

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff AMANDA VASQUEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF FRESNO

AMANDA VASQUEZ, an individual, on
behalf of herself and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICARE CALIFORNIA, P.C., a California
corporation; EMPLOYEE BENEFIT
MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; IMAGINE
360 ADMINISTRATORS, LLC, a Texas
limited liability company; IMAGINE 360 LLC,
a Delaware limited liability company; and
DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 22CECG01242

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION AND PAGA
SETTLEMENT**

Date: January 16, 2025

Time: 3:27 p.m.

Judge: Hon. Jeffrey Y. Hamilton, Jr.

Dept.: 503

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

.....1

II. THE SETTLEMENT BEFORE THE COURT

.....1

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

.....4

IV. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE AND ADEQUATE

.....5

A. The Settlement Satisfies the California Test for Fairness

.....6

1. The Investigation and Analysis of Documents are Sufficient to Allow Counsel and the Court to Act Intelligently

.....6

2. The Settlement was Reached Through Arm's Length Bargaining

.....6

3. Class Counsel is Experienced in Similar Litigation

.....8

4. There Are No Objections and No Requests for Exclusion

.....8

5. The Strength of Plaintiff's Case

.....9

6. The Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation

.....11

7. The Amount Offered in Settlement

.....12

V. THE PARTIES REQUEST APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT OF THE PAGA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE

.....13

VI. CONCLUSION

.....15

///

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
CASES

1		
2		
3	<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i>	
4	(2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1151.....	4
5	<i>Alberto v. GMRI, Inc.,</i>	
6	252 F.R.D. 652, 666 (E.D. Cal. Jun 24, 2008).....	7
7	<i>Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc.,</i> 2009	
8	U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118, *9 (S.D. Cal. 2009).....	10
9	<i>Brinker v. Superior Court,</i>	
10	53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012).....	9
11	<i>Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc.,</i> 2007	
12	U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86266, at *30 (N.D. Cal. 2007).....	10
13	<i>Cacho v. Eurostar, Inc.,</i>	
14	43 Cal. App. 5th 885 (2019).....	10
15	<i>Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.,</i>	
16	30 Cal. App. 5th 504, 517, 539 (2018).....	14
17	<i>Cardenas v. McLane Foodservice, Inc.,</i>	
18	2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13126, *10 (C.D. Cal. 2011).....	14
19	<i>Cellphone Termination Fee Cases</i>	
20	180 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1118, 1380, 1389, 1393 (2010).....	5
21	<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i>	
22	(1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801-1802.....	4-6
23	<i>Dunleavy v. Nadler (In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.),</i>	
24	213 F.3d 454, 459 (9th Cir. 2000).....	13
25	<i>Duran v. U.S. Bank National Association</i>	
26	(2014) 59 Cal.4th 1.....	10
27	<i>Fleming v. Covidien</i>	
28	2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154590 (C.D. Cal. 2011).....	15
	<i>Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.,</i>	
	2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476; 15 Wage & Hour Cas. 2d (BNA) 1330, at *15 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	
		7, 11
	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.,</i>	
	150 F.3d 1011, 1026 (9th Cir. 1998).....	9
	<i>Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.</i>	
	2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 at *19-20 (N.D. Cal. 2009).....	9
	<i>Huens v. Tatum,</i>	
	52 Cal. App. 4th 259, 265 (1997).....	4
	<i>In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litigation,</i>	
	80 F. Supp. 2d 164, 175 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).....	8
	<i>In re Taco Bell Wage & Hour Actions</i>	
	2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48557, *40-43 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2016).....	14
	<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i>	
	(2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133.....	6
	<i>Laskey v. Int'l Union,</i>	
	638 F.2d 954 (6th Cir. 1981).....	8
	<i>Louie v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.,</i>	
	2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314, *14 (S.D. Cal. 2008).....	10

1	<i>Ma v. Covidien Holding, Inc.</i> ,	
2	2014 WL 2472316, (C.D. Cal. 2014).....	13
3	<i>Malibu Outrigger Bd. of Governors v. Superior Court</i> ,	
4	103 Cal. App. 3d 573, 578-579 (1980).....	4
5	<i>Makabi v. Gedalia</i> ,	
6	2016 Cal. App. Unpub. 1489, *5-7 (2nd Dist. Ct. of App. Mar. 6, 2016).....	15
7	<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co.</i>	
8	(2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 409.....	6
9	<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n</i>	
10	(9th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 615, 625, 628.....	5
11	<i>Stoetznner v. U.S. Steel Corp.</i> ,	
12	897 F.2d 115, 118-119 (3d. Cir. 1990).....	8
13	<i>Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.</i> , 2015	
14	U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78671, at *12 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	13
15	<i>Viceral v. Mistras Grp., Inc.</i> ,	
16	2016 WL 5907869 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....	13
17	<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer</i> ,	
18	91 Cal. App. 4th 224, 245-2466 (2001).....	4-5

