costs of litigation purely on a contingency basis. *Id*. And, while Plaintiff is confident in the merits of his claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each cause of action, posing an actual risk that Plaintiff may not succeed at class certification and/or trial. *Id*. Any of these obstacles could have prevented recovery completely, meaning Class Counsel would have been left with no compensation for all the time and money invested in litigating this case. *Id*. Despite these risks, Class Counsel took this case on a contingency basis so that Class Members (a group of hourly

paid workers) could be compensated for their allegedly unpaid wages. *Id*. Consequently, Class Counsel was precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases which could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain. *Id*.

C. Class Counsel's Rates Are Similar to Those Approved by California Courts in Comparable Cases.

Class Counsel's hourly rates are comparable to those charged by other class action plaintiffs' counsel and the firms defending class actions. Fattahi MFA Decl. at ¶ 19. Class Counsel's rates are well within the range of hourly rates that the Northern California legal marketplace would compensate counsel for similar services accomplishing similar results. *Id*. For example, in *Bronshteyn v. State of California*, Los Angeles County Superior Ct. No. 19SMCV00057, Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Statutory Attorneys' Fees and Costs filed March 30, 2023, an employment action brought by two law firms (Levy, Vinick, Burrell & Hyams LLP and Law Offices of Wendy Musell), the court found that counsel's 2022 hourly rates of $1,100 and $1,000 per hour were reasonable for the plaintiff's five senior attorneys. *Id*. These rates were then augmented by a 1.75 lodestar multiplier and affirmed by the California Court of Appeal. *Id*. The rates requested here are well in line with those found reasonable in *Bronshteyn*. In *Tran v. Golden State FC LLC*, *et al*. (LASC Case No. BC699931), Fee Order filed 4/8/2022, the court found hourly rates of $1,300 per hour reasonable for plaintiff's 32-year attorney and $1,000 per hour reasonable for a 14-year attorney. *Id*.

Likewise, Class Counsel's hourly rates are reasonable when compared to rates charged within the relevant legal marketplace. Fattahi MFA Decl. ¶¶ 20-21, **Exhibits 1, 2**. In light of the foregoing, and considered against the risks of continued litigation, and the importance of advocating for employment rights and a speedy recovery, the relief provided under the Settlement represents a very strong result for the Class Members and PAGA Members. Class Counsel's fee request is fair and reasonable and should be approved. Accordingly, Class Counsel respectfully requests the Court approve their $40,000.00 fee request.

IV. THE REQUESTED LITIGATION EXPENSES PAYMENT IS REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

The Settlement permits Class Counsel to seek reimbursement of litigation costs in an amount up to $20,000.00. The actual costs incurred are $18,239.23. Fattahi MFA Decl. at ¶ 25, **Exhibit 3**. Additionally, Class Counsel anticipates incurring $300.00 in future costs for filing fees and service fees for a total of $18,539.23 in costs. *Id*. Since Class Counsel's costs do not meet the maximum of $20,000.00, the remaining $1,460.77 will revert to the Net Settlement Amount. *Id*. These costs were reasonable and necessary to prosecute this case and obtain the results achieved. *Id*.

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

Plaintiff also requests that he be awarded a Class Representative Service Payment of $10,000.00 for his role in obtaining the Settlement. In evaluating a service payment, the Court may consider: "(1) the risk, both financial and otherwise, the class representative faced in bringing the suit; (2) the notoriety and personal difficulties encountered by the class representative; (3) the amount of time and effort spent by the class representative; (4) the duration of the litigation; and (5) the personal benefit received by the class representative as a result of the litigation." *Golba v. Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.*, 238 Cal.App.4th 1251, 1272 (2015); *Clark v. American Residential Services, LLC*, 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804 (2009).

Here, Plaintiff provided a declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement detailing the risk he faced in bringing the suit, the notoriety and personal difficulties he encountered, the amount of time and effort he spent on this litigation, the duration of this litigation, and the personal benefit he will receive as a result of the litigation. *See generally* Declaration of Evan Romer in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement filed on March 2, 2026. Plaintiff should be adequately compensated for his role in obtaining this Settlement.

Additionally, no Class Members objected to the amount of additional compensation sought by Plaintiff. As such, the award is reasonable in light of the substantial benefits Plaintiff

conferred upon the settlement class.

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

The Parties agreed to hire Phoenix as the Administrator in this case and the Court approved this choice at preliminary approval. The Administrator was responsible for (i) preparing, printing, translating, and mailing the *Court Approved Notice of Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval* ("Notice"); (ii) responding to inquiries from Class Members; (iii) calculating the number of weeks each Class Member worked during the period from December 27, 2020 to December 24, 2024 ("Class Period") and the number of pay periods that each PAGA Member worked during the time period from December 27, 2023 to December 24, 2024 ("PAGA Period"); (iv) determining the validity of letters indicating a request to be excluded from the Class Settlement ("Requests for Exclusion"), written objections to the Class Settlement ("Objections"), and/or dispute regarding the number of Workweeks submitted by Class Members; (v) calculating the Net Settlement Amount and the Individual Settlement Shares to Class Members; (vi) calculating and issuing the Individual Settlement Payments and distributing them to Settlement Class Members and Individual PAGA Payments to Aggrieved Employees; (vii) issuing the payment to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees and costs, Class Representative Service Payment, and the employer/employee payroll taxes to the appropriate taxing authorities; and (viii) such other tasks as set forth in the Settlement Agreement or as the Parties mutually agree or as the Court orders. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 2. The requested amount of $4,750.00 for services rendered and to be rendered is therefore fair and reasonable. Phoenix's costs of $4,750.00 include all costs incurred to date as well as the estimated costs of completing the settlement distribution, and Phoenix's invoice is attached to the Tevenan Declaration as Exhibit B. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 16. Phoenix has performed its notice and administration duties with due diligence and in compliance with its obligations under the Settlement Agreement. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 17. The Tevenan Declaration refers to the Administrator as Phoenix Settlement Administrators, which is the entity identified in the Court's preliminary approval order as Phoenix Class Action Administration. Tevenan Decl. at ¶ 1.

VII. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Class Counsel respectfully requests that the Court grant final approval of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement, approve Class Counsel's attorneys' fees in the amount of $40,000.00 and reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of $18,539.23, the Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of $10,000.00, civil penalties under PAGA in the amount of $5,000.00, and settlement administration costs for Phoenix in the amount of $4,750.00.

Dated: November 13, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

By: _____

John G. Yslas
Arrash T. Fattahi
Arman A. Salehi
Trenten N. Bilodeaux

Attorneys for Plaintiff