JCL LAW FIRM, APC
Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
John L. Nitti (State Bar #330752)
jnitti@jcl-lawfirm.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
shani@zakaylaw.com
Nicole Noursamadi (State Bar #357246)
nicole@zakaylaw.com
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047

LAW OFFICE OF TATIANA HERNANDEZ, P.C.
Tatiana Hernández (SBN 255322)
tatiana@thlawpc.com
315 South Beverly Drive, Suite 504
Beverly Hills, California 90212
Telephone: (213) 909-4248
Facsimile: (310) 388-0639

Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ROSA SOLIS and JOSEPH JOHNSON, individuals, on behalf of themselves, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. 51ST ST. & 8TH AVE. CORP., a New York corporation; LOWES CORONADO HOTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation; LOEW'S HOTELS, INC., a New York corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. 37-2023-00031528-CU-OE-CTL **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT** Date: August 8, 2025 Time: 10:30 a.m. Judge: Hon. Carolyn Caietti Dept.: C-70

TABLE OF CONTENTS

/ / /

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

RULES, CODES, AND STATUTES

SECONDARY SOURCES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs ROSA SOLIS and JOSEPH JOHNSON (hereinafter "Plaintiffs") seek final approval of the Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims ("Agreement")[1], which if approved, would provide valuable monetary relief for 866 Settlement Class Members employed by Defendants 51st St. & 8th Ave. Corp., Lowes Coronado Hotel Corporation, and Loew's Hotels, Inc. (hereinafter "Defendants") during the period from May 19, 2019, to October 7, 2024 ("Class Period").

In an order dated April 4, 2025, this Court preliminarily approved the Agreement and preliminarily certified the Class. Declaration of Sydney Castillo-Johnson ("SCJ Dec.") ¶ 4. On April 25, 2025, the Court-approved Class Notice was mailed to each Class Member via U.S. First Class Mail. Declaration of Stacey Shim ("Apex Dec."), ¶ 7. ***The Class greeted news of the Settlement with 100.00% approval.***[2] There is only one (1) request for exclusion, zero disputes, and zero objections to the Settlement. Apex Dec., ¶¶ 11-13. The high approval by the Class evidences the fairness and reasonableness of the Settlement. SCJ Dec., ¶ 21.

An objective evaluation of the proposed settlement of One Million Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,700,000.00) ("Gross Settlement Amount") confirms that the relief negotiated on behalf of the Settlement Class Members is fair, reasonable, and valuable. The Settlement is a product of informed, adversarial, and non-collusive negotiations, between experienced counsel, and presided over by Hon. Carl J. West (Ret.), a retired jurist and respected mediator of wage and hour class and PAGA actions. After deducting any Court-approved PAGA Payment, Service Awards, Class Counsel Award, and the Settlement Administration Costs, the Net Settlement Amount shall be distributed to Settlement Class Members based on the number of Workweeks they worked while employed by Defendants during the Class Period. SCJ Dec., ¶ 7.

This Settlement provides substantial recovery for Defendants' alleged wage and hour violations. Plaintiffs estimate that the Settlement, if approved, would result in a Net Settlement Amount of approximately $957,343.33. This will result in an average Individual Settlement Payment of **$1,105.48,**

[1] The Agreement is attached as Ex "1" to the Declaration of Sydney Castillo-Johnson ("SCJ Dec.") at ¶ 3. All citations to the Agreement incorporate by this reference a citation to the SCJ Dec., ¶ 3. Further, unless indicated otherwise, capitalized terms used herein have the same meaning as those defined by the Agreement.
[2] Nineteen (19) Notice was deemed undeliverable. Apex Dec. at ¶ 10.

a high payment of **$3,861.95**, and low payment of **$13.99**. Apex Dec., ¶ 16. Additionally, the settlement results in an average Aggrieved Employee Payment of **$33.73,** a high payment of **$64.90**, and low payment of **$1.03**. Apex Dec. ¶ 18.

The relief offered by the Settlement is immediate and is particularly impressive when viewed against the difficulties encountered by plaintiffs pursuing similar wage and hour cases (*see infra).* Indeed, by settling now rather than proceeding to trial, the Class will not have to wait (possibly years) for relief, nor will they have to bear the risks associated with prolonged and uncertain litigation. SCJ Dec., ¶ 8.