STATUTES, RULES AND CODES

12	<i>Unclaimed Property Law, Cal. Civ. Code § 1500 et seq.</i>	3
13	<i>Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(e)(1)</i>	13

SECONDARY SOURCES

15	Newberg & Conte, Newberg on Class Actions, (3d ed. 1992) §11.41, pp. 11-91	
16		5

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 The parties to this action have reached a Settlement and the Court preliminarily approved the
3 Stipulation and Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims
4 (“Agreement”), a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit #1 to the Declaration of Jean
5 Claude Lapuyade (“JCL Dec.”)¹. In accordance with the Law and Motion Minute Order dated
6 August 22, 2024 (“Preliminary Approval Order”), the approved Class Notice has been disseminated
7 to the Class². The purpose of this hearing is to determine whether the proposed settlement of the
8 litigation should be finally approved. Plaintiff Amanda Vasquez (“Plaintiff”) respectfully submits
9 this memorandum in support of the unopposed motion for final approval and the proposed entry of
10 the Final Approval Order and Judgment, submitted herewith. The settlement represents an excellent
11 result for the Class and avoids the delays, risks, and costs of further litigation. After disseminating
12 the notice to the members of the Class, there were no objections and no requests for exclusion,
13 which means that 100% of the Class has elected to participate in the Settlement. JCL Dec. ¶8; Decl.
14 of Katherine Rovertoni (“Apex Dec.”) ¶ 13. This is a positive response from the Class evidencing
15 their collective approval of the settlement. As a result, Plaintiff respectfully submits that the class
16 settlement should be finally approved for the same reasons that the Court preliminarily approved
17 the settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate.

18 **II. THE SETTLEMENT BEFORE THE COURT**

19 Plaintiff and Defendants MiCare California, P.C. and Employee Benefit Management Services,
20 LLC (hereinafter collectively “Defendants”) reached a full and final settlement of the above-
21 captioned action, which is embodied in the Agreement filed concurrently with the Court. As
22 consideration for this Settlement, the Gross Settlement Amount to be paid by Defendants is One
23 Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$150,000.00). (Agreement at ¶ I(O).) Under the
24 Settlement, the Gross Settlement Amount consists of the following elements: (1) Individual
25 Settlement Payments; (2) Service Award; (3) Class Counsel Award; (4) PAGA Payment; and (5)
26

27 ¹ Capitalized terms are defined in the Agreement.

28 ² The “Class” is defined as “all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant as a
non-exempt employee in California at any time during the Class Period [April 3, 2019, through
April 3, 2024].” (Agreement at ¶¶ I(E); I(I).)

1 Settlement Administration Costs. (Agreement at ¶ III(A)(1)). Defendants' share of employer side
2 payroll taxes is in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount and shall be paid together with the
3 Gross Settlement Amount on the Funding Date. (Agreement at ¶ III(A)(4).) The Gross Settlement
4 Amount shall be all-in with no reversion to Defendants. (Agreement at ¶ III(A)(1).)

5 Defendants shall fund the Gross Settlement Amount to the Settlement Administrator within
6 sixty (60) days of notice of entry of the Court's order granting final approval or if an objection to
7 the settlement is made but if no appeal is filed, then Defendants shall pay the Gross Settlement
8 Amount to the Settlement Administrator within sixty (60) days of the expiration of the appeal
9 period. (Agreement at ¶ I(N)). The Individual Settlement Payments and Aggrieved Employee
10 Payments will be mailed by the Settlement Administrator within fifteen (15) calendar days after the
11 funding of the Gross Settlement Amount. (Agreement at ¶ III(M)(7).)

12 The Net Settlement Amount shall equal the net amount available for payment to the Class after
13 deducting the Court-approved amounts for the Class Counsel Award, Service Award, PAGA
14 Payment, and Settlement Administration Costs. (Agreement at ¶ I(S).) The Net Settlement Amount
15 will be distributed as the Individual Settlement Payments to the Class Members who do not timely
16 request exclusion ("Settlement Class Members"). (Agreement at ¶¶ I(LL). The Individual
17 Settlement Payments will be calculated as follows: Using the Class Data, the Settlement
18 Administrator shall add up the total number of Workweeks for all Class Members. The respective
19 Workweeks for each Class Member will be divided by the total Workweeks for all Class Members,
20 resulting in the Payment Ratio for each Class Member. Each Class Member's Payment Ratio will
21 then be multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to calculate each Class Member's estimated
22 Individual Settlement Payments. (Agreement at ¶ III(M)(1).)

