

D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
Emil@d.law
Alvin B. Lindsay (SBN 220236)
a.lindsay@d.law
Jean Hopkins Power (SBN 326509)
j.power@d.law
450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Fax: (818) 962-6469

DAVID YEREMIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
david@yeremianlaw.com
450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Fax: (818) 962-6469

UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
Walter Haines (SBN 71075)
whaines@uelglaw.com
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Telephone: (562) 256-1047
Facsimile: (562) 256-1006

Attorneys for Plaintiff JENNY ESTRADA, on behalf
of herself and others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

JENNY ESTRADA, an individual, on behalf
of herself, all others similarly situated, and
the State of California,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ONEMAIN GENERAL SERVICES
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation;
ONEMAIN FINANCIAL GROUP, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; and
DOES 1-50,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV005986

CLASS ACTION Assigned To:
Hon. Lauri Damrell
Dept.: 28

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR APPROVAL
OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND
RELEASE AND FOR AWARD OF
REASONABLE ATTORNEYS' FEES AND
COSTS AND ADMINISTRATION COSTS**

Hearing Date: December 13, 2024
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Department: 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RELEVANT BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY	1
A.	Litigation Overview and Procedural History	1
B.	Mediation and Settlement	2
III.	PAGA ACTIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS.....	3
A.	The PAGA Statutory Scheme.....	3
B.	The Court Has Discretion When Awarding the Amount of Penalties.....	4
C.	PAGA Authorizes the Payment of PAGA Counsel’s Fees and Costs.....	4
IV.	THE SETTLEMENT.....	5
V.	ARGUMENT	6
A.	The Court Should Approve the Settlement Agreement.....	6
B.	The Risks of Moving Forward with Plaintiffs’ PAGA Claim.....	6
C.	Trial of Plaintiff’s PAGA Claims Would Have Presented Many Hurdles.	7
D.	The Court May Have Exercised Its Discretion to Reduce Civil Penalties.....	8
VI.	THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS	8
A.	The Court Should Approve the Requested Attorneys’ Fees and Costs.....	8
1)	PAGA Counsel Are Entitled to Fees from the Civil Penalties Recovered.....	9
2)	The Attorneys’ Fees Request Is Within the Range of Reasonable Fees	10
3)	PAGA Counsel’s Fee Request Is Reasonable Under the Lodestar Crosscheck.	10
4)	The Court Should Approve the Reimbursement of PAGA Counsel’s Costs.	11
VII.	THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION	12
VIII.	CONCLUSION	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 993	3
<i>Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2</i> (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157	4, 8
<i>Arias v. Super. Ct.</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969	3, 5, 6
<i>Brown v. Ralphs Grocery Co.</i> (2011) 197 Cal. App. 4th 489, 501	3
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794	10
<i>Folsom v. Butte County Ass’n of Gov’ts</i> (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 668	5
<i>Iskanian v. CLS Transp. Los Angeles, LLC</i> (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348	3, 8
<i>Ketchum v. Moses</i> (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122	10
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.</i> (2016) 205 Cal.Rptr.3d 555	9
<i>Medina v. Vander Poel</i> (E.D. Cal. 2015) 523 B.R. 820	3
<i>Montano v. The Wet Seal Retail, Inc.</i> (2015) 232 Cal. App. 4th 1214	3
<i>Moreno v. Autozone, Inc.</i> (N.D. Cal. June 5, 2007) No. C05-04432 MJJ, 2007 WL 1650942	8
<i>Reyes v. Macy’s, Inc.</i> (2011) 202 Cal. App. 4th 1119	3
<i>Securitas Sec. Servs. USA, Inc. v. Sup. Ct. of San Diego</i> (2015) 234 Cal. App. 4th 1109	3
<i>Serrano v. Priest</i> (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25	10
<i>Thayer v. Wells Fargo Bank</i> (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 819	10
<i>Thurman v. Bayshore</i> (2012) 203 Cal. App. 4th 1112	8
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 224	10

STATUTES

Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5	5
Labor Code § 2698, <i>et seq</i>	1, 7
Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1)	1, 4
Labor Code § 2699(a)	3, 9
Labor Code § 2699(e)(2)	4, 8
Labor Code § 2699(f)(2).	4
Labor Code § 2699(g)(1)	4, 9

1	Labor Code § 2699(<i>l</i>)	6
2	Labor Code § 2699(<i>l</i>)(2).....	1, 5, 6
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		

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Through this motion, Plaintiff Jenny Estrada (“Plaintiff”) requests that the Court grant approval of the Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement and Release (“Settlement Agreement”) reached between the parties to resolve claims brought exclusively under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) seeking civil penalties for various violations of the California Labor Code and Industrial Wage Commission’s Wage Orders. Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendants OneMain General Services Corporation and OneMain Financial Group, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) will pay a gross settlement amount of \$390,000.00. A copy of the Settlement Agreement and Notice Letter are provided at Exhibit A to the concurrently filed Declaration of PAGA Counsel, David Yeremian (“Yeremian Decl.”).

As addressed herein and in the supporting documents, and given the amount Defendant will pay to effectuate the Settlement and the formula for distribution of the Settlement funds, Plaintiff and her counsel believe that the Settlement is fair, reasonable and in the best interests of the State and the aggrieved employees. Accordingly, Plaintiff requests that the Court “review and approve” the Settlement pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(1)(2). If the Court deems the Settlement fair and acceptable, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter an order approving the Settlement in the form lodged herewith and ordering the parties and Administrator to carry out the terms of the Settlement Agreement and enter a Final Judgment thereon. Following filing, Plaintiff Estrada will be submitting this Motion along with the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA by uploading it on the LWDA’s website as required by Labor Code § 2699(1)(2). (See concurrently filed Declaration of Alvin B. Lindsay in support of Settlement Approval (“Lindsay Decl.”), ¶ 17).

II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A. Litigation Overview and Procedural History

On August 2, 2023, Plaintiff Jenny Estrada filed a Complaint and a claim with the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (the “LWDA”) pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1) and gave notice to Defendant. (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 4). Plaintiff sought investigation into alleged violations Defendants committed of wage and hour sections of the Labor Code and Wage

1 Orders. On October 9, 2023, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint against Defendants adding a
2 cause of action under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*
3 (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 5).

4 Given the arbitration agreement signed by the Aggrieved Employees and the class waiver
5 therein, Plaintiff agreed to dismiss the class claims and proceed with the claims under the PAGA.
6 The Court rejected the parties’ joint stipulation dismissing class claims, and thereafter Plaintiff filed
7 the First Amended Complaint and Defendants Answered. The parties then filed a Rule 3.770
8 Dismissal of the Class Claims that was approved and they are proceeding on a PAGA only basis.
9 After Plaintiff’s Counsel analyzed the relevant documents and other gathered data, Counsel
10 believed that this case was appropriate for resolution via mediation. With comprehensive informal
11 discovery in hand, the parties were able to engage in meaningful settlement discussions, in an
12 attempt to resolve the claims remaining in the Action at a mediation. (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 9).

13 Defendants deny each and all of Plaintiff’s allegations in their entirety (Yeremian Decl.,
14 Exhibit A, Settlement ¶ II.B 1.) The Agreement reached between the Parties does not constitute, is
15 not intended to constitute, and will not be deemed to constitute, an admission of liability by
16 Defendants as to the merits, validity, or accuracy of any of the allegations or claims made against
17 Defendants in the Action. (*Id.*)

18 **B. Mediation and Settlement**

19 Prior to mediation, Plaintiff conducted comprehensive informal discovery and
20 Defendants provided sampled data and numbers and documents. The information and data
21 exchanged by Plaintiff and Defendants prior to and during mediation and settlement negotiations
22 were sufficient to reliably assess the merits of the parties’ respective positions, to compromise
23 the issues on a fair and equitable basis, and to devise a formula for distribution of civil penalties
24 among PAGA Employees that took into consideration the strength of the PAGA claims.
25 (Lindsay Decl., ¶¶ 10-12).

26 On April 25, 2024, Plaintiff and Defendants attended a mediation with Todd Smith, Esq.
27 During Mediation and after lengthy direct negotiations assisted and facilitated by a respected
28 wage and hour mediator, the parties agreed to the general terms for settling this Action that were

1 first memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding and thereafter in the long-form
2 Settlement Agreement now before the Court for approval.

3 The parties believe and agree that the Settlement provides for a fair, adequate, and
4 reasonable resolution of the Action and have arrived at the Settlement in extensive, arm's length
5 negotiations, considering all relevant factors, present and potential. (Lindsay Decl. ¶¶ 10-23;
6 Yeremian Decl., ¶¶ 11-13; Haines Decl., ¶ 11). PAGA Counsel believes that the Settlement confers
7 substantial benefits upon Plaintiff and the PAGA Employees and that an independent review of the
8 Settlement by the Court in the approval process will confirm this conclusion. (*Id.*).

9 **III. PAGA ACTIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS**

10 **A. The PAGA Statutory Scheme**

11 PAGA creates a means of “deputizing” citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the
12 Labor Code on behalf of the LWDA. *Brown v. Ralphs Grocery Co.* (2011) 197 Cal. App. 4th 489,
13 501, *review den.* (Oct. 19, 2011, No. S195850), *cert. denied* 132 S.Ct. 1910 (Apr. 16, 2012). A
14 plaintiff may not — and Plaintiff here does not — bring a PAGA claim simply on his or her own
15 behalf as an individual claim, but “as the proxy or agent of the state’s labor law enforcement
16 agencies.” *Id.*, at 986; *see also Reyes v. Macy’s, Inc.* (2011) 202 Cal. App. 4th 1119, 1123-1124;
17 *Iskanian v. CLS Transp. Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348, 380. When an aggrieved
18 employee brings a PAGA claim, “the government is always the real party in interest.” *Securitas*
19 *Sec. Servs. USA, Inc. v. Sup. Ct. of San Diego Cnty.* (2015) 234 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 1119; *Montano*
20 *v. The Wet Seal Retail, Inc.* (2015) 232 Cal. App. 4th 1214, 1222 (“[A] PAGA action is a dispute
21 between an employer and the State agency.”). Accordingly, a plaintiff that brings a PAGA claim
22 represents “the same legal right and interest as state labor law enforcement agencies,” in that the
23 plaintiff seeks to recover those civil penalties that the LWDA otherwise would assess and collect.
24 *Arias v. Super. Ct.* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, 986; Labor Code § 2699(a) & (f); *Securitas, supra*, 234
25 Cal. App. 4th at 1119; *see also Medina v. Vander Poel* (E.D. Cal. 2015) 523 B.R. 820, 825 (holding
26 “PAGA plaintiffs do not have property rights in their cases.”), and *Amalgamated Transit Union,*
27 *Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 993, 1003.

1 Therefore, when a plaintiff brings a PAGA claim, he or she is properly viewed as a private
2 attorney general prosecuting violations of California’s labor laws on behalf of the state. An
3 employee may commence a PAGA action by fulfilling the requirements of California Labor Code §
4 2699.3(a)(1), which simply states: “The aggrieved employee or representative shall give written
5 notice by certified mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and the employer of the
6 specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
7 support the alleged violation.” Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1). As explained above, Plaintiff complied
8 with the notice requirements and properly pled a PAGA claim. (Lindsay Decl. ¶¶ 4-5).

9 **B. The Court Has Discretion When Awarding the Amount of Penalties.**

10 The PAGA provides for penalties in the amount of \$100 for each violation per aggrieved
11 employee per pay period for the initial violation and \$200 for each violation per aggrieved
12 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation. Labor Code § 2699(f)(2). “PAGA
13 penalties...are mandatory, not discretionary” and must be awarded upon a showing that Defendants
14 violated the Labor Code. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1213.
15 However, the PAGA provides the Court with discretion when it finds liability and awards these
16 penalties as part of a judgment. Labor Code § 2699(e)(2) states that “a court may award a lesser
17 amount than the maximum civil penalty amount specified by this part if, based on the facts and
18 circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust,
19 arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory.” Here, Defendants deny each and all of Plaintiffs’
20 allegations in their entirety. (Yeremian Decl., Exhibit A, Settlement ¶ II.B.1)

21 The Parties agree that the Court, in assessing the Settlement, should consider Defendants
22 attempts to ameliorate any potential liability, along with the risk assessment, and the post-judgment
23 prerogative the Court possesses to lower penalties had Plaintiff prevailed at trial. The Parties
24 believe that, based on these factors, the Court will find that this settlement is fair and reasonable.

25 **C. PAGA Authorizes the Payment of PAGA Counsel’s Fees and Costs**

26 PAGA provides for the recovery of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs. Labor Code §
27 2699(g)(1) (“Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable
28 attorney’s fees and costs, including any filing fee paid...”). The monetary settlement and

1 programmatic relief make Plaintiff a “prevailing party.” *Folsom v. Butte County Ass’n of Gov’ts*
2 (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 668,671; *Santisas v. Goodin* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 599, 621. Even if Labor Code §
3 2699(g)(1) did not authorize fees, Plaintiff would be entitled to fees as a Private Attorneys General
4 under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 because Plaintiff brought this action to, and the action
5 does, benefit the public. *Arias*, 46 Cal.4th at 985–986. PAGA Counsel seeks one-third of the
6 \$390,000 monetary relief provided, or \$130,000 in fees and \$13,726.67 in actual costs) to PAGA
7 Counsel consisting of David Yeremian & Associates, D.Law, Inc., and United Employees Law
8 Group. Pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code § 2699(l)(2), Plaintiff will be providing the LWDA notice
9 of the Settlement and this Motion upon its filing. (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 17). The LWDA therefore will
10 have the opportunity to object or otherwise comment on the terms of the Settlement.

11 **IV. THE SETTLEMENT**

12 The Settlement Agreement requires Defendant to pay a total sum of \$390,000.00 (the
13 “Gross Settlement Amount”) in exchange for a release of Plaintiff’s Representative PAGA claims
14 as asserted in the operative Complaint and the LWDA letter. (Yeremian Decl., Exhibit A,
15 Settlement, ¶¶ II.A.5, 6). In no event shall Defendants be required to pay more than the Gross
16 Settlement Amount. The Settlement terms are addressed below and at Lindsay Decl., ¶¶ 13-16.

17 For purposes of the Settlement, the Aggrieved Employees or “PAGA Employees” are
18 defined as: All current and former non-exempt California employees of Defendant who worked
19 during the PAGA Period of August 2, 2022 to May 3, 2024. (Yeremian Decl., Settlement, Exhibit
20 A, ¶ II.A.10). In this case, there are approximately 673 Aggrieved Employees.

21 Pending Court approval, the following will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount:
22 (1) Attorneys’ fees of up to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount which are **\$130,000.00**
23 (“PAGA Counsel’s Fees”) (Yeremian Decl., Exhibit A, Settlement, ¶ II.A.2); (2) PAGA Counsel’s
24 litigation costs incurred in this matter which are **\$15,752.32** (“PAGA Counsel’s Costs”)
25 (Settlement, ¶ II.A.3); and (3) Settlement Administration costs of **\$7,000.00** to be paid to the
26 Settlement Administrator, Apex Settlement Administration for sending notices and for calculating
27 settlement shares and preparing all checks and mailings. (Settlement, ¶¶ II.A.15-16). PAGA counsel
28 will provide the quotation from Apex should the Court wish to review it. There are no further

deductions requested, including for Plaintiff given that Plaintiff has agreed to a separate individual settlement agreement including a general release of all her individual claims against Defendants and a Section 1542 waiver. (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 15).

The remainder after the above deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount is defined as the “PAGA Settlement Fund” and is approximately \$239,273.33. This PAGA Settlement Fund will be paid in its entirety as PAGA Penalties to be allocated between the LWDA and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(i). More specifically, 75% of the PAGA Settlement Fund (i.e., \$17,455.00) will be paid to the LWDA and 25% of the PAGA Settlement Fund (i.e., \$59,818.33) is the PAGA Employee Fund from which Individual Settlement Payments will be paid by Apex to the PAGA Employees on a pro rata basis. (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 16; Yeremian Decl., Exhibit A, Settlement, ¶¶ II.A.7, 9, 11). PAGA employees cannot opt-out and 100% of the Individual Settlement Payments made to PAGA Employees will be deemed miscellaneous income for which a Form 1099 will be issued. (Settlement, ¶¶ II.A.7).

V. ARGUMENT

A. The Court Should Approve the Settlement Agreement.

Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(I), the Parties must obtain Court approval of a settlement of a PAGA action on a representative basis. However, as explained in *Arias v. Superior Ct.* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, the Parties need not follow the class action procedural rules in PAGA cases and therefore need not obtain approval of the PAGA settlement through a motion for preliminary or final approval. Plaintiff’s counsel will upload this Motion upon filing and the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA in accordance with Labor Code § 2699(I)(2) (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 17), which will allow the LWDA to appear and/or object at the Settlement approval hearing.

B. The Risks of Moving Forward with Plaintiffs’ PAGA Claim

To help the Court evaluate the fairness of the Settlement, below is a discussion of the risk evaluation made by Plaintiff and her Counsel. They considered the arguments and defenses asserted by Defense Counsel at mediation, assessed the risks of moving forward to trial and what this Court could do in awarding penalties even if Plaintiff prevailed at trial. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated various provisions of California law and seeks civil penalties for the foregoing violations

pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* Plaintiff allegations and claimed underlying violations are summarized by PAGA Counsel. (Lindsay Decl., ¶¶ 18-22).

The Gross Settlement Amount of \$390,000 is 19% of the maximum exposure of \$2.05 million at \$100/pay period that PAGA Counsel estimated. The \$390,000 gross settlement amount therefore represents a reasonable value at approximately \$19.00 per pay period. (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 25). Specifically, the total exposure on the PAGA claim was calculated by multiplying the total number of pay periods (20,500) by \$100 per violation. Plaintiff's calculation of the total potential exposure on the PAGA claim is for one PAGA penalty per pay period (i.e., Plaintiff did not stack the penalties in their calculation). Defendants argued case law supports the notion that it is inappropriate to "stack" penalties for multiple violations, particularly when those violations all stem from the same alleged "injury."

From PAGA Counsel's review of the facts, strengths, and weaknesses of the case, the risks and delays posed by further litigation, and PAGA Counsel's own prior litigation experience, PAGA Counsel believes that the recovery for each Aggrieved Employee is fair and reasonable taking into consideration the amounts received in other PAGA actions, the risks inherent in litigation of this genre, and the reasonable tailoring of each Aggrieved Employee's claim to the settlement award he or she will receive. Further, and based on the settlement negotiations, which were extensive and conducted in good faith and at arm's length between attorneys with substantial experience litigating PAGA actions, the Settlement Agreement was the product of a non-collusive settlement process. (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 17).

C. Trial of Plaintiff's PAGA Claims Would Have Presented Many Hurdles.

Defendant denied and continues to deny all of the claims made by Plaintiff in this Action and contends it acted at all relevant times in conformance with the law. Defendant contends Plaintiff and all putative Aggrieved Employees were paid for all hours worked; provided lawfully compliant meal periods and that any deviations were at the voluntary election of the Plaintiff and/or the putative Aggrieved Employees and not at the request of Defendant or due to work; that Defendant paid all wages due on a timely basis; that Defendant paid all wages due on a timely basis and using Labor-Code compliant instruments; that Defendant's wage statements complied with the

1 law; and that neither Plaintiff nor any Aggrieved Employee incurred reasonable business related
2 expenses for which they were not reimbursed. (Yeremian Decl., Exhibit A, Settlement, ¶ II.B.1). As
3 a result of Defendants' arguments Plaintiff's Counsel had to apply appropriate discounts in light of
4 the facts and law as discussed above. (Lindsay Decl., ¶ 23).

5 **D. The Court May Have Exercised Its Discretion to Reduce Civil Penalties.**

6 "PAGA penalties...are mandatory, not discretionary" and the Court must award penalties
7 upon a showing that Defendant violated the Labor Code. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163
8 Cal. App. 4th 1157, 1213; *Moreno v. Autozone, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. June 5, 2007) No. C05-04432 MJJ,
9 2007 WL 1650942, at *3. However, PAGA does provide the Court with discretion when it awards
10 these penalties. In departing from the \$100/pay period calculation to arrive at the \$390,000 gross
11 settlement amount in this case, Plaintiff considered various reasons why the Court may reduce any
12 eventual recovery at its discretion, and considered that PAGA penalties are not mandatory but
13 permissive. Labor Code § 2699(e)(2) states that "a court may award a lesser amount than the
14 maximum civil penalty amount specified by this part if, based on the facts and circumstances of the
15 particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or
16 confiscatory." (See also *Thurman v. Bayshore* (2012) 203 Cal. App. 4th 1112 (reducing PAGA
17 penalties by 30% under this provision).

18 **VI. THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS**

19 **A. The Court Should Approve the Requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs**

20 Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, PAGA Counsel is requesting an award of
21 attorneys' fees in the amount of **\$130,000** and an award of attorneys' costs to PAGA Counsel of
22 **\$13,726.67** (\$13,724.35 to David Yeremian & Associates and D.Law, Inc. and \$2.32 to United
23 Employees Law Group). (Yeremian Decl., Exhibit A, Settlement, ¶¶ II.A.2, 3)

24 Prior to enactment of PAGA, when the State had the resources to seek civil penalties on
25 behalf of the public, it paid its employees (including their attorneys) their salaries and benefits for
26 pursuing such penalties. The Legislature enacted PAGA because the Labor Commissioner and other
27 agencies were hampered in their enforcement of civil penalties by inadequate funding and staffing
28 constraints. *Iskanian, supra*, 59 Cal.4th at 379. To facilitate broader enforcement, the Legislature

1 enacted PAGA, authorizing “aggrieved employees” to pursue civil penalties on the state’s behalf.
2 Labor Code § 2699(a). In creating PAGA, the Legislature expressly provided that the private
3 counsel retained by the Plaintiff to represent the public’s interest can recover fees if the Plaintiff is
4 the prevailing party. Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

5 1) PAGA Counsel Are Entitled to Fees from the Civil Penalties Recovered

6 As previously indicated, this is *not* a class action. However, like a class action, it is a
7 representative action where instead of a class the Plaintiff represents the State, the public. As a
8 matter of law and substance, counsel’s client is the public at large and the State of California. The
9 Plaintiff is simply a “proxy” for the State. On August 11, 2016, the California Supreme Court
10 decided *Laffitte v. Robert Half International*, which addressed, in a class action context, the correct
11 methodology for awarding fees in a representative action settlement. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern.*
12 *Inc.* (2016) 205 Cal.Rptr.3d 555, 573. The *Laffitte* Court approved awarding fees as a percentage of
13 the settlement fund.:

14 We join the overwhelming majority of federal and state courts in holding that
15 when class action litigation establishes a monetary fund for the benefit of the class
16 members, and the trial court in its equitable powers awards Class Counsel a fee
17 out of that fund, the court may determine the amount of a reasonable fee by
18 choosing an appropriate percentage of the fund created.

19 *Id.* at p. 573. Here, the \$390,000 common fund created for the benefit of the public is, with
20 Plaintiff as proxy for the State, not unlike the fund created in class action settlements, with the
21 public the equivalent of the class referenced in *Laffitte*.

22 The Court, in *Laffitte*, pointed out several reasons why the percentage-of-the-fund method is
23 preferred over the alternative lodestar-multiplier approach in California courts:

24 The recognized advantages of the percentage method—including relative ease of
25 calculation, alignment of incentives between counsel and the class, a better
26 approximation of market conditions in a contingency case, and the encouragement
27 it provides counsel to seek an early settlement and avoid unnecessarily prolonging
28 the litigation [citations]—convince us the percentage method is a valuable tool that
should not be denied our trial courts.

Id. at 573.

1 An award of one-third of the civil penalties realized in the Settlement is appropriate here
2 under the “substantial benefit” theory. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1810;
3 *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 224, 254. That theory permits a litigant
4 who has sued in a representative capacity to recover fees from the beneficiaries of that
5 representation. Courts exercise their inherent equitable powers to assess attorneys’ fees against the
6 entire fund, thereby spreading the cost of those fees among the public who benefits from PAGA
7 actions. *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 35 (*Serrano III*). As this approach “better
8 approximates the workings of the marketplace than the lodestar approach,” there is “a greater
9 judicial willingness to evaluate a fee award as a percentage of the recovery.” *Lealao v. Beneficial*
10 *Calif., Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 19, 31, 48.

11 2) The Attorneys’ Fees Request Is Within the Range of Reasonable Fees

12 Plaintiffs’ Counsel at David Yeremian & Associates and D.Law, Inc. are experienced
13 employment attorneys with expertise in wage and hour class and representative actions. (*See*
14 *Lindsay Decl.*, ¶¶ 30-39; *Yeremian Decl.*, ¶¶ 4-10; *Haines Decl.*, ¶ 2). The requested one-third of
15 the common benefit created which PAGA Counsel requests here is generally awarded by California
16 Superior Courts in class and PAGA action settlement contexts, and PAGA Counsels Messrs.
17 Yeremian, Lindsay, and Haines all have well over 20 years of litigation experience each and
18 respectfully submit the requested \$130,000 in attorneys’ fees is reasonable in this instance.

19 3) PAGA Counsel’s Fee Request Is Reasonable Under the Lodestar Crosscheck.

20 Plaintiffs’ Counsel’s fee request is reasonable when calculated using the lodestar method.
21 Under the lodestar method, a base fee amount is calculated from a compilation of time reasonably
22 spent on the case and the reasonable hourly compensation of the attorney. *Serrano v. Priest* (1977)
23 20 Cal.3d 25, 48. The court then may enhance this lodestar figure by a “multiplier” to account for a
24 range of factors, such as the novelty and difficulty of the case, its contingent nature, and the degree
25 of success achieved. *Id.* at 49; *see also Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1132-36; *Thayer*
26 *v. Wells Fargo Bank* (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 819, 834, (“[t]here is no...rule limiting the factors that
27 may justify an exercise of judicial discretion to [adjust the] lodestar”).

PAGA Counsel address the fees request in light of their attorney time and billable hours invested in this action to date. PAGA Counsel charges rates commensurate with the prevailing market rates for attorneys of comparable experience and skill in handling complex litigation. The hourly rates for individual lawyers providing declarations and who worked on this matter are: (1) David Yeremian - \$850/hr; (2) Alvin B. Lindsay - \$800/hr; (3) Walter Haines - \$725/hr; and (4) Jean H Power - \$550/hr. (Yeremian Decl., ¶¶ 20-21, Exhibit C – Laffey Matrix).

Therefore, for lodestar cross-check purposes, using these rates and PAGA Counsel’s summary of attorney hours and as summarized in the supporting Declarations, PAGA Counsel has collectively incurred **200** hours and **\$140,097.50** in fees for lodestar purposes. (Yeremian Decl., ¶¶ 20-21, Lindsay Decl., ¶¶ 27-29; Haines Decl., ¶¶ 6-8). The requested fee award of **\$130,000** therefore is less than the billable hours PAGA counsel has invested in this Action and **requires no multiplier**. Given the results obtained, and the fees and costs provisions under the PAGA, settlement approval of the reasonable terms is well-justified in this instance. This is especially true given the efficient resolution that is preferable to unnecessarily incurring more billable hours through contested motion practice and discovery wars and trial.

Here, Plaintiffs’ Counsel have borne, and continue to bear, the entire risk and cost of litigation associated with this class action on a pure contingency basis. The factual and legal issues posed in this case were highly disputed, and there were also risks as to whether or not a trial would ultimately be manageable, leaving a large number of aggrieved employees potentially unlikely to receive any recovery. It is likely that, even after approval of the Settlement has been granted, Plaintiffs’ Counsel will be called upon to expend additional amounts of time fielding calls from aggrieved employees and resolving issues that may arise. Thus, consideration of the lodestar method as a cross-check to the percentage figure sought strongly supports the reasonableness of the requested fee award. PAGA Counsel respectfully requests the Court grant its request for **\$130,000** in reasonable attorneys’ fees

4) The Court Should Approve the Reimbursement of PAGA Counsel’s Costs.

The Litigation Costs for PAGA Counsel are also to be awarded under the Settlement Agreement to David Yeremian & Associates, Inc. and D.Law, Inc. and United Employees Law Group as PAGA Counsel. Mr. Yeremian reports that David Yeremian & Associates and D.Law,

1 Inc. have incurred a total of **\$15,750.00** in costs. (Yeremian Decl., ¶ 24). The lion's share of these
2 costs were incurred in connection with mediation, and the others listed are all reasonably incurred
3 and were necessary to the prosecution of this action. When added with the **\$2.32** in costs United
4 Employees Law Group has incurred (*see* Haines Decl., ¶ 10), PAGA Counsel respectfully requests
5 the Court award their cumulative costs of **\$15,752.32**.

6 **VII. THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION**

7 After receiving a not to exceed quotation, the parties agreed to use Apex Class Action
8 Administration ("Apex") as the third-party settlement administrator in this case. (Lindsay Decl. ¶¶
9 2, 15-16). Apex shall be responsible for updating the addresses for PAGA Members, mailing the
10 Notice of Settlement and calculating and distributing the settlement checks, among other duties.
11 (Yeremian Decl., ¶ 24). Apex capped its fees at \$7,000 for administering the settlement, and based
12 on PAGA Counsels' experience in other class and PAGA settlements, Apex's costs for
13 administering this settlement are fair and reasonable and should be awarded.


14 **VIII. CONCLUSION**

15 Plaintiff and her Counsel submit that the proposed Settlement as documented in the
16 Settlement Agreement is fair, adequate, reasonable, and in the best interest of Plaintiff, Defendants,
17 the aggrieved employees, and the State of California. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court
18 approve the Settlement and Order the Parties to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of
19 the Settlement Agreement, and enter the concurrently filed [Proposed] Order Granting Approval
20 and Judgment to that end.

21 DATED: November 19, 2024

D.LAW, INC
DAVID YEREMIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

22
23 By


David Yeremian
Alvin B. Lindsay
Jean H. Power
Attorneys for Plaintiff JENNY ESTRADA
and all others similarly aggrieved