As discussed below, the proposed Settlement satisfies all criteria for final settlement approval under California law and falls well within the range of reasonableness. Accordingly, the Class Representatives and Class Counsel respectfully request this Court grant final approval of the Agreement and entry of the proposed Final Approval Order and Judgment. SCJ Dec., ¶ 9.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE LITIGATION

Defendants operate, own and manage hotels in the state of California, including San Diego County, where Plaintiffs worked. Plaintiff Solis was employed by Defendants from May 2012 to approximately June 2022, as a non-exempt employee. Declaration of Rosa Solis ("Solis Dec.") at ¶ 4. Plaintiff Johnson was employed by Defendants from 2018 through April 2024 as a non-exempt employee. Declaration of Joseph Johnson ("Johnson Dec.") at ¶ 4. Plaintiffs allege that they were denied legally compliant meal and rest periods, and minimum wages and overtime during their employment. Throughout their employment, Plaintiffs were subject to Defendants' written policies and procedures contained in, among other documents, "Loews Hotels & Co. Team Member Handbook." SCJ Dec., ¶ 10.

Generally, Plaintiffs claim that Defendants failed to provide compliant meal and rest periods, failed to pay for all time worked, failed to pay overtime, sick pay, and meal period premiums at the correct regular rate of pay, and failed to reimburse employees for all necessary business expenditures. Defendants deny any liability or wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims alleged in the Action, disputes any wages, damages and penalties claimed by the Class Representatives, alleged in the Operative Complaint, and/or alleged in the Class Representative's PAGA notices to the LWDA are owed, and further contend that, for any purpose other than settlement, the Action is not appropriate for class or representative action treatment. Defendants contend, among other things, that at all times they complied with the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders and raised several other significant defenses to Plaintiffs' claims, including but not limited to, facially compliant meal and rest period policies. SCJ Dec., ¶ 11.

On May 19, 2023, Plaintiff Solis served Defendants and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") with a Notice of Violations ("PAGA Notice"). Plaintiff's PAGA Notice set forth the facts and theories supporting Defendants' alleged violations of various provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commissions ("IWC") Wage Order and of her intent to pursue claims under California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Lab. Code Sections 2698 *et seq*. ("PAGA"). SCJ Dec., ¶ 12.

Also on May 19, 2023, Plaintiff Solis filed a class action complaint in the San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00021359-CU-OE-CTL ("Class Action"). The Class Action alleged eight causes of action against Defendants for: (1) Unfair Competition in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et. seq.;* (2) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1; (3) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*; (4) Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order; (5) Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order; (6) Failure to Pay Wages When Due in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, and 203; (7) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements in violation of Cal. Lab Code §226; and (8) Failure to Reimburse for Required Expenses in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802. SCJ Dec., ¶ 13.

On July 25, 2023, Plaintiff Solis filed a separate representative action complaint in the San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00031528-CU-OE-CTL ("Action") alleging a single cause of action for violations of PAGA. SCJ Dec., ¶ 14.

On June 23, 2023, Defendants filed a notice of removal in the Class Action removing the case to the Southern District Court, asserting diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 1332, 1441, and 1446. SCJ Dec., ¶ 15.

On January 11, 2024, the Parties participated in a full day mediation with mediator Steven Rottman, Esq. Mediation concluded without a settlement. Subsequently, the Parties engaged in significant formal discovery in the Class Action and PAGA Action aimed at class certification. On July 26, 2024, the Parties participated in a second full day mediation with retired jurist and respected wage and hour mediator, Hon. Carl J. West (Ret.). The second mediation concluded with a settlement after both sides agreed to a Mediator's proposal which was subsequently memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding. After reaching an agreement in principle, the Parties drafted and negotiated a long-form settlement agreement, which is the subject of the instant motion. SCJ Dec., ¶ 16.