23 Class Members could opt-out of the Settlement by following the directions in the Class Notice.
24 (Agreement at ¶ III(L)(7)). All Class Members who did not "opt out" are deemed Settlement Class
25 Members who will be bound by the Settlement and will be entitled to receive a Settlement Share.
26 Aggrieved Employees who opt out the Settlement will still be paid their allocation of the PAGA
27 Payment, respectively, and will remain bound by the release of the Released PAGA Claims,
28

1 regardless of their request for exclusion. (Agreement at ¶ III(L)(2)(a)). Finally, the Class Notice
2 also advised the Class Members of their right to object to the Settlement. (Agreement at ¶ III(L)(8)).

3 A Settlement Class Member must cash his or her Settlement Share check within 180 days after
4 the date of issuance. (Agreement at ¶ III(M)(8)). The Settlement Administrator will send a reminder
5 to Settlement Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees who have not cashed their checks 90
6 days before the expiration date. (Agreement at ¶ III(M)(8).) Any settlement checks not cashed
7 within 180 days will be voided and any funds from such uncashed checks shall be transmitted to
8 the Controller of the State of California to be held pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law,
9 California Civil Code § 1500 et seq., in the names and corresponding amounts associated with each
10 Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee whose check(s) are cancelled. (Agreement at ¶
11 III(M)(8).)

12 APEX Class Action LLC was appointed by the Court as the Settlement Administrator for the
13 Settlement. (Preliminary Approval Order at ¶5.) From the Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement
14 Administrator shall be paid for the expenses of administering the Settlement in an amount not to
15 exceed \$3,990.00. (Agreement at ¶ I(JJ).) The Settlement Administration Costs, including fees and
16 costs incurred to-date, as well as anticipated fees and costs for completion of the settlement
17 administration, are \$3,990.00. Apex Dec., ¶ 18.

18 Subject to Court approval, the Agreement provides for Class Counsel to be awarded a sum not
19 to exceed \$50,000.00 (one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount) plus costs of \$17,505.63.
20 (Agreement at ¶ I(G).) Subject to Court approval, the Agreement provides for a payment of no more
21 than \$5,000 to Plaintiff as a Service Award. (Agreement at ¶ I(HH).) In support of this separate
22 motion for Class Counsel Award and Service Award, Class Counsel is providing evidentiary
23 support, for these requests, including lodestar.

24 The Parties seek approval from the Court for the PAGA Payment of \$10,000 out of the Gross
25 Settlement Amount, which shall be allocated 75% (\$7,500) to the LWDA as the LWDA Payment
26 pursuant to PAGA and 25% (\$2,500) will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees based on their
27 respective pay periods worked during the PAGA Period (“Aggrieved Employee Payment”).
28 (Agreement at ¶ III(M)(11).)

1 All Aggrieved Employees will be sent their Aggrieved Employee Payment and will be subject
2 to the release of the Released PAGA Claims, whether or not they opt out of the Settlement.
3 (Agreement at ¶ III(L)(7).) As set forth in the accompanying proof of service, the LWDA has been
4 served with this motion and the Agreement on December 20, 2024. JCL Dec. ¶ 6. The Settlement
5 is fair, adequate and reasonable to the class and should be finally approved for the same reasons the
6 Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement, agreeing that the settlement is “fair, adequate,
7 and reasonable.” (Preliminary Approval Order at Section (2)(b).) In sum, the Settlement valued at
8 \$150,000 is an excellent result for the Class. This result is particularly favorable in light of the fact
9 that liability and class certification in this case were far from certain in light of the defenses asserted
10 by Defendants. Given the complexities of this case, the defenses asserted, the uncertainty of class
11 certification, along with the uncertainties of proof at trial and appeal, the proposed settlement is fair,
12 reasonable and adequate, and should be finally approved. JCL Dec. ¶¶ 9.

13 **III. GENERAL STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO JUDICIAL REVIEW AND** 14 **APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS**

15 Settlements of disputed claims are favored by the courts. *Huens v. Tatum*, 52 Cal. App. 4th 259,
16 265 (1997). In evaluating settlements, the courts have long recognized that compromise is
17 particularly appropriate since such litigation is difficult and notoriously uncertain. *7-Eleven Owners*
18 *for Fair Fran. v. Southland Corp.*, 85 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1151 (2000) (“[V]oluntary conciliation
19 and settlement are the preferred means of dispute resolution. This is especially true in complex class
20 action litigation.”)

21 “[T]o prevent fraud, collusion or unfairness to the class, the settlement or dismissal of a class
22 action requires court approval.” *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1801 (1996) (*citing*
23 *Malibu Outrigger Bd. of Governors v. Superior Court*, 103 Cal. App. 3d 573, 578-579 (1980).) The
24 court must decide whether the proposed settlement falls within the range of reasonable settlements,
25 taking into account that settlements are compromises between the parties reflecting subjective,
26 unquantifiable judgments concerning the risks and possible outcomes of litigation. *See Wershba v.*
27 *Apple Computer*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 224, 246 (2001) (“The proposed settlement is not to be judged
28 against a hypothetical or speculative measure of what might have been achieved had plaintiffs

1 prevailed at trial.”) In *Wershba*, appellants argued that the settlement was too low given the “clear”
2 liability, however, the Court rejected this argument and held that “the merits of the underlying class
3 claims are not a basis for upsetting the settlement of a class action.” *Id.*; see also *7-Eleven, supra*,
4 at 1150.

5 In these cases, courts have repeatedly emphasized that there is a strong initial presumption that
6 the compromise is fair and reasonable. *Wershba*, 91 Cal. App. 4th at 245. Courts should not
7 substitute their judgment for that of the parties who negotiated the settlement. *Id.* at 246. The
8 presumption of fairness exists where: (1) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel
9 and the court to act intelligently; (2) the settlement is reached through arm's-length bargaining; (3)
10 counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small. *Dunk*, 48
11 Cal. App. 4th at 1801, citing Newberg & Conte, *Newberg on Class Actions*, (3d ed. 1992) §11.41,
12 pp. 11-91. Here, all of these factors support a presumption of fairness.

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

17 **IV. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE AND ADEQUATE**

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

23 The trial court has broad discretion to determine whether the settlement is fair. *Cellphone*
24 *Termination Fee Cases*, 180 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1117 (2009). “The well-recognized factors that
25 the trial court should consider in evaluating the reasonableness of a class action settlement
26 agreement include ‘the strength of plaintiffs’ case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration
27 of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in
28 settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and

1 views of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members
2 to the proposed settlement.” *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal. App. 4th 116, 128 (2008)
3 (internal citations omitted); see also *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of L. A.*, 186 Cal. App.
4 4th 399, 408 (2010).

5 The list of factors is not exhaustive and should be tailored to each case. *Dunk, supra*, at
6 1801. Due regard should be given to what is otherwise a private consensual agreement between the
7 parties. *Id.* The inquiry “must be limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment that
8 the agreement is not the product of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion between, the negotiating
9 parties, and that the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned.”
10 *Id.* “Ultimately, the [trial] court's determination is nothing more than 'an amalgam of delicate
11 balancing, gross approximations and rough justice.' [Citation omitted.]” *Id.*

12 These factors are analyzed seriatim below, and all support final approval of the class action
13 settlement before this Court, consistent with this Court’s Preliminary Approval.

14 **A. The Settlement Satisfies the California Test for Fairness**

15 1. The Investigation and Analysis of Documents are Sufficient to Allow Counsel and
16 the Court to Act Intelligently

17 Over the course of twenty-three (23) months, the Parties engaged in the investigation of the
18 claims, including the production of documents, class data, and other information, allowing for the
19 full and complete analysis of liabilities and defenses to the claims in this Action. The procedural
20 history and investigation performed was detailed at length in support of the motion for preliminary
21 approval. The Settlement was the product of one arms-length mediation and contentious
22 negotiations through an all-day mediation presided over by Louis Marlin, Esq., a respected and
23 experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. JCL Dec. at ¶10.

24 2. The Settlement was Reached Through Arm’s Length Bargaining

25 This Settlement is the result of extensive and hard-fought litigation as well as negotiations
26 before an experienced mediator. Defendants have expressly denied and continue to deny any
27 wrongdoing or legal liability arising out of the conduct alleged in the Action. Plaintiff and Class
28 Counsel have determined that it is desirable and beneficial to the Class to resolve the Released Class

1 Claims in accordance with this Settlement. Class Counsel are experienced and qualified to evaluate
2 the class claims, the viability of the defenses asserted, and the risks and benefits of trial and
3 settlement, and Class Counsel are experienced in wage and hour class actions, as Class Counsel has
4 previously litigated and certified similar claims against other employers. JCL Dec. ¶11.

5 The Parties attended an arms-length mediation session with Louis Marlin, Esq., an
6 experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions, in order to reach this Settlement. In
7 preparation for the mediation, Defendants provided Class Counsel with necessary information for
8 the members of the Class, including a sampling of time data, payroll data and data concerning the
9 composition of the Class. Plaintiff analyzed the data with the assistance of damages expert, Berger
10 Consulting Group (“BCG”), and prepared and submitted a mediation brief and damage valuation to
11 the Mediator. The mediation concluded with a settlement after the Parties agreed to the mediator’s
12 settlement proposal. The final settlement terms were negotiated and set forth in the Agreement now
13 presented for this Court’s approval. JCL Dec. ¶12. The fact that the settlement was negotiated with
14 the assistance of an experienced mediator supports approval. *Alberto v. GMRI, Inc.*, 252 F.R.D.
15 652, 666 (E.D. Cal. Jun 24, 2008); *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476; 15 Wage
16 & Hour Cas. 2d (BNA) 1330, at *15 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (“The settlement was negotiated and approved
17 by experienced counsel on both sides of the litigation, with the assistance of a well-respected
18 mediator with substantial experience in employment litigation [, and] this factor supports approval
19 of the settlement”).

20 From January 2024 through April 2024, the settlement agreement and exhibits thereto were
21 finalized and executed. On April 9, 2024, the Motion for Preliminary Approval was filed. On
22 August 22, 2024, the Court issued its Order granting preliminary approval of the settlement as fair
23 and reasonable to the Class.³ JCL Dec. ¶13.

24
25 ///

27 ³ The Court’s Preliminary Approval Order preliminarily approved attorneys’ expenses in the
28 amount of \$17,505.63. (Preliminary Approval Order at Section 3). The Preliminary Approval Order
also preliminarily approved the Class Administration Costs in an amount not to exceed \$3,990.
(Preliminary Approval Order at Section 5). These amounts are reflected in this Motion.

1 3. Class Counsel is Experienced in Similar Litigation

2 Class Counsel in this matter has extensive class action experience and has represented
3 thousands of persons in class actions including employment litigation, wage and hour class actions,
4 and complex litigation. Class Counsel has previously litigated wage and hour class actions
5 involving employees and claims similar to this case and have been approved as experienced class
6 counsel in courts throughout California. As such, Class Counsel is experienced and knowledgeable
7 in this area of law. JCL Dec., at ¶14; Declaration of Shani O. Zakay (“SOZ Decl.”) at ¶3. Class
8 Counsel have participated in every aspect of the settlement discussions and have concluded the
9 settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class. JCL Dec. ¶14.

10 4. There Are No Objections and No Requests for Exclusion

11 The reaction of the Class unequivocally supports approval of the Settlement. On September
12 12, 2024, the Settlement Administrator mailed the Court-approved Class Notice to the Class
13 Members, which provided each class member with the terms of the Settlement, including notice of
14 the claims at issue and the financial terms of the settlement, including the attorneys’ fees, costs, and
15 service award that were being sought, how Individual Settlement Payment would be calculated, and
16 the specific, estimated payment amount to that individual. See Apex Dec.¶ 7. In disseminating the
17 notice, the Settlement Administrator followed the notice procedures authorized by the Court in its
18 Preliminary Approval Order. Significantly, there have been no objections and no opt-outs. Apex
19 Dec. ¶¶ 11-13. As such, 100% of the Class will participate in the Settlement and will be sent a
20 settlement check. Apex Dec. at ¶ 14; JCL Dec. ¶8.

21 The absence of any objector strongly supports the fairness, reasonableness and adequacy of
22 the Settlement. *See In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litigation*, 80 F. Supp. 2d 164, 175
23 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (“If only a small number of objections are received, that fact can be viewed as
24 indicative of the adequacy of the settlement.”); *Stoetznner v. U.S. Steel Corp.*, 897 F.2d 115, 118-
25 119 (3d. Cir. 1990) (29 objections out of 281 member class “strongly favors settlement”); *Laskey*
26 *v. Int’l Union*, 638 F.2d 954 (6th Cir. 1981) (The fact that 7 out of 109 class members objected to
27 the proposed settlement should be considered when determining fairness of settlement). Here,
28 where there are no objections, the approval of the class is evident.

1 5. The Strength of Plaintiff's Case

2 The Action generally alleges that Plaintiff and other Class Members were not properly paid
3 all minimum and overtime wages for hours worked, were not provided meal and rest periods, were
4 not timely paid earned wages, were not paid at the proper regular rate of pay, were not provided
5 reimbursement for required expenses, were not provided accurate itemized wage statements, and
6 were not paid all wages at the time of termination. The Action seeks unpaid wages, penalties,
7 attorney fees, litigation costs, and any other equitable or legal relief allegedly due to Plaintiff and
8 the other Class Members by virtue of the foregoing claims. JCL Dec. ¶15.

9 Where both sides face significant uncertainty, the attendant risks favor settlement. *Hanlon*
10 *v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1026 (9th Cir. 1998). Here, a number of defenses asserted by
11 Defendants present serious threats to the claims of the Plaintiff and the other Class Members.
12 Defendants asserted that Defendants' practices complied with all applicable Labor laws. Defendants
13 argued that it accurately compensated employees for all hours worked. Defendants contended that
14 their meal and rest period policies fully complied with California law and that Defendants' provided
15 compliant meal and rest periods to Class Members during the Class Period. Finally, Defendants
16 could argue that the Supreme Court decision in *Brinker v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012),
17 weakened Plaintiff's claims, on liability, value, and class certifiability as to the meal and rest period
18 claims. Defendants also argued that based on their facially lawful practices, they acted in good faith
19 and without willfulness, which if accepted would negate the claims for waiting time penalties and/or
20 inaccurate wage statements. In fact, under the current state of the law, it is questionable whether
21 these penalties could be awarded at all based upon the alleged meal and rest period violations. If
22 successful, Defendants' defenses could eliminate or substantially reduce any recovery to the Class.
23 While Plaintiff believes that these defenses could be overcome, Defendants maintains these
24 defenses have merit and therefore present a serious risk to recovery by the Class. JCL Dec. ¶16.

25 In a similar wage and hour case, the federal district court in *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.*,
26 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 at *19-20 (N.D. Cal. 2009), explained in approving an overtime class
27 action settlement:

28 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

1 Service Associates were misclassified as exempt. In addition to the uncertainties
2 raised by Defendants at the preliminary stage regarding Plaintiffs' chance of success
3 in this case, Defendants notes that the question of an employer's duty to provide rest
4 and meal periods is an open one, signaling even less certainty for Plaintiffs. [...T]he
gross 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.

5 *see also Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86266, at *30 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (“In
6 considering the strength of Plaintiff's case, legal uncertainties at the time of settlement - particularly
7 those which go to fundamental legal issues – favor approval.”). As recognized in a federal decision
8 approving settlement of an overtime wage class action:

9 The potential complexity and possible duration of trial also weigh in favor of granting
10 final approval. Plaintiffs acknowledge the difficulties of proving damages, recognize
11 the uncertainty of outcome, and believe defendant would appeal in the event of
12 adverse judgment. A post-judgment appeal would require many years to resolve and
13 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.

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

16 There was also a significant risk that, if the Actions were not settled, Plaintiff would be
17 unable to obtain class certification and thereby not recover on behalf of any employees other than
18 themselves. Defendants argued that the individual experience of each putative class member varied
19 with respect to the claims. Defendants could also contest class certification by arguing injury and
20 good faith were case by case determinations that precluded class certification. Plaintiff is aware of
21 cases where class certification of similar claims was denied. *See e.g. Cacho v. Eurostar, Inc.*, 43
22 Cal. App. 5th 885 (2019) (denying certification of meal and rest break claims). Defendants also
23 contended that individual differences in work experiences not only impacted damages but would
24 also impact certification. Finally, even if class certification was successful, as demonstrated by the
25 California Supreme Court decision in *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.*, 59 Cal. 4th 1 (2014),
26 there are significant hurdles to overcome for a class wide recovery even where the class has been
27 certified. While other cases have approved class certification in wage and hour claims, class
28

1 certification in this action would have been hotly disputed and was by no means a foregone
2 conclusion. JCL Dec. ¶17.

3 In sum, the Settlement is a fair and reasonable result, and provides the Class with a
4 significant recovery, particularly when viewed in light of the fact that the Defendants asserted
5 serious and substantial defenses both to liability and to class certification. JCL Dec. at ¶18.
6 Currently, the maximum and average Individual Settlement Payments are \$4,713.12 and \$1,326.30,
7 respectively. Apex Dec. ¶15. Given the complexities of this case, the defenses, along with the
8 uncertainties of proof and appeal, the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and
9 should be finally approved. JCL Dec. at ¶18.

10 6. The Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation

11 As demonstrated by the decision in *Duran*, the complexities and duration of further litigation
12 cannot be overstated. There is little doubt that Defendants would post a bond and appeal in the event
13 of an adverse judgment. A post-judgment appeal by Defendants would have required many more
14 years to resolve, assuming the judgment was affirmed. If the judgment was not affirmed in total,
15 then the case could have dragged on for years after the appeal. The benefits of a guaranteed recovery
16 today outweigh an uncertain result for three or more years in the future. JCL Dec. ¶19.

17 Plaintiff and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of continuing to litigate and
18 trying this Action against Defendants through possible appeals which could take several years.
19 Class Counsel has also considered the uncertain outcome and risk of litigation, especially in
20 complex class actions such as this Action. Class Counsel is also mindful of and recognizes the
21 inherent problems of proof under, and alleged defenses to, the claims asserted in the Action. Based
22 upon their evaluation, Plaintiff and Class Counsel have determined that the Settlement set forth in
23 the Agreement is in the best interest of the Class Members. JCL Dec. ¶20.

24 Although Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe that their case has merit, which Defendants
25 continues to vigorously deny, they recognized the potential risks both sides would face if litigation
26 of the Action continued. As the federal court held in *Glass*, where the parties faced uncertainties
27 similar to those in this litigation:

28 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

1 how this Court might have ruled on the merits of the legal issues, the losing party
2 likely would have appealed, and the parties would have faced the expense and
3 uncertainty of litigating an appeal. "The expense and possible duration of the
4 litigation should be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of [a] settlement."
5 See *In re Mego Financial Corp. Securities Litigation*, 213 F.3d 454, 458 (9th Cir.
6 2000). Here, the risk of further litigation is substantial.

7 *Id.* at *12.

8 7. The Amount Offered in Settlement

9 The Settlement in this case is fair, reasonable and adequate considering Defendants'
10 defenses to Plaintiff's claims. As discussed in detail at the time of preliminary approval, the Gross
11 Settlement Amount compares favorably to the value of the claims. The calculations to compensate
12 for the amount due to the Class Members at the time this Settlement was negotiated were calculated
13 by Plaintiff's expert, BCG, in advance of mediation. For the individuals whose claims are at issue
14 in this Action, Plaintiff analyzed the data and determined the potential maximum damages for the
15 class claims. For the Class, Plaintiff estimated Defendants' exposure for wage statement claims
16 ranged from approximately \$64,260 to \$71,400, the estimated exposure for meal period claims
17 ranged from approximately \$98,294.56 to \$196,589.12, the estimated exposure for rest period
18 claims ranged from approximately \$108,141.60 to \$216,283.20, the estimated exposure for waiting
19 time penalties ranged from approximately \$156,492.00 to \$312,984.00, the estimated exposure for
20 unreimbursed business expenses ranged from approximately \$2,736.00 to \$18,240.00, and the
21 estimated exposure for unpaid minimum wages ranged from approximately \$30,515.93 and
22 \$122,063.74. However, these claims for wage statement and waiting time penalties potentially have
23 a much smaller value, even if damages were awarded, to the extent that they are only derivative of
24 other claims alleged. JCL Dec. ¶21.

25 Consequently, the Gross Settlement Amount represents approximately 13.92% of
26 Defendants' class-wide liability exposure for damages and statutory penalties, assuming these
27 amounts could all be proven in full at trial.⁴ The above maximum calculations should then be
28 adjusted in consideration for both the risk of certification and the risk of establishing class-wide

⁴ Because the PAGA claim does not provide a recovery to the Class, Plaintiff did not include the PAGA claim in this discussion of the Class claim valuation. The PAGA claim is addressed herein below and in the JCL Dec. at ¶ 34.

1 liability on all claims. Given the amount of the Settlement as compared to the potential value of the
2 claims, the Settlement is most certainly fair and reasonable.⁵ JCL Dec. ¶22. Clearly, the goal of this
3 litigation has been met.

4 **V. THE PARTIES REQUEST APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT OF THE**
5 **PAGA PAYMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE**

6 Labor Code § 2699(l) requires that the Court "shall review and approve any settlement of any
7 civil [PAGA] action filed pursuant to this part. The proposed settlement shall be submitted to the
8 agency at the same time that it is submitted to the court." The proposed Settlement was submitted
9 to the LWDA on April 9, 2024, when the motion for preliminary approval was filed, and was again
10 served on the LWDA at the time of the filing of this motion, as set forth in the accompanying proof
11 of service. The LWDA has expressed no objection or opposition to this Settlement. Consequently,
12 Plaintiff respectfully asks the Court to approve the settlement of the PAGA claims and the PAGA
13 Payment to be paid as part of the proposed settlement.

14 The Parties believe that the PAGA Payment amount is fair and reasonable and therefore
15 "shall" be reviewed and approved. The Labor and Workforce Development Agency has released
16 data on PAGA settlement amounts. After removing the outliers at the low and high end, the average,
17 total settlement amount of PAGA claims is approximately \$10,000.

18 This PAGA Payment amount compares favorably to the estimated amount of PAGA
19 penalties. With the assistance of an expert, Plaintiff estimated Defendants' potential PAGA
20 exposure to be \$139,950.00 if successful at trial. Importantly, however, these calculations were
21 performed at the maximum statutory rate for the penalties, when in fact, it is likely that any penalties
22 awarded would be at a lower rate. California Labor Code Section 2699(e)(1) permits a Court to
23

24 ⁵ See e.g. *Dunleavy v. Nadler (In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.)*, 213 F.3d 454, 459 (9th Cir. 2000)
25 (approving settlement which represented "roughly one-sixth of the potential recovery"); *Stovall-*
26 *Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78671, at *12 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (granting
27 final approval where "the proposed Total Settlement Amount represents approximately 10% of
28 what class might have been awarded had they succeeded at trial."); *Viceral v. Mistras Grp., Inc.*,
2016 WL 5907869 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (approving wage and hour class action settlement amounting
to 8.1% of full verdict value); *Ma v. Covidien Holding, Inc.*, 2014 WL 2472316, (C.D. Cal. 2014)
(approving wage and hour class action settlement worth "somewhere between 9% and 18%" of full
verdict value).

1 award a lesser amount than the maximum civil penalty if based on the facts and circumstances to
2 do otherwise would result in an award that is “unjust, arbitrary and oppressive or confiscatory.”⁶
3 JCL Dec., ¶36.

4 *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*, 30 Cal. App. 5th 504 (2018), illustrates the risk of PAGA
5 claims. In *Carrington*, while the plaintiff prevailed on his PAGA claim upon trial, the trial court
6 reduced the maximum PAGA penalty amount by 90%, citing the employer's good faith attempt at
7 complying with the law. *Id.* at 517. Upon review, the Court of Appeal found such reduction to be
8 proper. *Id.* at 539. Again, the *Carrington* decision was after Plaintiff actually prevailed at trial, and
9 even then, the PAGA penalties were reduced by 90%. Moreover, in *Carrington*, the Court of Appeal
10 affirmed a judgment after trial which only provided for a PAGA penalty of \$5 per pay period.
11 Therefore, at trial, any PAGA penalties awarded in this case could be less than Plaintiff's
12 calculation, even had Plaintiff prevailed on the PAGA claim. Here, multiplying the number of pay
13 periods (approximately 787) by \$5 results in a total potential liability of \$3,935.00. JCL Dec., ¶ 37.
14 For the aforementioned reasons, the PAGA allocation of the Gross Settlement Amount is fair, just,
15 and reasonable.

16
17
18
19
20 ///

21
22 ⁶ Under PAGA, Courts have considerable discretion to reduce the penalty award. In *Fleming v.*
23 *Covidien*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154590 (C.D. Cal. 2011), a federal court reduced PAGA penalties
24 from \$2,800,000 to \$500,000, a reduction of 82.2%, because the court found maximum penalties
25 "unjust" because the employees had suffered no injuries. Some trial courts have actually awarded
26 no civil penalties, even when Labor Code violations are established. *See Makabi v. Gedalia*, 2016
27 Cal. App. Unpub. 1489, *5-7 (2nd Dist. Ct. of App. Mar. 6, 2016) (no PAGA penalties were
28 awarded by the Los Angeles County Superior Court) (unpublished decision); *In re Taco Bell Wage
& Hour Actions* 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48557, *40-43 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2016) (PAGA penalties
denied after trial). In order to recover any PAGA penalties, Plaintiff would be required at trial to
prove each of the underlying Labor Code violations. *See Cardenas v. McLane Foodservice, Inc.*,
2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13126, *10 (C.D. Cal. 2011) ("Given the statutory language [of PAGA], a
plaintiff cannot recover on behalf of individuals whom the plaintiff has not proven suffered a
violation of the Labor Code by the defendant.").

1 **VI. CONCLUSION**

2 Plaintiff respectfully submits that the proposed settlement satisfies the standard of fairness
3 established in California law and should therefore be finally approved as fair, reasonable and
4 adequate and requests entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment, submitted herewith.
5

6 Dated: December 20, 2024

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

7 By: 
8 Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28