On October 18, 2024, Plaintiff Solis filed a First Amended Complaint for the purpose of adding the claims asserted in the Class Action to the instant Action. On February 21, 2025, the Parties stipulated to allow Plaintiff leave to file a Second Amended Complaint for the purpose of adding Joseph Johnson as an additional Plaintiff. SCJ Dec., ¶ 17.

On March 19, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint to add Plaintiff Johnson as an additional named Plaintiff in the Action. SCJ Dec., ¶ 18.

On April 4, 2025, this Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement. On April 25, 2025, the Settlement Administrator mailed Notice Packets to all 867 Class Members. Apex Dec., ¶ 7. The mailing of the Notice Packets triggered a sixty (60) day Response Deadline for the Class to submit requests for exclusion or objections to the Settlement. The response from the Class to the Settlement was outstanding – 99.88% of the Class Members are participating in the Settlement. SCJ Dec., ¶ 19.

III. THE SETTLEMENT BEFORE THE COURT

The Court preliminarily approved an initial Gross Settlement Amount of One Million Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,700,000.00) based on a total of an estimated 66,257 Workweeks worked by the Class during the Class Period. The Gross Settlement Amount shall be used to satisfy: (1) the Individual Settlement Payments; (2) the Service Awards; (3) the Class Counsel Award; (4) the PAGA Payment; and (5) the Settlement Administration Costs incurred in this action. SCJ Dec., ¶ 20.

Defendants will fund the Settlement by transferring the Gross Settlement Amount into a Qualified

Settlement Fund within sixty (60) days after the final approval order. Agreement, ¶ I(N). The Settlement Administrator shall mail checks for all of the Individual Settlement Payments to the Settlement Class Member no later than fifteen (15) business days after Defendants fund the Gross Settlement Amount. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(7). The Settlement Administrator will calculate Individual Settlement Payments by adding up the total number of Workweeks for all Class Members. The respective Workweeks for each Class Member will then be divided by the total Workweeks for all Class Members, resulting in the Payment Ratio for each Class Member. Each Class Member's Payment Ratio will then be multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to calculate each Class Member's estimated Individual Settlement Payments. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(1). The estimated average Individual Settlement Payment is approximately **$1,105.48** Apex Dec., ¶ 16.

In exchange for the valuable consideration, as of the funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Class Members will release the Released Parties from the Released Class Claims as defined in the Agreement. Agreement, ¶ III(B).

Apex Class Action LLC was appointed as the Settlement Administrator for the Class. The Settlement Administration Costs include those expenses of effectuating and administering the Settlement, i.e., the costs incurred to the Settlement Administrator, the costs of giving notice to the Class, the costs of administering and disbursing the Individual Settlement Payments, and the fees of the Settlement Administrator approved for reimbursement by the court. The Settlement Administration Costs are $10,990.00. Apex Dec., ¶ 19. These expenses shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(12).

Subject to Court approval, Class Counsel shall seek a payment of Class Counsel Award in the amount of $631,666.66, comprised of attorneys' fees of up to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount estimated to be at least $566,666.66 and up to $65,000 for actually incurred litigation expenses. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(10). Class Counsel is to split the fees 37.5% to JCL Law Firm, APC, 37.5% to Zakay Law Group, APLC, and 25% to The Law Office of Tatiana Hernandez. Agreement, ¶ I(G). Plaintiffs have consented in writing to the fee split. Solis Dec., ¶ 17; Johnson Dec., ¶ 17. The Agreement also provides for Service Awards in the amount of $10,000 each Plaintiff, in consideration of their time, risk, and efforts as the Class Representatives on behalf of the Class. Agreement, ¶ I(HH); III(M)(9).

As explained in further detail below, the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable to the class and should be granted final approval. This is evidenced by the high approval of the Settlement by the Class, the absence of any objections to the Settlement and the average Individual Settlement Payment of **$1,105.48**. Apex Dec., ¶¶ 16; SCJ Dec., ¶ 21.

IV. GENERAL STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO JUDICIAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS

Settlements of disputed claims are favored by the courts. *Huens v. Tatum* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 259, 265. In evaluating settlements, the courts have long recognized that compromise is particularly appropriate since such litigation is difficult and notoriously uncertain. *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Fran. v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1151 ("voluntary conciliation and settlement are the preferred means of dispute resolution. This is especially true in complex class action litigation").

"[T]o prevent fraud, collusion or unfairness to the class, the settlement or dismissal of a class action requires court approval." *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 *citing Malibu Outrigger Bd. Of Governors v. Superior Court* (1980) 103 Cal.App.3d 573, 578-579. The court must decide whether the proposed settlement falls within the range of reasonable settlements, considering that settlements are compromises between the parties reflecting subjective, unquantifiable judgments concerning the risks and possible outcomes of litigation. *See also Wershba v. Apple Computer* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 246 (The proposed settlement is not to be judged against a hypothetical or speculative measure of what might have been achieved had plaintiffs prevailed at trial."). In *Wershba*, appellants argued that the settlement was too low given the "clear" liability, however, the Court rejected this argument and held that "the merits of the underlying class claims are not a basis for upsetting the settlement of a class action." *Wershba*, *supra*, at 246; *see also 7-Eleven*, *supra*, at 1150.

In these cases, Courts have repeatedly emphasized that there is a strong initial presumption that the compromise is fair and reasonable. *Wershba*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 245. Courts should not substitute their judgment for that of the parties who negotiated the settlement. *Id.* At 246. The presumption of fairness exists where: (1) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently; (2) the settlement is reached through arm's-length bargaining; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small. *Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801, citing

Newberg & Conte, *Newberg on Class Actions*, (3d ed. 1992) §11.41, pp. 11-91. Here, all of these factors support a presumption of fairness.

The essential evaluation is whether, given the risks of litigation and the range of probable results, the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable, and adequate to all concerned. Here, the facts and circumstances compel the conclusion that the proposed settlement satisfies that standard.

V. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE, AND ADEQUATE

The court must determine whether the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801; *see also Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com'n* (9th Cir. 1982) 688 F. 2d 615, 625. The purpose of the requirement is "the protection of those class members, including the named plaintiffs, whose rights may not have been given due regard by the negotiating parties." *Dunk*, *supra*, at 1801.

The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether the settlement is fair. *Rebney v. Wells Fargo Bank* (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 1117, 1138. "The well-recognized factors that the trial court should consider in evaluating the reasonableness of a class action settlement agreement include 'the strength of plaintiffs' case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and views of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement.' [Citations.]" *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 128; see also *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 408.

The list of factors is not exhaustive and should be tailored to each case. *Dunk*, *supra*, at 1801. Due regard should be given to what is otherwise a private consensual agreement between the parties. *Id.* The inquiry "must be limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment that the agreement is not the product of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion between, the negotiating parties, and that the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned." *Id.* "Ultimately, the [trial] court's determination is nothing more than 'an amalgam of delicate balancing, gross approximations and rough justice.' [Citation omitted.]" *Id.*

These factors are analyzed seriatim below and all support final approval of the class action settlement before this Court.

A. Class Counsel Conducted a Thorough Investigation.

As detailed in the motion for preliminary approval, Class Counsel thoroughly investigated the proposed Class Members' claims, applicable law, and potential defenses. Specifically, Class Counsel assessed the value of the class claims using data and documents provided by Defendants through informal discovery. Class Counsel obtained time, payroll, and policy records, as well as data regarding the number of Class Members, workweeks, and average rate of pay to assess damages before mediation. Class Counsel retained BCG to analyze Defendants' time and payroll data to formulate damage models estimating Defendants' liability exposure. Class Counsel's investigation, research, experience, and damage models informed and guided the mediated negotiations that resulted in this settlement. Accordingly, Class Counsel fully understood the strengths and weaknesses of the class claims before the parties reached a settlement. SCJ Dec., ¶ 22-28.

B. Class Counsel is Experienced in Similar Litigation.

Class Counsel in this matter has extensive class action experience in multiple fields and has represented tens-of-thousands of persons in class actions. Counsel has previously litigated similar wage and hour class actions involving similar claims. Class Counsel has been approved as class counsel in similar wage and hour class actions throughout the State of California. As such, courts throughout California have deemed Class Counsel experienced and knowledgeable in this area of law. Class Counsel has participated in every aspect of the settlement discussions and has concluded the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class. SCJ Dec. ¶¶ 29-33, JCL Dec., ¶¶ 1-9; Declaration of Shani Zakay ("Zakay Dec."), ¶¶ 1-3; Declaration of Tatiana Hernandez ¶¶ 8-13.

C. The Class Responded Positively to the Settlement.

The reaction of the Class unequivocally supports approval of the Settlement. Significantly, after dissemination of the notice to the Class, which provided each Class Member with the terms of the Settlement, including the specific estimated Individual Settlement Payments. To date, only one (1) of the 867 Class Members submitted a request for exclusion. Moreover, there are ***zero*** objections. Stated differently, **99.88%** of the Class chose to participate in the Settlement. SCJ Dec., ¶ 20; Apex Dec., ¶¶ 11-14.

The high approval by the Class strongly supports a finding that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. *See In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. 2000) 80 F.Supp.2d 164, 175 ("If only a small number of objections are received, that fact can be viewed as indicative of the adequacy of the settlement."); *Stoetzner v. U.S. Steel Corp.* (3d. Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 115, 118-119 (29 objections out of 281 member class "strongly favors settlement"); *Laskey v. Int'1 Union* (6th Cir. 1981) 638 F.2d 954 (The fact that 7 out of 109 class members objected to the proposed settlement should be considered when determining fairness of settlement.). Consequently, Class Counsel respectfully requests the Court to follow the high participation rate of the Class and grant final approval of the Settlement.

D. <u>The Gross Settlement Amount is Fair and Reasonable.</u>

The Gross Settlement Amount of One Million Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,700,000.00) in this case is fair and well within the range of reasonableness recognized by California courts. The *Kullar* court acknowledged that "as the court does when it approves a settlement as in good faith under Code of Civil Procedure section 877.6, the court must at least satisfy itself that the class settlement is within the 'ballpark' of reasonableness." *Kullar*, *supra,* at 129; *See Tech-Bilt, Inc. v. Woodward-Clyde & Associates*, 38 Cal.3d 488, 499-500 (1985).)

Here, the Settlement is clearly within the "ballpark" of reasonableness because the Settlement provides a sizeable recovery to the Settlement Class Members and need not necessarily obtain 100 percent of the damages sought to be fair, reasonable, and ultimately, meaningful. *Wershba*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 250. While the Gross Settlement Amount of One Million Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,700,000.00) represents a discount on Defendants' potential exposure if Plaintiffs established liability on all claims and was awarded the full amount of the estimated damages at trial, this compromise is reasonable because (1) the formidable defenses raised by Defendants presented a risk that could award significantly less in damages than Plaintiffs' estimate and (2) any theoretical post-trial recovery may require many more years of litigation, resulting in added fees and costs without any guarantee of recovery for the Class. SCJ Dec., ¶ 34.

As detailed at the time of preliminary approval, the Gross Settlement Amount is fair and reasonable considering the nature and magnitude of the claims being settled and the various potential impediments to recovery. Class Counsel developed varied economic damages models measuring Defendants' liability exposure while accounting for the uncertainties of continued litigation. The various models were informed by Class Counsel's investigation, including the analysis of a significant sample of time and payroll data. Detailed in greater depth during the preliminary approval process, Class Counsel projected a range of Defendants' liability exposure for the claims asserted on behalf of the Class. The Gross Settlement Amount represents approximately 37% of Defendants' *class-wide* liability exposure as estimated by Class Counsel at the time of mediation. SCJ Dec., ¶ 35.

In *Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.,* 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78671, at * 12, the District Court for the Northern District of California granted final approval in a wage and hour misclassification action and found that the total settlement amount representing 10% of the estimated trial award was within the "range of reasonableness." In *Dunleavy v. Nadler (In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.)* (9th Cir. 2000) 213 F.3d 454, 459, the Ninth Circuit approved a settlement representing "roughly one-sixth of the potential recovery." Given the amount of the settlement here as compared to potential value of the claims, particularly the strength of Plaintiffs' action, the settlement is clearly fair and reasonable.[3]

The calculation methodology used to compensate the Settlement Class Members for the alleged damages was negotiated at the time of the Settlement. More importantly, the methodology is fair, objective, and impartial. The calculation methodology is based on the number of Workweeks each Settlement Class Member worked for Defendants during the Class Period. The number of Workweeks for the Settlement Class Member is established through Defendants' data and documented compensation records. The Settlement Administrator is responsible for calculating the Individual Settlement Payments by adding up the total number of Workweeks for all Class Members. The respective Workweeks for each Class Member will then be divided by the total Workweeks for all Class Members, resulting in the Payment Ratio for each Class Member. Each Class Member's Payment Ratio will then be multiplied by

[3] *See also Viceral v. Mistras Grp., Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2016, No. 15-CV-02198) 2016 WL 5907869, at *3, 7 (approving a California wage and hour settlement where the class received 11.6% of the estimated total liability, or approximately $29 per work week); *Leverage v. Traeger Pellet Grills, LLC* (N.D. Cal. June 28, 2017, No. 16-CV-00784) 2017 WL 2797811, at *7 (Approving a California wage and hour settlement where the class received 18% of the estimated total liability); *see also In re Newbridge Networks Sec. Litig.* (D.D.C. Oct. 23, 1998) 1998 WL 765724, at *2 ("Courts have not identified a precise numerical range within which a settlement must fall in order to be deemed reasonable; but an agreement that secures roughly six to twelve percent of a potential trial recovery, while preventing further expenditures and delays and eliminating the risk that no recovery at all will be won, seems to be within the targeted range of reasonableness.").

the Net Settlement Amount to calculate each Class Member's estimated Individual Settlement Payments. Agreement, ¶ III(M)(1). This process establishes an objectively fair and reasonable procedure to compensate the Class. SCJ Dec., ¶ 36.

The settlement also provides significant relief to the Settlement Class Members. After deductions for the Class Counsel Award, Settlement Administration Costs, the PAGA Payment, and the Service Awards, the Net Settlement Amount is currently estimated to be $957,343.33. Apex Dec., ¶ 15. The average settlement payment is approximately $1,105.48, and the highest is approximately $3,861.95. Apex Dec., ¶ 16. This average net recovery is on par with many wage and hour class action settlements approved by California state and federal courts. *See, e.g., Palencia v. 99 Cents Only Stores,* No. 34-2010-00079619 (Sacramento County Super. Ct) (average net recovery of approximately $80); *Fukuchi v. Pizza Hut,* Case No. BC302589 (LA. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately $120); *Contreras v. United Food Group, LLC,* Case No. BC389253 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately $120); *Ressler v. Federated Department Stores, Inc.,* Case No. BC335018 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately $90); *Doty v. Costco Wholesale Corp.,* Case No. CV05-3241 FMC-JWJx (C.D. Cal. May 14, 2007) (average net recovery of approximately $65); *Sorenson v. PetSmart, Inc.,* Case No. 2:06-CV-02674-JAM-DAD (ED. Cal.) (average net recovery of approximately $60); *Lim v. Victoria's Secret Stores, Inc.,* Case No. 04CC00213 (Orange County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately $35); and *Gomez v. Amadeus Salon, Inc.,* Case No. BC392297 (L.A. Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately $20). Additionally, Defendants must separately fund its share of any employer side payroll taxes. Agreement, ¶ III(A)(1).

Clearly the goal of this litigation to obtain redress for the class has been met by this Settlement. Given the amount of the Settlement, the risks of litigation and the arm's length negotiations between experienced counsel, the settlement is fair and reasonable, and is therefore entitled to final approval. SCJ Dec., ¶ 37.

E. <u>The Strength of Plaintiffs' Case and Risks of Continued Litigation</u>

Although Class Counsel believes strongly in Plaintiffs' claims, it would be misguided to ignore the asserted defenses. If successful on any one of its defenses, Defendants could defend the action or, at least, drastically undercut Plaintiffs' claims. SCJ Dec., ¶ 38. As the federal court in *Glass v. UBS*

Fin. Servs., 2007 WL221862 held, where the parties faced uncertainties similar to those in this litigation:

> ***In light of the above-referenced uncertainty in the law, the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation likewise favors the settlement.*** Regardless of how this Court might have ruled on the merits of the legal issues, the losing party likely would have appealed, and the parties would have faced the expense and uncertainty of litigating an appeal. The expense and possible duration of the litigation should be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of [a] settlement.

With respect to the most immediate challenge, i.e., class certification, the risks attendant to the certification of similar wage and hour claims are demonstrated by *Ali v. U.S.A. Cab Ltd.* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 1333, 1341. There, the Court of Appeal affirmed the Trial Court's denial of class certification because employees' declarations attesting to having taken meal and rest breaks demonstrated that individualized inquiries were required to show harm. *See also Campbell v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, (C.D. Cal. 2013) 2013 WL 5302217 at *11-13 (following *Brinker* and denying certification of proposed off-the-clock and rest and meal break classes due to lack of uniform policy); *Brown v. Fed Express Corp.* (C.D. Cal. 2008) 249 F.R.D. 580, 587-88 (denying certification of driver meal and rest period claims based on the predominance of individual issues). SCJ Dec., ¶ 39.

Further, even if a class is certified, liability remains uncertain. The risks attendant to the issue of Defendant's liability in similar wage and hour actions are demonstrated by *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Association* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 1, 31. There, the Court reversed a trial verdict in favor plaintiffs in a wage and hour class action. *See also Tien v. Tenet Healthcare Corp.* (2012) 209 Cal.App.4th 1077, 1088 ("[T]he reason, if any, that employees might not take their breaks were predominantly individualized questions of fact not susceptible to class treatment."). SCJ Dec., ¶ 40.

Finally, even if a class is certified and Defendant is found liable for the class claims alleged, post-certification risks remain, including a reversal of a favorable judgment for Plaintiff and decertification of the class. These post-certification risks are demonstrated by *Magadia v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2021) 999 F.3d 668. There, the Ninth Circuit vacated reversed and remanded a $110 million judgment against an employer for, *inter alia*, inaccurately paying overtime, and directed the trial court to enter judgment in favor of the employer. *See also O'Conner v. Uber Technologies,* *Inc.* (9th Cir. 2018) 904 F.3d 1087 (decertification of wage and hour misclassification action). SCJ Dec., ¶ 41.

Collectively, the examples cited above illustrate the uncertain nature of class litigation. Consequently, the uncertainty of obtaining certification through a contested motion is a significant risk factor favoring settlement. SCJ Dec., ¶ 42.

Although Plaintiffs are confident about the strength of their claims, Plaintiffs nevertheless recognize that Defendants have factual and legal defenses that, if successful, would potentially defeat or impair the value of the lawsuit. Legally, the fast-changing landscape of wage and hour litigation can drastically affect the value of Plaintiffs' claims and, in fact, already has. SCJ Dec., ¶ 43.

In a similar wage and hour case, the federal district court in *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 at * 19-20 (N.D. Cal. 2009), granted approval of an overtime class action settlement and explained:

> **Plaintiffs may have a strong case, but the risks inherent in continued litigation are great**. Defendants strongly deny liability for Plaintiffs' principal claim that full-time Service Associates were misclassified as exempt. In addition to the uncertainties raised by Defendants at the preliminary stage regarding Plaintiffs' chance of success in this case, Defendants notes that the question of an employer's duty to provide rest and meal periods is an open one, signaling even less certainty for Plaintiffs.....**[T]he Total Settlement amount and the Class Members' expected net recovery, after fees and other costs are deducted, appear to be a reasonable compromise, in light of the risks of litigation**.

See also Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc., 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86266, at *30 (N.D. Cal. 2007) ("In considering the strength of Plaintiffs' case, legal uncertainties at the time of settlement - particularly those which go to fundamental legal issues - favor approval.").

As recognized in a federal decision approving settlement of an overtime wage class action:

> **The potential complexity and possible duration of trial also weigh in favor of granting final approval**. Plaintiffs acknowledge the difficulties of proving damages, recognize the uncertainty of outcome, and believe Defendants would appeal in the event of adverse judgment. A post-judgment appeal would require many years to resolve and delay payment to class members. Plaintiffs believe the benefits of a guaranteed recovery today outweigh an uncertain future result. Accordingly, plaintiffs argue, and the Court agrees, the actual recovery confers substantial benefits on the class that outweigh the potential recovery through full adjudication.

Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118, *9 (S.D. Cal. 2009); see also *Louie v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc*., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314, *14 (S.D. Cal. 2008).

In sum, while other cases have approved class certification in wage and hour claims, class certification in this action would have been hotly disputed and was by no means a foregone conclusion. Where both sides face significant uncertainty, as here, the attendant risks favor settlement. *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.* (9th Cir. 1998) 150 F.3d 1011, 1026.

As demonstrated by the decisions in *Magadia, supra,* 999 F.3d 668, *O'Conner v. Uber Technologies* (N.D. Cal. 2018) 82 F.Supp.3d 1133 and *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 1, the complexities and duration of further litigation cannot be overstated. There is little doubt that if Defendants faced a large adverse judgment, Defendants undoubtedly have the resources to post a bond and appeal. A post-judgment appeal by Defendants would have required many more years to resolve, assuming the judgment was affirmed. If the judgment was not affirmed in total, then the case could have dragged on for years after the appeal. The benefits of a guaranteed recovery today outweigh an uncertain result three or more years in the future. SCJ Dec., ¶ 44.

Class Representatives and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of a trial against Defendants through possible appeals which could take another three years. In arriving at their informed belief that the present settlement is fair and adequate, Class Counsel accounted for the uncertain outcome and risk inherent in complex actions such as this one. Class Counsel is also mindful of and recognizes the inherent problems of proof under, and alleged defenses to, the claims asserted in the litigation. Moreover, post-trial motions and appeals would have been inevitable. Costs would have increased, and recovery would have been delayed if not denied, thereby reducing the benefits of an ultimate victory. Class Representatives and Class Counsel believe that the Settlement confers substantial monetary and non-monetary benefits upon the Class. Based upon their evaluation, Class Representatives and Class Counsel have determined that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is in the best interest of the Class, is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and should be granted final approval. SCJ Dec., ¶ 45.

/ / /

VI. THE PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT OF 2004 ARE REASONABLE

Where settlements "negotiate a good faith amount" for PAGA penalties and "there is no indication that this amount was the result of self-interest at the expense of class members," such amounts are generally considered reasonable. *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.,* No. CV-08-0844 EDL, 2009 WL 928133, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2009). Courts routinely approve of amounts for PAGA penalties in the range of zero to two percent of the settlement. *See id.* at *1, 9 (approving a PAGA payment of 0.3%); *Jack v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.*, No. 09cv1683 MMA (JMA), 2011 WL 4899942, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2011) (approving a PAGA payment of 0.25%); *McKenzie v. Fed. Express Corp.*, No. CV 10-02420 GAF (PLAx), 2012 WL 12882124, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2012) (acknowledging that courts approve PAGA claim settlements in the range of zero to two percent of the total settlement).

Here, Plaintiffs and Defendants negotiated a good faith PAGA Payment in the amount of $80,000.00 which is 4.71% of the Gross Settlement Amount. As illustrated above, this amount falls well within the range of approved PAGA settlements. Seventy-Five percent (75%) of the PAGA Payment ($60,000.00) will be paid to the LWDA ("LWDA Payment") with the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) of the PAGA Payment ($20,000.00) to be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees ("Aggrieved Employee Payments"), which is within the range of PAGA Payment approved by courts and should be approved. SCJ Dec., ¶ 46.

Class Counsel gave the LWDA notice of this Settlement and proposed allocation by filing a copy of the Settlement, the Motion for Preliminary Approval, and this motion seeking final approval with the LWDA. SCJ Dec., ¶ 47. By not registering an objection with either Class Counsel or the Court, the LWDA has accepted and approved of the proposed PAGA Payment.

/ / /

VII. CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs respectfully submit that the proposed settlement satisfies the standard of fairness established in California law and should therefore be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. Plaintiffs also request entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment submitted herewith.

Dated: July 14, 2025

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: Sydney Castillo-Johnson
Sydney Castillo-Johnson, Esq.
Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS