2/10/2022 12:49 PM Superior Court of California County of Stanislaus Clerk of the Court Justin F. Marquez, Esq. (SBN 262417) 1 By: Angela Mesa, Deputy justin@wilshirelawfirm.com Benjamin H. Haber, Esq. (SBN 315664) 2 benjamin@wilshirelawfirm.com 3 Rachel J. Vinson, Esq. (SBN 331434) rvinson@wilshirelawfirm.com WILSHIRE LAW FIRM 4 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor 5 Los Angeles, California 90010 Telephone (213) 381-9988 6 Facsimile: (213) 381-9989 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 FOR THE COUNTY OF STANISLAUS 11 Case No. CV-21-000269 LETICIA RODRIGUEZ, individually, and on 12 behalf of all others similarly situated, **CLASS ACTION** 13 Plaintiff, [Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable 14 Sonny S. Šandhu, Dept. 24] v. 15 **DECLARATION OF JUSTIN F.** MODESTO RESTAURANT GROUP, LLC, a MARQUEZ IN SUPPORT OF California limited liability corporation; and DOES 16 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR 1 through 10, inclusive, PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS 17 ACTION SETTLEMENT Defendants. 18 [Filed with Memorandum of Points and Authorities the Declaration of Justin F. 19 Marguez, and Proposed Order] 20 PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING Date: March 8, 2022 21 Time: 8:30 a.m. Dept: 24 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 DECLARATION OF JUSTIN F. MARQUEZ IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Electronically Filed

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

## **DECLARATION OF JUSTIN F. MARQUEZ**

I, Justin F. Marquez, declare as follows:

1. I am admitted, in good standing, to practice as an attorney in the State of California, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and the United States District Courts for the Central, Southern, Eastern, and Northern Districts of California. I am a Senior Partner at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC, counsel of record for Plaintiff. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and could and would competently testify to them under oath if called as a witness. This Declaration is submitted in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

## CASE BACKGROUND

- 2. This is a wage and hour class action and PAGA representative action. Plaintiff and putative class members worked in California as hourly-paid, non-exempt employees for Defendant during the class period. Defendant manages Carl's Jr. fast food locations in Modesto, California and the surrounding area.
- 3. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's payroll, timekeeping, and wage and hour practices resulted in Labor Code violations. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay for all hours worked by not recording the actual start and end times of shifts and only paying for 8 hours of work for each workday, regardless of whether an employee worked overtime. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant failed to provide employees with legally compliant meal and rest periods. Based on these allegations, Plaintiff asserts claims against Defendant for failure to pay overtime wages, failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, inaccurate wage statements, failure to pay all final wages at termination, unfair business practices, and civil penalties under PAGA.
- 4. On January 21, 2021, Plaintiff filed a putative wage-and-hour class action complaint against Defendant Modesto Restaurant Group, LLC for: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages (Labor Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197); (2) failure to pay overtime wages (Labor Code §§ 1194, and 1198); (3) failure to provide meal periods (Labor Code §§ 226.7) and 512); (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods (Labor Code §§ 226.7);

(5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination (Labor Code §§ 201-203); (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements (Labor Code § 226); and (7) unfair business practices (Business and Professions Code 17200 et seq.). On February 8, 2022, Plaintiff filed a Joint Stipulation and [Proposed] Order for Leave to file First Amended Complaint, and the First Amended Complaint adding a claim for civil penalties under Private Attorneys General Act "PAGA" (Labor Code § 2698 et seq.). The Court has yet to sign the Proposed Order.

### DISCOVERY AND INVESTIGATION

- 5. Following the filing of the Complaint, the parties exchanged documents and information before mediating this action. Defendant produced a sample of time and pay records for class members. Defendant also provided documents of its wage and hour policies and practices during the class period, and information regarding the total number of current and former employees in its informal discovery responses.
- 6. After reviewing documents regarding Defendant's wage and hour policies and practices, analyzing Defendant's timekeeping and payroll records, and interviewing Class Members, Class Counsel was able to evaluate the probability of class certification, success on the merits, and Defendant's maximum monetary exposure for all claims. Class Counsel also investigated the applicable law regarding the claims and defenses asserted in the litigation. Class Counsel reviewed these records and prepared a damage analysis prior to mediation.

## **SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS**

- 7. On November 30, 2021, the parties participated in private mediation with experienced class action mediator Kelly Knight. After extensive negotiations and discussions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of Plaintiff's claims and Defendant's defenses, Mr. Knight issued a mediator's proposal that was accepted by all parties, the material terms of which are encompassed within the Settlement. Attached as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Joint Stipulation for Class Action Settlement.
- 8. The settlement includes \$25,000 allocated to Plaintiff's claims under PAGA, with 75% of which (\$18,750) will be paid to the LWDA and 25% (\$6,250) will be paid to eligible members of the PAGA Class. (Settlement, § I(O).) Class Counsel submitted the proposed

settlement to the LWDA before filing this Motion for Preliminary Approval.

- 9. The Settlement provides that Defendant will not oppose a fee application of up to 33 1/3% (\$200,000) of the Settlement Amount, plus out-of-pocket costs not to exceed \$25,000. (Settlement, § XIII.) At this time, Class Counsel's costs are approximately \$18,433.02. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's costs to the date is attached to this declaration as **Exhibit 2**.
- 10. I requested several bids from experienced class action settlement administrators to handle the responsibilities of the Settlement Administrator under this settlement. The Parties accepted the bid of Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions. In its bid, Phoenix agreed to cap its costs at \$11,750 if there are 1,400 class members. The bid also provides that class notice will be provided in English and Spanish. A true and correct copy of the bid is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3.**
- 11. Plaintiff Leticia Rodriguez does not have any interest, financial or otherwise, in the proposed third-party administrator, Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions.
- 12. No one at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC (meaning the law firm itself and anyone employed at the law firm) has any interest, financial or otherwise, in the proposed third-party administrator Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions.
- 13. Wilshire Law Firm, PLC has no fee-splitting agreement with any other counsel in this case.

## THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE

- 14. Class Counsel has conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of this case. Based on the foregoing discovery and their own independent investigation and evaluation, Class Counsel is of the opinion that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interests of the Settlement Class Members in light of all known facts and circumstances, the risk of significant delay, the defenses that could be asserted by Defendant both to certification and on the merits, trial risk, and appellate risk.
- 15. Based on an analysis of the facts and legal contentions in this case, documents and information from Defendant, I evaluated Defendant's maximum exposure. I took into account the risk of not having the claims certified and the risk of not prevailing at trial, even if the claims

are certified. After using the data Defendant provided, including a random sample of timekeeping and payroll records, as well as class member demographics (i.e., the number of class members, workweeks, and average total compensation of the class), with the assistance of a statistics expert I created a damages model to evaluate the realistic range of potential recovery for the class. The damages model is based on the following benchmarks:

Shifts Analyzed: 225,114

Total Workweeks: 56,179

Total Class Members: 1,260

Terminated Class Members during 3-year statute: 775

PAGA Pay Periods: 12,149

Avg. Hourly Rate: \$12.39

Class period: January 21, 2017 through date the Court grants preliminary approval or April 1,

2022, whichever is earlier

- 16. Discovery and investigation revealed that Defendant failed to pay class members minimum wages and overtime for all hours worked, failed to pay for off-the-clock work, failed to record any instances of missed meal period, and failed to have a legally compliant written policy providing meal periods and authorizing and permitting rest periods.
- 17. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages. My expert analyzed Defendant's timekeeping records and found that Defendant failed to pay minimum wages for all recorded hours worked in the total of \$17,899. Defendants counter that their policies were legally compliant, and contend that certification of Plaintiff's off-the-clock claim is not appropriate because individualized inquiries would be required to determine the amount of unpaid work time, and whether Defendants had knowledge of off-the-clock work occurring. A conservative estimate of unpaid overtime 1 hour per workweek was appropriate given the difficulty of proving an off-the-clock work violation on a class-wide basis. For purposes of calculating Defendants' liability based on a best case scenario for Plaintiff and the Class, I estimate that Defendants' maximum potential exposure is \$1,044,367.61(56,179 weeks \*\$18.59 hourly overtime rate \* 1

2

hour of unpaid work per week). I discounted these figures by 80% to account for the difficulty of prevailing on a motion for class certification and a trial on the merits, yielding a realistic damage estimate of \$208,873.52.<sup>1</sup>

- 18. With respect to the meal period claim, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant required him and similarly situated class members to work in lieu of taking meal periods, and Defendant lacked legally compliant policies and practices providing meal periods during the class period. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendants required her and similarly situated class members to sign an illegal blanket meal period waiver for shifts between 5-6 hours long and shift between 10-12 hours long that applies prospectively. My expert analyzed Defendant's timekeeping records and found that approximately 31.5% of all meal breaks had violations of short, missed, or no meal periods. Potential liability of the meal period claim, which includes shifts 5-6 hours long, shifts over 6 hours long, and shifts over 10 hours long, is \$814,810, including interest; however, I discounted this figure by 80% to account for the difficulty of certifying and proving meal period claims, and to account for the possibility of class members voluntarily choosing to forego a meal period, yielding a realistic damage estimate of \$162,962.
- 19. With respect to the rest period claim, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant required him and similarly situated class members to work in lieu of taking rest periods, and Defendant lacked legally compliant policies and practices authorizing and permitting employees to take rest periods during the class period. My expert analyzed Defendant's timekeeping records and found that approximately 36.4% of eligible shifts have a rest breaks. Defendant's potential liability for the rest period claim is \$1,120,622; however, I discounted this figure by 80% to account for the difficulty of certifying and proving rest period claims, particularly because rest periods do not have to be recorded, and to account for the possibility of class members voluntarily choosing to forego a rest period, yielding a realistic damage estimate of \$224,124.40.

25

26

27

28

<sup>1</sup> This discount for risk at certification and trial is reasonable because the Judicial Council of California found that only 21.4% of all class actions were certified either as part of a settlement or as part of a contested certification motion. See Findings of the Study of California Class Action Litigation, 2000-2006, available at http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/classaction-lit-study.pdf.

- 20. In sum, Plaintiff's maximum recovery for the unpaid wages due to unpaid work (minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages), meal period, and rest period claims is \$2,979,799.61, but, after factoring in the risk and uncertainty of prevailing at certification and trial, Plaintiff's realistic estimated recovery for the non-penalty claims is \$592,959.92.
- 21. With respect to Plaintiff's derivative claims for statutory and civil penalties, Plaintiff estimated that Defendant's realistic potential liability is \$350,000. While Defendant's maximum potential liability for waiting time penalties is \$1,897,421 based on approximately 775 terminated class members during the 3-year statute, \$1,184,900 for inaccurate wage statements based on approximately 600 class members who worked 12,149 pay periods within the 1-year statute, and \$1,214,900 for PAGA violations based on the Court assessing a \$100 penalty for initial violations for all 12,149 pay periods within the 1-year statute, I believe that it would be unrealistic to expect the Court to award the full \$4,297,221 in penalties given Defendant's defenses, the contested nature of Plaintiff's claims, and the discretionary nature of penalties. Considering that the underlying claims are realistically estimated to be \$592,959.92, such a disproportionate award would also raise due process concerns. Weighing these factors, and applying a discount to account for the risk and uncertainty of prevailing at trial, I arrived at \$350,000 for statutory and civil penalties.
- Using these estimated figures, Plaintiff predicted that the realistic maximum recovery for all claims, including penalties, would be \$942,959.92. This means that the \$600,000 settlement figure represents approximately 49.5% of the realistic maximum recovery (\$600,000 / \$942,959.92= 63.6%). Considering the risk and uncertainty of prevailing at class certification and at trial, this is an excellent result for the Class. Indeed, because of the proposed Settlement, class members will receive timely, guaranteed relief and will avoid the risk of an unfavorable judgment.
- 23. While Plaintiff is confident in the merits of her claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each cause of action. Plaintiff also recognizes that proving the amount of wages due to each Class Member would be an expensive, time-consuming, and uncertain proposition.
  - 24. This settlement avoids the risks and the accompanying expense of further

litigation. Although the parties had engaged in a significant amount of investigation, informal discovery and class-wide data analysis, the parties had not yet completed formal written discovery. Plaintiff intended to depose corporate officers and managers of Defendant. Moreover, preparation for class certification and a trial remained for the parties as well as the prospect of appeals in the wake of a disputed class certification ruling for Plaintiff and/or adverse summary judgment ruling. Had the Court certified any claims, Defendant could move to decertify the claims. As a result, the parties would incur considerably more attorneys' fees and costs through trial.

- 25. The Net Settlement Amount available for Class Member settlement payments is estimated to be \$336,500, for a class of 1,260 persons.<sup>2</sup> As a result, each Settlement Class Member is eligible to receive an average net benefit of approximately \$280.42.
- 26. The proposed settlement of \$600,000 therefore represents a substantial recovery when compared to Plaintiff's reasonably forecasted recovery. When considering the risks of litigation, the uncertainties involved in achieving class certification, the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability, the probability of appeal of a favorable judgment, it is clear that the settlement amount of \$600,000 is within the "ballpark" of reasonableness, and preliminary settlement approval is appropriate.

## ENHANCEMENT AWARD FOR PLAINTIFF IS REASONABLE

- 27. Class Counsel represent that Plaintiff devoted a great deal of time and work assisting counsel in the case, communicated with counsel very frequently for litigation and to prepare for mediation, and was frequently in contact with Class Counsel during the mediation. Plaintiff's requested enhancement award is reasonable particularly in light of the substantial benefits Plaintiff generated for all class members.
- 28. Throughout this litigation, Plaintiff, who is a former employee of Defendant, has cooperated immensely with my office and has taken many actions to protect the interests of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Net Settlement Amount is: \$600,000 minus \$8,000 for class representative service award, minus \$11,750 in administration costs, minus \$18,750 for PAGA portion sent to the LWDA, minus \$200,000 for Class Counsel's attorneys' fees, and minus \$25,000 for Class Counsel's litigation expenses.

class. Plaintiff provided valuable information regarding unpaid overtime, meal period, and rest period claims. Plaintiff also informed my office of developments and information relevant to this action, participated in decisions concerning this action, made herself available to answer questions during the mediation, and provided my office with the names and contact information of potential witnesses in this action. Before we filed this case, Plaintiff provided my office with several documents, including policy documents, and communications from Defendant regarding the claims alleged in this action. The information and documentation provided by Plaintiff was instrumental in establishing the wage and hour violations alleged in this action, and the recovery provided for in the Settlement Agreement would have been impossible to obtain without Plaintiff's participation.

- 29. At the same time, Plaintiff faced many risks in adding herself as the class representative in this matter. Plaintiff faced actual risks with her future employment, as putting herself on public record in an employment lawsuit could also very well affect her likelihood for future employment. Furthermore, as part of this settlement, Plaintiff is executing a general release of all claims against Defendant.
- 30. In turn, class members will now have the opportunity to participate in a settlement, reimbursing them for alleged wage violations they may have never known about on their own or been willing to pursue on their own. If these class members would have each tried to pursue their legal remedies on their own, that would have resulted in each having to expend a significant amount of their own monetary resources and time, which were obviated by Plaintiff putting herself on the line on behalf of these other class members.
- 31. In the final analysis, this class action would not have been possible without the aid of Plaintiff, who put her own time and effort into this litigation, sacrificed the value of his own individual claims, and placed herself at risk for the sake of the class members. The requested enhancement award for Plaintiff for her service as the class representative and for his general release of all individual claims is a relatively small amount of money when the time and effort put into the litigation are considered and in comparison to enhancements granted in other class actions. The requested incentive award is therefore reasonable to compensate Plaintiff for her

active participation in this lawsuit. Indeed, in *Karl Adams, III, et al. v. MarketStar Corporation*, et al., No. 2:14-cv-02509-TLN-DB, a wage and hour class action alleging that class members were misclassified as exempt outside salespersons, I was co-lead Class Counsel and helped negotiate a \$2.5 million class action settlement for 339 class members, and the court approved a \$25,000 class representative incentive award for each named plaintiff.

## THE REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS IS REASONABLE

- 32. The Settlement provides for attorney's fees payable to Class Counsel in an amount up to one-third (33 1/3%) of the Settlement Amount, for a maximum fees award of \$200,000, plus actual costs and expenses not to exceed \$25,000. The proposed award of attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in this case can be justified under either method lodestar or percentage recovery. Class Counsel, however, intend to base the proposed award of fees, costs and expenses on the percentage method as many of the entries in the time records will have to be redacted to preserve attorney-client and attorney work product privileges.
- 33. I am informed and believe that the fee and costs provision is reasonable. The fee percentage requested is less than that charged by my office for most employment cases. My office invested significant time and resources into the case, with payment deferred to the end of the case, and then, of course, contingent on the outcome.
- 34. It is further estimated that my office will need to expend at least another 50 to 100 hours to monitor the process leading up to the final approval and payments made to the class.

  My office also bears the risk of taking whatever actions are necessary if Defendant fails to pay.
- 35. The risk to my office has been very significant, particularly if we would not be successful in pursuing this class action. In that case, we would have been left with no compensation for all the time taken in litigating this case. Indeed, I have taken on a number of class action cases that have resulted in thousands of attorney hours being expended and ultimately having certification denied or the defendant company going bankrupt. The contingent risk in these types of cases is very real and they do occur regularly. Furthermore, we were precluded from focusing on, or taking on, other cases which could have resulted in a larger, and less risky, monetary gain.

- 36. Because most individuals cannot afford to pay for representation in litigation on an hourly basis, Wilshire Law Firm, PLC represents virtually all of its employment law clients on a contingency fee basis. Pursuant to this arrangement, we are not compensated for our time unless we prevail at trial or successfully settle our clients' cases. Because Wilshire Law Firm, PLC is taking the risk that we will not be reimbursed for our time unless our client settles or wins his or her case, we cannot afford to represent an individual employee on a contingency basis if, at the end of our representation, all we are to receive is our regular hourly rate for services. It is essential that we recover more than our regular hourly rate when we win if we are to remain in practice so as to be able to continue representing other individuals in civil rights employment disputes.
- 37. As of the drafting of this motion, my office has incurred around \$16,967.80 in expenses litigating this action, and we anticipate accruing additional costs up to Final Approval of the Settlement. These expenses were reasonably necessary to the litigation and were actually incurred by my office. They should be reimbursed in full, up to the maximum amount allowed in the Settlement Agreement.

## MY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

- 38. Wilshire Law Firm was selected by Best Lawyers and U.S. News & World Report as one of the nation's Best Law Firms in 2021 and is comprised of over 30 attorneys and over 200 employees. Wilshire Law Firm is actively and continuously practicing in employment litigation, representing employees in both individual and class actions in both state and federal courts throughout California.
- 39. Wilshire Law Firm is qualified to handle this litigation because its attorneys are experienced in litigating Labor Code violations in both individual, class action, and representative action cases. Wilshire Law Firm has handled, and is currently handling, numerous wage and hour class action lawsuits, as well as class actions involving consumer rights and data privacy litigation.
- 40. I graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles's College Honors

  Program in 2004 with Bachelor of Arts degrees in History and Japanese, *magna cum laude* and

*Phi Beta Kappa*. As an undergraduate, I also received a scholarship to study abroad for one year at Tokyo University in Tokyo, Japan. I received my Juris Doctor from Notre Dame Law School in 2008.

- 41. My practice is focused on advocating for the rights of consumers and employees in class action litigation and appellate litigation. I am currently the primary attorney in charge of litigating several class action cases in state and federal courts across the United States.
- 42. I have received numerous awards for my legal work. From 2017 to 2020, Super Lawyers selected me as a "Southern California Rising Star," and in 2022 I was selected as a "Southern California Super Lawyer." In 2016 and 2017, the National Trial Lawyers selected me as a "Top 40 Under 40" attorney. I am also rated 10.0 ("Superb") by Avvo.com.
- 43. I am on the California Employment Lawyers Association (CELA)'s Wage and Hour Committee and Mentor Committee, and I was selected to speak at CELA's 2019 Advanced Wage & Hour Seminar on the topic of manageability of class actions. Since 2013, I have actively mentored young attorneys through CELA's mentorship program.
- 44. I am also an active member of the Consumer Attorneys of California (CAOC). In 2020, I was selected for a position on CAOC's Board of Directors. I am also a member of CAOC's Diversity Committee, and I help assist the CAOC in defeating bills that harm employees. Indeed, I recently helped assist Jacqueline Serna, Esq., Legislative Counsel for CAOC, in defeating AB 443, which proposed legislation that sought to limit the enforceability of California Labor Code § 226.
- 45. As the attorney responsible for day-to-day management of this matter at the Wilshire Law Firm, I have over eleven years of experience with litigating wage and hour class actions. Over the last eleven years, I have managed and assisted with the litigation and settlement of several wage and hour class actions. In those class actions, I performed similar tasks as those performed in the course of prosecuting this action. My litigation experience includes:
  - I served as lead or co-lead in negotiating class action settlements worth over \$10
     million in gross recovery to class members for each year during 2020 and 2021.

- b. To my knowledge, I am the only attorney to appear on each of the following *Top Verdict* lists for 2018 in California: Top 20 Civil Rights Violation Verdicts, Top 20 Labor & Employment Settlements, and Top 50 Class Action Settlements.
- c. As lead counsel, on April 29, 2021, I prevailed against CVS Pharmacy, Inc. by winning class certification on behalf of hundreds of thousands of consumers for misleading advertising claims in *Joseph Mier v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*, U.S. Dist. Ct. C.D. Cal. no. SA CV 20-1979-DOC-(ADSx).
- d. As lead counsel, I prevailed against Bank of America by: winning class certification on behalf of thousands of employees for California Labor Code violations; defeating appellate review of the court's order certifying the class; defeating summary judgment; and defeating a motion to dismiss. (Frausto v. Bank of America, N.A. (N.D. Cal. 2019) 334 F.R.D. 192, 2020 WL 1290302 (9th Cir. Feb. 27, 2020), 2019 WL 5626640 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2019), 2018 W.L. 3659251 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 2018).). The decision certifying the class in Frausto is also discussed in Class Certification Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 in Action by Information Technology or Call Center Employees for Violation of State Law Wage and Hour Rules, 35 A.L.R. Fed. 3d Art. 8.
- e. I was the primary author of the class certification and expert briefs in *ABM*Industries Overtime Cases (2017) 19 Cal.App.5th 277, a wage and hour class action for over 40,000 class members for off-the-clock, meal period, split shift, and reimbursement claims. ABM Industries Overtime Cases is the first published California appellate authority to hold that an employer's "auto-deduct policy for meal breaks in light of the recordkeeping requirements for California employers is also an issue amenable to classwide resolution." (Id. at p. 310.)<sup>3</sup> Notably, the Court of Appeal also held that expert analysis of timekeeping records can also

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As a California district court observed before the *ABM Industries Overtime* decision, "[t]he case law regarding certification of auto-deduct classes is mixed." (*Wilson v. TE Connectivity Networks, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2017) No. 14-CV-04872-EDL, 2017 WL 1758048, \*7.)

- support the predominance requirement for class certification. (*Id.* at p. 310-311.) In 2021, the case settled for \$140 million, making it one of the largest ever wage and hour class action settlements for hourly-paid employees in California.
- f. I briefed, argued, and won *Yocupicio v. PAE Group, LLC* (9th Cir. 2015) 795 F.3d 1057. The Ninth Circuit ruled in my client's favor and held that non-class claims under California's Private Attorney Generals Act ("PAGA") cannot be used to calculate the amount in controversy under the Class Action Fairness Act ("CAFA"). This case is cited in several leading treatises such as *Wright & Miller's Federal Practice & Procedure*, and *Newberg on Class Actions*. In October 2016, the U.S. Supreme Court denied review of a case that primarily concerned *Yocupicio*. That effort was led by Theodore J. Boutrous, who brought the cert petition, with amicus support from a brief authored by Andrew J. Pincus. Considering that leading Supreme Court practitioners from the class action defense bar were very motivated in undermining *Yocupicio* case, but failed, this demonstrates the national importance of the *Yocupicio* decision.
- g. On December 13, 2018, the United States District Court granted final approval of the \$2,500,000 class action settlement in *Mark Brulee, et al. v. DAL Global Services, LLC* (C.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2018) No. CV 17-6433 JVS(JCGx), 2018 WL 6616659 in which I served as lead counsel. In doing so, the Court found: "Class Counsel's declarations show that the attorneys are experienced and successful litigators." (*Id.* at p. \*10.)
- h. *Gasio v. Target Corp.* (C.D. Cal. Sep. 12, 2014) 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129852, a reported decision permitting class-wide discovery even though the employer has a lawful policy because "[t]he fact that a company has a policy of not violating the law does not mean that the employees follow it, which is the issue here." The court also ordered defendant to pay for the cost of *Belaire-West* notice.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> http://www.chamberlitigation.com/cases/abm-industries-inc-v-castro

- i. In 2013, I represented a whistleblower that reported that his former employer was defrauding the State of California with the help of bribes to public employees.
   The case, a false claims (qui tam) action, resulted in the arrest and criminal prosecution of State of California employees by the California Attorney General's Office.
- j. In 2013, I was part of a team of attorneys that obtained conditional certification for over 2,000,000 class members in a federal labor law case for misclassification of independent contractors that did crowdsourced work on the Internet, *Otey v. CrowdFlower, Inc.*, N.D. Cal. Case No. 12-cv-05524-JST (MEJ), resulting in the following pro-plaintiff reported decisions:
  - 1) 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 151846 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2013) (holding that an unaccepted Rule 68 offer doesn't moot plaintiff's claims, and granting plaintiff's motion to strike defendant's affirmative defenses based on *Twombly/Iqbal*).
  - 2) 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 122007 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2013) (order granting conditional collective certification).
  - 3) 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 95687 (N.D. Cal. July 8, 2013) (affirming the magistrate judge's discovery ruling which held that "evidence of other sources of income is irrelevant to the question of whether a plaintiff is an employee within the meaning of the FLSA").
  - 4) 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91771 (N.D. Cal. June 20, 2013) (granting broad discovery because "an FLSA plaintiff is entitled to discovery from locations where he never worked if he can provide some evidence to indicate company-wide violations").
- k. From 2012 to 2013, I was part of a team of attorneys that obtained class certification for over 60,000 class members for off-the-clock claims, *Linares v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC416555. We also successfully opposed subsequent appeals to the California

4

3

6

5

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

Court of Appeal and California Supreme Court.

- 46. Bobby Saadian is the Founding President and Managing Attorney at Wilshire Law Firm. He graduated from California State University, Northridge, Pepperdine University Graziadio Business School and Pepperdine University School of Law. He is listed in both The Best Lawyers in America and Super Lawyers. Through his work with the CAOC, Bobby meets with state attorney generals and legislators to help shape policies designed to protect vulnerable consumers from large corporations. He frequently speaks at trial advocacy, litigation seminars, and other continuing legal education events, including the annual Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles (CAALA) Las Vegas Convention, the National Trial Lawyers Summit and the Association of Plaintiff Interstate Trucking Lawyers of America (APITLA) National Interstate Trucking Supper Summit. He has been named one of the "Most Influential Minority Lawyers" by the Los Angeles Business Journal. The Streets Are For Everyone (SAFE). In 2017, Mr. Saadian started Wilshire Law Firm's Academic Scholarship Program, which is "committed to helping the next generation of lawyers succeed." He is also an Executive Board Member of the Los Angeles Trial Lawyers' Charities (LATLC). He is also rated 10.0 ("Superb") by Avvo.com and he has been awarded "Client's Choice Award Winner." He also holds Martindale-Hubbell AV Preeminent Peer Review Rating, the highest possible rating in both legal ability and ethical standards. In 2014 and 2015, he was awarded the "Litigator Award Winner", which is awarded to the Top 1% of lawyers nationwide. He is admitted to practice in the State of California, State of Texas and District of Columbia.
- 47. Benjamin H. Haber is a fifth-year Associate Attorney at Wilshire Law Firm. His current hourly rate is \$500. He graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles, with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, and received his Juris Doctor from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 2016. During law school, he was a member of the executive board for the Hastings Law Journal and student mediator at the San Francisco Superior Court, Small Claims Division. He was admitted to practice law in the State of California in 2017. Since graduating from law school, he has focused his legal work primarily on wage-and-hour litigation and has helped obtain dozens of settlements on behalf of tens of thousands of workers

in California.

- 48. Rachel J. Vinson is a second-year Associate Attorney at Wilshire Law Firm. She was admitted to practice law in the State of California and the Central and Southern Districts of California in 2020. Rachel graduated from Claremont McKenna College with a Bachelor in Arts in Philosophy and Government. She received her Juris Doctor from Washington University in St. Louis where she earned a Scholar in Law Award, was Executive Editor of the Washington University Journal of Law and Policy, was a Finalist in the Client Interviewing and Counseling Competition, and successfully second-chaired a felony trial as a Rule 13 Attorney for the Missouri State Public Defender Office. She is also a member of CAALA and CELA.
- 49. My current contingent billing rate of \$800 per hour is consistent with my practice area, lead appellate experience in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, numerous awards received, legal market and accepted hourly rates:
  - a. In the December 8, 2008 article "Billable Hours Aren't the Only Game in Town Anymore," *NATIONAL LAW JOURNAL*, the following hourly billing rates were reported by Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, a leading firm in the defense of wage-and-hour class actions that I opposed when litigating wage-and-hour class actions: Partners: \$475-\$795; Associates: 1st Year \$275, 2nd Year \$310, 3rd Year \$335, 4th Year \$365, 5th Year \$390, 6th Year \$415, 7th Year \$435, 8th Year \$455. I am an 11th year attorney and Senior Partner, with most of my experience in class action litigation as a primary practice area. Having successfully briefed and argued a published appeal in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals involving CAFA and PAGA, having experience certifying large class actions (including *ABM Industries Overtime Cases*, which was decided on appeal), and having received numerous awards for my legal work, my hourly rate should be adjusted upward.
  - b. On September 9, 2021, the Hon. Peter Wilson of the Orange County Superior Court approved my \$800 hourly rate when he granted final approval of the class action settlement in *Ricardo Campos Hernadez v. Adams Iron Co., Inc.*, No. 30-

2010	Λ1	066522	CIL	$\Delta \mathbf{r}$	CVC
2015	/-( <i>)</i>	U00.3ZZ	( ,( ) -(	ノロー	しんし

- c. On August 6, 2021, the Hon. Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr. of the United States District Court granted final approval of the \$1,600,000 class action settlement in *Carlos Moreno v. Pretium Packaging, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2021) No. 8:19-cv-02500-SB-DFM, 2021 WL 3673845 in which I served as lead counsel. In doing so, the Court approved my then \$750 hourly rate after finding it was "reasonable, given the qualifications of the attorneys who worked on this matter." (*Id.* at p. \*3.)
- d. On January 19, 2021, the Hon. Elihu M. Berle of the Los Angeles County Superior Court approved my \$750 hourly rate when he granted final approval of the class action settlement in *Faye Zhang v. Richemont North America, Inc.*, No. 19STCV32396.
- e. On December 13, 2018, the United States District Court granted final approval of the \$2,500,000 class action settlement in *Mark Brulee, et al. v. DAL Global Services, LLC* (C.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2018) No. CV 17-6433 JVS(JCGx), 2018 WL 6616659 in which I served as lead counsel. In doing so, the Court approved my then \$600 hourly rate and found: "Class Counsel's declarations show that the attorneys are experienced and successful litigators." (*Id.* at p. \*10.)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on February 10, 2022, at Los Angeles, California.

Justin F. Marquez, Esq.

27

28

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

This Stipulation of Settlement is made by and between the Named Plaintiff, LETICIA RODRIGUEZ ("Plaintiff"), on her own behalf and on behalf of all members of the Settlement Class, as defined below, on the one hand, and Defendant MODESTO RESTAURANT GROUP, LLC, ("Defendant") on the other hand (collectively the "Parties"), in the lawsuit entitled *Leticia* Rodriguez v. Modesto Restaurant Group, LLC, filed in the Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-21-0002691. This Stipulation of Settlement resolves all claims that were asserted or could have been asserted against Defendant pertaining to the claims in the Litigation.

### **DEFINITIONS**

- Administrative Costs. All administrative costs of settlement, including cost of Α. notice to the Settlement Class, claims administration, and any fees and costs incurred or charged by the Settlement Administrator in connection with the execution of its duties under this Stipulation of Settlement.
- В. Agreement. The terms "Agreement" or "Settlement Agreement" are used synonymously herein to mean this Stipulation of Settlement.
- C. Class Counsel. The term "Class Counsel" as used herein means: WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC and all the lawyers of the firm acting on behalf of Named Plaintiff and the Settlement Class. The term Class Counsel shall be used synonymously with the term Plaintiff's Counsel.
- D. Court. The term "Court" as used herein means the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Stanislaus.
- Ε. **Final.** The term "Final" means: (1) the date of final affirmation of the Final Approval Order from any appeal, the expiration of the time for, or the denial of, a petition to review the Final Approval Order, or if review is granted, the date of final affirmation of the Final Approval Order following review pursuant to that grant; or (2) the date of final dismissal of any appeal from the Final Approval Order or the final dismissal of any proceeding to review the Final Approval Order, provided that the Final Approval Order is affirmed and/or not reversed in any part; or (3) if no appeal is filed, the expiration date of the time for the filing or noticing of any appeal from the Court's Final Approval Order, as determined under Rule 8.104(a)(3) of the California Rules of Court.
  - F. **Date of Final Approval.** The terms "Date of Final Approval" or "Final Approval"

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

- Order" as used herein mean date of issuance of the final formal judgment entered by the Court at the Final Fairness and Approval Hearing in accordance with the terms herein, approving this Agreement.
- G. Defendant. The term "Defendant" as used herein means MODESTO RESTAURANT GROUP, LLC.
- H. Employer Taxes. Employer-funded taxes and contributions imposed on the wage portions of the Settlement Payment under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and any similar state taxes and contributions required of employers, such as for unemployment insurance.
- I. Litigation. The term "Litigation" as used herein means the action entitled filed in Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-21-0002691.
- Named Plaintiff. The term "Named Plaintiff" as used herein means LETICIA J. RODRIGUEZ.
- K. Net Settlement Fund. The term "Net Settlement Amount" or "Net Settlement Fund" as used herein means the Settlement Amount minus any award of attorneys' fees and Litigation costs, Administrative Costs, enhancement to the Named Plaintiff, and penalties recoverable pursuant to California's Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA") (the "PAGA Settlement"), and as provided in Sections VIII, XIII, XIV, XV, and XVI, respectively.
- L. Net Settlement Payments. The term "Net Settlement Payment(s)" shall include payments made to the Settlement Class as part of the Settlement, including wages, penalties and interest.
- M. **PAGA Employee.** For settlement purposes only, the Parties agree to the definition of a PAGA Employee as: All persons who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee during the PAGA Settlement Period of January 25, 2020 through the date the Court grants preliminary approval of the settlement or April 1, 2022, whichever is earlier (together, collectively referred to as the "PAGA Employees").
- N. PAGA Settlement Period. January 25, 2020 through the date the Court grants preliminary approval of the settlement or April 1, 2022, whichever is earlier.
  - 0. **PAGA Settlement.** In order to settle claims alleged under the Private Attorneys'

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

General Act, California Labor Code section 2698 et seq., the Parties agree to allocate \$25,000.00 from the Settlement Amount as penalties authorized by the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (PAGA Settlement). Seventy-five percent (75%) of the PAGA Settlement (totaling \$18,750) will be paid to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and 25% of the PAGA Settlement (totaling \$6,250) will be distributed to participating PAGA Employees.

- Р. **Settlement.** The term "Settlement" as used herein means this Agreement to resolve the Litigation.
- Q. Settlement Administrator. The term "Settlement Administrator" as used herein means Phoenix Settlement Administrators, which will be responsible for the administration of the Settlement Amount, as defined below, and all related matters.
- Settlement Agreement. The terms "Settlement Agreement" or "Agreement" are R. used synonymously herein to mean this Stipulation of Settlement.
- S. Settlement Amount. The term "Settlement Amount" as used herein means the sum of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$600,000.00), which shall be paid by Defendant, and from which all Net Settlement Payments, Court-approved attorneys' fees and Litigation costs pursuant to Section XIII, Administrative Costs pursuant to Section VIII, enhancement to Named Plaintiff pursuant to Section XIV, statutory penalties, interest, and PAGA Settlement pursuant to Section XVI shall be paid, except as provided herein. Subject to Section XI(C) below, the Settlement Amount will be increased in the event the final number of workweeks in the Settlement Period is more than 10% higher than the initially agreed upon estimate of 56,179 workweeks.
- T. **Settlement Class.** For settlement purposes only, the Parties agree to the certification of a class pursuant to California *Code of Civil Procedure* § 382 defined as:

All persons who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee during the Settlement Period of January 21, 2017 through the date the Court grants preliminary approval of the settlement or April 1, 2022, whichever is earlier (together, collectively referred to as the "Class Members").

U. Settlement Period. The term "Settlement Period" as used herein means the

period from January 21, 2017 through date the Court grants preliminary approval or April 1, 2022, whichever is earlier.

## II. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

A. In the Litigation, the Named Plaintiff alleges, *inter alia*, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, that Defendant violated California state wage and hour laws, the California *Business and Professions Code* Section 17200 *et seq.*, and PAGA, as a result of Defendant's California wage and hour policies and practices. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay its employees at or above the applicable minimum wage rates, failed to provide regular/straight time, overtime, and double time pay, failed to provide meal breaks (including first and second meal breaks), and failed to authorize and permit legally compliant rest breaks each day based on the hours worked by each employee. Plaintiff further alleged that the aforementioned resulted in the employees receiving inaccurate wage statements, and the underpayment of wages to employees upon termination and/or resignation. Finally, the Plaintiff made claims for unfair competition and penalties under California's Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA") arising out of the alleged wage and hour policies and practices.

Class Counsel conducted informal discovery concerning the claims and defenses set forth in the Litigation, such as a sample of class member timekeeping and payroll records, Defendant's policies and procedures concerning the payment of wages, the provision of meal and rest breaks, issuance of wage statements, and providing all wages at separation, as well as information regarding the number of putative class members and the mix of current versus former employees, the wage rates in effect, and the amount of meal and rest period premium wages paid to class members.

**B.** Named Plaintiff and Class Counsel have engaged in good faith, arms-length negotiations with Defendant concerning possible settlement of the claims asserted in the Litigation. The Parties participated in a full day of mediation before Kelly Knight, Esq., a well-respected wage and hour class action mediator, that resulted in a tentative settlement of the Litigation, subject to the approval of the Court, and finalization of a formal Stipulation of Settlement. The Parties have engaged in extensive negotiations about the terms and conditions of the Settlement at the mediation and subsequent thereto. The Parties have now formalized the Settlement Agreement for submission

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

to the Court for preliminary and Final Approval.

- C. Class Counsel has conducted an investigation of the law and facts relating to the claims asserted in the Litigation and has concluded, taking into account the sharply contested issues involved, the defenses asserted by Defendant, the expense and time necessary to pursue the Litigation through trial and any appeals, the risks and costs of further prosecution of the Litigation, the risk of an adverse outcome, the uncertainties of complex litigation, and the substantial benefits to be received by the Named Plaintiff and the members of the Settlement Class pursuant to this Agreement, that a settlement with Defendant on the terms and conditions set forth herein is fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. Named Plaintiff, on her own behalf and on behalf of the Settlement Class, has agreed to settle the Litigation with Defendant on the terms set forth herein.
- D. Defendant has concluded that for reasons including the substantial expense of defending against the Litigation, the length of time necessary to resolve the issues presented herein, the inconvenience involved, and the concomitant disruption to its business operations, it is in Defendant's best interests to accept the terms of this Agreement. Defendant denies each of the allegations and claims asserted against them in the Litigation, and denies that this case could be certified as a class action or proceed on a representative bases, or that a trial would result in any damages. However, without admitting to any liability, Defendant nevertheless desires to settle the Litigation for the purpose of avoiding the burden, expense and uncertainty of continuing litigation and for the purpose of putting to rest the controversies engendered by the Litigation.
- Ε. This Agreement is intended to and does effectuate the full, final and complete settlement of all allegations and claims that were asserted, or could have been asserted, in the Litigation by Named Plaintiff and members of the Settlement Class as set forth in Section II.A.

#### III. **JURISDICTION**

The Court has jurisdiction over the Parties and the subject matter of this Litigation. The Litigation includes claims that, while Defendant denies them in their entirety, would, if proven, authorize the Court to grant relief pursuant to the applicable statutes. After the Court has granted Final Approval of the Settlement and after the Court has ordered the entry of Judgment, pursuant to

5

1

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

24

25

28

California Code of Civil Procedure Section 664.6 the Court shall retain jurisdiction of this action solely for the purpose of interpreting, implementing, and enforcing this Settlement consistent with the terms set forth herein.

#### STIPULATION OF CLASS CERTIFICATION IV.

The Parties stipulate to the certification of this Settlement Class for purposes of Settlement only. This Stipulation is contingent upon the Preliminary and Final approval and certification of the Settlement Class only for purposes of Settlement. Should the Settlement not become final, for whatever reason, the fact that the Parties were willing to stipulate provisionally to class certification as part of the Settlement shall have no bearing on, and shall not be admissible in connection with, the issue of whether a class should be certified in a non-settlement context in the Litigation. Defendant expressly reserves the right to oppose class certification and/or proactively move to deny certification should this Settlement be modified or reversed on appeal or otherwise not become final.

#### V. MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

Named Plaintiff will bring a motion before the Court for an order preliminarily approving the Settlement including the Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement, and Workweek Dispute Form, which are attached hereto as Exhibits "A" and "B," respectively, and including certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only.

The date that the Court grants Preliminary Approval of this Agreement will be the "Preliminary Approval Date." Class Counsel will prepare the Motion for Preliminary Approval and will provide Defendant's counsel the opportunity to review it and provide input before it is filed. On the same date on which it is filed with the Court, Class Counsel shall concurrently submit the Motion for Preliminary Approval to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency in compliance with Labor Code § 2698 et seq., the Private Attorneys General Act.

#### VI. **STATEMENT OF NO ADMISSION**

Α. Defendant denies liability to Named Plaintiff and to the Settlement Class upon any claim or cause of action. This Agreement does not constitute, and is not intended to constitute, an admission by Defendant as to the merits, validity, or accuracy of any of the allegations or claims made against them in the Litigation.

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

В. Nothing in this Agreement, nor any action taken in implementation thereof, nor any statements, discussions or communications, nor any materials prepared, exchanged, issued or used during the course of the negotiations leading to this Agreement or the Settlement, is intended by the Parties to constitute, nor will any of the foregoing constitute, be introduced, be used or be admissible in any way in this case or any other judicial, arbitral, administrative, investigative or other forum or proceeding as evidence of any violation of any federal, state, or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, rule or executive order, or any obligation or duty at law or in equity. The Parties themselves agree not to introduce, use, or admit this Agreement, directly or indirectly, in this case or any other judicial, arbitral, administrative, investigative, or other forum or proceeding, as purported evidence of any violation of any federal, state, or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, rule or executive order, or any obligation or duty at law or in equity, or for any other purpose. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Agreement may be used and filed in any proceeding before the Court that has as its purpose the interpretation, implementation, or enforcement of this Agreement or any orders or judgments of the Court entered in connection with implementation of the Settlement.

- C. None of the documents produced or created by Named Plaintiff or the Settlement Class in connection with the claims procedures or claims settlement procedures constitute, and they are not intended to constitute, an admission by Defendant of any violation of any federal, state, or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, rule, or executive order, or any obligation or duty at law or in equity.
- D. The Parties agree that class certification pursuant to California Code of Civil *Procedure* Section 382 under the terms of this Agreement is for settlement purposes only. Nothing in this Agreement will be construed as an admission or acknowledgement of any kind that any class should be certified or given collective treatment in the Litigation or in any other action or proceeding. Further, neither this Agreement nor the Court's actions with regard to this Agreement will be admissible in any court or other tribunal regarding the propriety of class certification or collective treatment. In the event that this Agreement is not approved by the Court or any appellate court, is terminated, or otherwise fails to be enforceable, Named Plaintiff will not be deemed to have waived, limited, or affected in any way any claims, rights, or remedies in the Litigation, and Defendant will

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

not be deemed to have waived, limited, or affected in any way any of their objections or defenses in the Litigation.

#### VII. WAIVER, RELEASE AND CONFIDENTIALITY

#### Α. Release as to All Settlement Class Members.

Upon the date the Court's Final Approval Order becomes "Final" (as that term is defined in Section I(E) above) and all payments are made by Defendant pursuant to this Agreement, Named Plaintiff and all members of the Settlement Class, except those that make a valid and timely request to be excluded from the Settlement Class and Settlement, waive, release, discharge, and promise never to assert in any forum any and all wage or penalty-related claims, including all claims for damages, attorneys' fees and costs, expenses, penalties, and injunctive relief, that were alleged in the Litigation or which could have been alleged in the Litigation based on the facts asserted in the Litigation arising during the Settlement Period against Defendant Modesto Restaurant Group, and its divisions, affiliates, predecessors, successors, shareholders, officers, directors, employees, agents, trustees, representatives, administrators, fiduciaries, assigns, subrogees, executors, partners, parents, subsidiaries, joint employers, insurers, attorneys, and related corporations, individually and collectively, including but not limited to: 1) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for the failure to pay overtime or double time wages owed pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, the IWC Wage Orders or any comparable federal statute under any theory of liability; 2) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for the failure to pay all wages of any kind, including any minimum wage or straight time wages, owed pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1194.2, and 1198, the IWC Wage Orders, or any comparable federal statute under any theory of liability; 3) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for failure to provide meal periods pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders; 4) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for the failure to authorize and permit rest periods pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders; 5) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for the failure to properly calculate any premiums owed and/or paid pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(b); 6) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for violation of Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.; 7) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for penalties

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

pursuant to PAGA (Labor Code §§ 2698 et seq.); 8) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for any penalties of any kind arising from an alleged failure to pay final wages or other amounts allegedly owed to Class Members pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 201-203; 9) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for any penalties of any kind arising from any alleged wage statement or recordkeeping violations pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1174.5; and 10) all claims, under any legal theory of liability, for any penalties or any another amounts that could be potentially owed to Class Members arising out of and/or related to the allegations in the Lawsuit arising during the Settlement Period, including penalties owed pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, and 1197.1.

#### В. General Release by Named Plaintiff Only.

In addition to the release made in Section VII (A), Named Plaintiff makes the additional following general release of all claims, known or unknown. Named Plaintiff releases Defendant, and its divisions, affiliates, predecessors, successors, shareholders, officers, directors, employees, agents, trustees, representatives, administrators, fiduciaries, assigns, subrogees, executors, partners, parents, subsidiaries, joint employers, insurers, attorneys and related corporations of any of them, from all claims, demands, rights, liabilities, losses, damages, actions, charges, attorneys' fees and costs, expenses, penalties, injunctive relief, actions, and causes of action of every nature and description whatsoever, known or unknown, asserted or that might have been asserted, whether in tort, contract, common law, or for violation of any state or federal statute, rule or regulation, or local ordinance arising out of, relating to, or in connection with Named Plaintiff's employment, application for employment, or termination of employment with Defendant as well as any and all acts or omissions by or on the part of Defendant. (The release set forth in this Paragraph B shall be referred to hereinafter as the "General Release.")

With respect to the General Release, Named Plaintiff stipulates and agrees that, upon the Date of Final Approval, Named Plaintiff shall be deemed to have expressly waived and relinquished, to the fullest extent permitted by law, the provisions, rights and benefits of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, or any other similar provision under federal or state law, which provides:

6

9

15

25

23

27

"SECTION 1542. [CERTAIN CLAIMS NOT AFFECTED BY GENERAL RELEASE.] A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY."

Accordingly, if the facts relating in any manner to this Settlement are found hereafter to be other than or different from the facts now believed to be true, the release of claims contained herein shall be effective as to all unknown claims.

#### C. PAGA Release.

Upon the date the Court's Final Approval Order becomes "Final" (as that term is defined in Section I(E) above) and all payments are made by Defendant pursuant to this Agreement, Named Plaintiff and all PAGA Employees waive, release, discharge, and promise never to assert in any forum any and all civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), California Labor Code section 2698 et seq., and demands for related interest and attorneys' fees on the penalties, that were asserted in the Litigation and/or letter sent to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency by Plaintiff during the PAGA Settlement Period, or which could have been alleged in the Litigation based on the facts asserted in the Litigation arising during the Settlement Period against Defendant Modesto Restaurant Group, and its divisions, affiliates, predecessors, successors, shareholders, officers, directors, employees, agents, trustees, representatives, administrators, fiduciaries, assigns, subrogees, executors, partners, parents, subsidiaries, joint employers, insurers, attorneys, and related corporations, individually and collectively.

#### VIII. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

Named Plaintiff and Defendant, through their respective counsel, have selected Phoenix Settlement Administrators as the Settlement Administrator to administer the Settlement, which includes but is not limited to distributing and responding to inquiries about the Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement and Workweek Dispute Form, determining the validity of any disputes and opt-outs, and calculating all amounts to be paid from the Net Settlement Amount. Charges and expenses of the Settlement Administrator, estimated to be no more \$15,000.00, will be paid from

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

the Settlement Amount. Any charges and expenses of the Settlement Administrator greater than the allocated \$15,000.00 will come from the Settlement Amount. If the actual Settlement Administrator fees are less than the Parties' estimation, the difference between the actual and estimated Settlement Administrator fees will revert to the participating Settlement Class members. The Parties agree that this Agreement may be provided to the Settlement Administrator to effectuate its implementation of the settlement procedures herein.

#### NOTICE, OBJECTIONS AND EXCLUSION RIGHTS IX.

#### Α. Notice.

Named Plaintiff and Defendant, through their respective attorneys, have jointly prepared a Notice of Class Action and Proposed Settlement (the "Notice") and a Workweek Dispute Form, which in substance will be provided to the members of the Settlement Class as follows:

As soon as practicable following Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, but no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the Court's Preliminary Approval order, Defendant will provide to the Settlement Administrator the following information about each Settlement Class member ("Class List"): (1) name; (2) last known home address; (3) number of workweeks as a class member during the Settlement Period or the dates of employment for each Settlement Class member; and (4) Social Security number. Defendant further agrees to consult with the Settlement Administrator prior to the production date to ensure that the format will be acceptable to the Settlement Administrator. Plaintiff's Counsel shall also receive a redacted Class List that shall only disclose an identification number attributed to each class member and the number of workweeks each class member worked during the Settlement Period.

The Settlement Administrator shall run all the addresses provided through the United States Postal Service NCOA database (which provides updated addresses for any individual who has moved in the previous four years who has notified the U.S. Postal Service of a forwarding address) to obtain current address information, and shall mail the Notice and Workweek Dispute Form to the members of the Settlement Class via first-class regular U.S. Mail using the most current mailing address information available, within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the Class List from Defendant. The Notice shall provide the members of the Settlement Class forty-five (45) days' notice of all

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

applicable dates and deadlines.

The Notice will also include information regarding the nature of the Litigation; a summary of the terms of the Settlement; the definition of the Settlement Class; a statement that the Court has preliminarily approved the Settlement; the nature and scope of the claims being released; the procedure and time period for objecting to the Settlement, the date and location of the Final Approval hearing; information regarding the opt-out procedure; Defendant's calculation of the number of Eligible Workweeks (defined further below) that each Settlement Class member has worked as an employee in California at any time during the Settlement Period, and the estimated potential recovery for the proposed Settlement Class Member. The Notice shall enclose the Workweek Dispute Form for Settlement Class members.

For each Settlement Class member the Workweek Dispute Form will identify the number of Eligible Workweeks that s/he was employed and inform the employee of his or her right to dispute this number by completing and returning the form within forty five (45) days of the postmark date of the Workweek Dispute Form. A Settlement Class member's receipt of his or her share of the Net Settlement Payments is not conditional on the submission of the Workweek Dispute Form. Absent the receipt of a Workweek Dispute Form, the number of workweeks identified in the Workweek Dispute Form shall be deemed accurate. The settlement of any disputes concerning the number of Eligible Workweeks is discussed in Section X, below.

If a Notice is returned from the initial notice mailing, the Settlement Administrator will perform a skip trace in an attempt to locate a more current address. If the Settlement Administrator is successful in locating a new address, it will re-mail the Notice to the Settlement Class member. Further, any Notices returned with a forwarding address to the Settlement Administrator, as nondeliverable before the deadline date, shall be sent to the forwarding address affixed thereto.

Should any member of the Settlement Class timely submit a Workweek Dispute Form with a deficiency, the Settlement Administrator shall, within five (5) calendar days of receipt by the Settlement Administrator of each timely submitted Workweek Dispute Form, send a deficiency notice. The deficiency notice will provide the member of the Settlement Class no more than fourteen (14) days from the mailing of the deficiency notice to postmark a written response to cure all

1

5 6

8 9

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

deficiencies. The failure of a member of Settlement Class to timely submit a Workweek Dispute or timely respond to a notice of deficiency shall invalidate the dispute unless all Parties' counsel agree to allow the dispute.

No later than twenty-one (21) days before the Final Approval Hearing, the Settlement Administrator shall provide counsel for Defendant and Class Counsel with a declaration attesting to the completion of the Notice process, including the number of attempts to obtain valid mailing addresses for and re-sending of any returned Notices, as well as the number of valid Workweek Dispute Forms, opt-outs and deficiencies that the Settlement Administrator received.

#### В. Objections.

In order for any Settlement Class member to object to this Settlement, or any term of it, the person making the objection must not submit a request for exclusion (i.e., must not opt out). To object to the Settlement in writing, a Class Member may send the objection to the Settlement Administrator by forty-five (45) days after Notice of the Proposed Class Action Settlement was initially mailed to the Settlement Class members. A Settlement Class member making an objection may appear at the Final Approval Hearing with or without submitting any written objection. The Settlement Class member may appear personally or through an attorney, at his or her own expense, at the Final Approval hearing to present his or her objection directly to the Court. If a Settlement Class member objects to the Settlement, the Settlement Class member will remain a member of the Settlement Class and if the Court approves this Agreement, the Settlement Class member will be bound by the terms of the Settlement and Final Approval Order in the same way and to the same extent as a Settlement Class member who does not object. The date of mailing of the Notice to the objecting Settlement Class member shall be conclusively determined according to the records of the Settlement Administrator. The Court retains final authority with respect to the consideration and admissibility of any Settlement Class member objections. Any Settlement Class member who submits an objection may also participate in the settlement.

Named Plaintiff hereby endorses the Settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate and in the best interests of the Settlement Class.

# C. Opportunity to be Excluded and Defendant's Opt-Out Threshold.

In order for any Settlement Class member to validly exclude himself or herself from the Settlement Class and the Settlement (i.e., to validly opt out), a written request for exclusion ("Request to be Excluded") must be signed by the Settlement Class member or his or her authorized representative and must be sent to the Settlement Administrator, postmarked by no later than forty five (45) days after the date the Settlement Administrator initially mails the Notice to the Settlement Class members. The Notice shall contain instructions on how to opt out.

The date of the initial mailing of the Notice, and the date the signed Request to be Excluded was postmarked, shall be conclusively determined according to the records of the Settlement Administrator. Any Settlement Class member who timely and validly submits a Request to be Excluded from the Settlement Class and the Settlement will not be entitled to any portion of the Net Settlement Payments, will not be bound by the terms and conditions of the Settlement, and will not have any right to object, appeal, or comment thereon.

Any member of the Settlement Class who does not timely file and mail a Request to be Excluded from the Settlement Class will be deemed included in the Settlement Class in accordance with this Settlement.

In the event that 10% or more of the Class Members exercise their right to exclude themselves and opt out of the Settlement and Settlement Agreement, Defendant retains the exclusive right, but not the obligation, to withdraw from and terminate the Settlement and the Settlement Agreement and return all parties back to their same position before the Settlement was reached and the Settlement Agreement was entered into. In the event that Defendant exercises such rights under this paragraph, the Plaintiff and Defendant shall resume the Litigation through and until there is a final settlement of the Litigation. Defendant must notify Class Counsel and the Court of such a decision to withdraw and terminate the Settlement no later than five (5) days prior to the date of the Final Approval Hearing. In the event of Defendant's withdrawal, no party may use the fact that the Parties agreed to the Settlement for any reason, and Defendant shall pay all administration expenses incurred through the date of its termination of the Settlement.

///

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

#### D. Cooperation

The Parties and their respective counsel agree not to encourage members of the Settlement Class to refrain from participating in the Settlement, to opt out of the Settlement, or to object to the Settlement, directly or indirectly, through any means. However, if a Settlement Class member contacts Class Counsel, Class Counsel may discuss the terms of the Settlement and the Settlement Class member's options.

#### **DISPUTES PROCEDURE** Χ.

Named Plaintiff and Defendant have agreed upon the following payment formula to resolve all disputes submitted by Settlement Class members during the Settlement Period.

The Settlement Administrator will calculate the total number of workweeks for all Class Members who were employed by Defendant during the Settlement Class Period ("Total Workweeks"). The value of each Workweek shall be determined by the Settlement Administrator by dividing the Net Settlement Fund by the total number of Workweeks available to the Class Members who do not opt out in accordance with Section IX(C) above during the Settlement Class Period ("Workweek Point Value").

An "Individual Settlement Payment" for each Class Member will then be determined by multiplying a Class Member's workweeks worked during the Class Period ("Eligible Workweeks") by the Workweek Point Value. Eligible Workweeks are calculated as the number of days between a Class Member's start date and end date working as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee for Defendant during the Settlement Period, divided by seven. Where a Class Member has worked multiple eligible stints or tenures during the Settlement Period, the number of Eligible Workweeks in each eligible stint will be added together to produce a total number of Eligible Workweeks for that Class Member. The Individual Settlement Payment will be reduced by any required legal deductions, for each participating Class Member.

If a member of the Settlement Class does not dispute the number of Eligible Workweeks set forth in the Workweek Dispute Form, such person need not take further action to participate in the Settlement. If the member of the Settlement Class disputes the number of Eligible Workweeks set forth in the Workweek Dispute Form, such person must follow the directions in the Workweek

Dispute Form and in the Notice, including preparing a statement setting forth the number of Eligible Workweeks that such person believes in good faith is correct, and stating that the member of the Settlement Class authorizes the Settlement Administrator to review the Settlement Class member's personnel file and leave management records to determine such information, and attaching any relevant documentation in support thereof. The member of the Settlement Class must mail the signed and completed statement no later than forty-five (45) days after the date of the mailing of the Workweek Dispute Form, or the number of Eligible Workweeks set forth in the Notice and Workweek Dispute Form will govern the Net Settlement Payment to the member of the Settlement Class.

Upon timely receipt of any such challenge, the Settlement Administrator, in consultation with Class Counsel and counsel for Defendant, will review the pertinent payroll records showing the dates the Settlement Class member was employed and the pertinent leave(s) taken, which records Defendant agrees to make available to the Settlement Administrator and Class Counsel.

After consulting with Class Counsel and counsel for Defendant, the Settlement Administrator shall compute the number of Eligible Workweeks to be used in computing the Settlement Class member's pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount. In the event there is a disparity between the dates a Settlement Class member claims he or she worked during the Settlement Period and the dates indicated by Defendant's records, Defendant's records will control unless inconsistent with paycheck stub(s) (or bona fide copies thereof) provided by the Settlement Class member, in which case the paycheck stub(s) will control. The Settlement Administrator's decision as to the total number of Eligible Workweeks shall be final and non-appealable. The Settlement Administrator shall send written notice of the decision on any such claim to the Settlement Class member, to Class Counsel, and counsel for Defendant within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the dispute.

# XI. COMPUTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS

### A. Distribution Formula.

Members of the Settlement Class not opting out will receive a lump sum payment as good and valuable consideration for the waiver and release of claims set forth in Section VII(A), above, in an amount determined by the Settlement Administrator in accordance with the provisions of this

Agreement.

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

The lump sum payment to each member of the Settlement Class not excluding him/ herself will be determined in accordance with the procedure set forth in Section X.

#### В. **Funding of Settlement.**

Within thirty (30) calendar days following the date on which the Court grants Final Approval of the Settlement and a determination of the pro-rata share of the settlement amount to which each member of the Settlement Class is entitled, Defendant will deposit the first half of the Settlement Amount (totaling \$300,000.00) and the half of the Employer Taxes into an interest-bearing trust account for the benefit of the participating Settlement Class members and Class Counsel, through the Settlement Administrator.

Within 6 months after the first payment described above, Defendant will deposit the second half of the Settlement Amount (totaling \$300,000.00) and the second half of the Employer Taxes into the same trust account. In the event the Settlement Amount is increased pursuant to Section XI(C) below, Defendant will deposit the additional funds within 6 months after the first payment described above. At no time prior to Final Approval of the Settlement shall Defendant be required to escrow any portion of the Settlement Amount.

#### C. **Potential Increase in Funding**

Defendant represents that there are approximately 56,179 Workweeks at issue for the Settlement Class Members prior to the date of the parties' mediation on November 30, 2021. In the event the number of Workweeks worked by the Settlement Class Members increases by more than 10%, or 5,618 Workweeks by the date of Preliminary Approval or April, 1, 2022, whichever is earlier, then the Settlement Amount shall be increased proportionally by the Workweeks in the Settlement Period in excess of 56,179 multiplied by the Workweek Value. The Workweek Value shall be calculated by dividing the Settlement Amount by 56,179 Workweeks. The Parties agree that the Workweek Value is \$10.68 (\$600,000.00 / 56,179 Workweeks). Thus, for example, should there be 70,000 Workweeks in the Settlement Period, then the Settlement Amount shall be increased by \$147,608.28 ((70,000 Workweeks – 56,179 Workweeks) x (\$10.68/Workweek)). The Settlement Amount will not be reduced due to Defendant's estimate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

# 13

14 15 16

> 17 18

> 19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

#### D. Time for Distribution.

The Settlement Administrator shall cause the Settlement Amount (inclusive of the Net Settlement Amount, the Court approved attorney's fees and Litigation costs, Court approved enhancement to Named Plaintiff, and PAGA Settlement) and the Employer Taxes to be mailed within twenty-one (21) calendar days following the date of funding the second installment of the Settlement Amount and accompanying Employer Taxes.

If a check is returned to the Settlement Administrator as undeliverable, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly attempt to obtain a valid mailing address by performing a skip trace search and, if another address is identified, shall mail the check to the newly identified address. Any settlement checks remaining uncashed after one hundred and eighty (180) days shall be deemed unpaid residue pursuant Code of Civil Procedure Section 384(a). In accordance with Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, the parties shall follow the procedure set for in (1) - (5) below in regard to unpaid residue:

- (1) Unpaid residue (uncashed or returned checks) will be paid, with interest, to California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc., 1430 Franklin Street, Suite 103, Oakland, CA 94612, which has been selected by the parties as a nonprofit organization that operates in the counties in which the Settlement Class lives and that supports projects that will benefit the class or similarly situated persons, or that promotes the law consistent with the objectives and purposes of the underlying causes of action, and that provides civil legal services to the indigent.
- (2) The attorneys for the parties shall file, with the Motion for Final Approval, a stand-alone Stipulation to Amend Judgment and Proposed Stipulated Amended Judgment (Section 384) memorializing the parties' agreement to amend the judgment to adopt the administrator's determination of amount of unpaid residue, plus interest, if any, from the date of entry of the initial judgment, to be paid to the cy pres;
- (3) The parties shall attach to the Stipulation a [Proposed] Stipulated Amended Judgment form with a signature line for the court and blanks for the amount of residue plus interest to be added to the judgment and the total amount of the amended judgment;

- (4) Along with the Final Report, the administrator shall file, with the court, a photocopy of the attorneys' Stipulation to Amend Judgment along with a [Proposed] Stipulated Amended Judgment form with the amount of residue plus interest to be added to the judgment and the total amount of the judgment, plus interest, filled in;
- (5) The court signs and enters the Stipulated Amended Judgment;
- (6) In such event, the Class Members and PAGA Employees will nevertheless remain bound by this Settlement Agreement, including the release of the Released Claims.

## XII. NO CONTRIBUTIONS TO EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLAN

The amounts paid under this Agreement do not represent a modification of any previously credited hours of service under any employee benefit plan, policy, or bonus program sponsored by Defendant. Such amounts will not form the basis for additional contributions to, benefits under, or any other monetary entitlement under, benefit plans (self-insured or not) sponsored by Defendant, policies or bonus programs. Any payments made under the terms of this Settlement shall not be applied retroactively, currently or on a going forward basis as salary, earnings, wages, or any other form of compensation for the purposes of Defendant's benefit plan, policy or bonus program. Defendant retains the right to modify the language of their benefit plans, policies and bonus programs to effect this intent and to make clear that any amounts paid pursuant to this Settlement are not for "hours worked," "hours paid," "hours of service," or any similar measuring term as defined by applicable plans, policies and bonus programs for purpose of eligibility, vesting, benefit accrual, or any other purpose, and that additional contributions or benefits are not required by this Settlement.

## XIII. CLASS COUNSEL ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION COSTS

Defendant shall not oppose an application by Class Counsel for, and Class Counsel shall not seek or receive an amount in excess of \$200,000.00, which represents 33 1/3% of the Settlement Amount for all past and future attorneys' fees necessary to prosecute, settle and administer the Litigation and this Settlement. Additionally, Defendant shall not oppose an application by Class Counsel for, and Class Counsel shall not seek or receive an amount in excess of \$25,000.00, which represents all past and future Litigation costs and expenses necessary to prosecute, settle and administer the Litigation and this Settlement. Any attorneys' fees or Litigation costs awarded to

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

Class Counsel by the Court as part of the Settlement Amount shall be deducted from the Settlement Amount for the purpose of determining the Net Settlement Amount. The "future" aspect of these amounts include, without limitation, all time and expenses expended by Class Counsel in defending the Settlement and securing preliminary and Final Approval (including any appeals therein). There will be no additional charge of any kind to either the members of the Settlement Class or request for additional consideration from Defendant for such work. This amount shall include all attorneys' fees, Litigation costs, and expenses for which Named Plaintiff and Class Counsel could claim under any legal theory whatsoever. Within twenty-one (21) calendar days following the date the settlement is funded pursuant to Section XI(B), the Settlement Administrator shall disburse payment from the Settlement Amount for the amount of attorneys' fees and Litigation costs approved by the Court to Class Counsel. Should the Court approve a lesser percentage or amount of fees and/or Litigation costs than the amount that Class Counsel ultimately seeks, then any such unapproved portion or portions shall revert into the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed between the participating Settlement Class Members on a pro-rata basis.

## XIV. ENHANCEMENT TO NAMED PLAINTIFF

Defendant shall not oppose an application by Named Plaintiff, and Named Plaintiff shall not seek or receive an amount in excess of \$8,000.00 for her participation in and assistance with the Litigation (i.e., Named Plaintiff's class representative enhancement / service award). enhancement awarded to Named Plaintiff by the Court as part of the Settlement Amount shall be deducted from the Settlement Amount for the purpose of determining the Net Settlement Amount, and shall be reported on IRS Form 1099. If the Court approves an enhancement of less than \$8,000.00 to Named Plaintiff, then the unapproved portion or portions shall revert into the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed between the participating Settlement Class Members on a prorata basis.

#### XV. TAXATION AND ALLOCATION

The Parties agree that all employment taxes and other legally required withholdings will be withheld from payments to the members of the Settlement Class and Named Plaintiff based on the Parties stipulated allocation of the Net Settlement Amount as provided for in this Section.

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

In Defendant's sole discretion, and to which Named Plaintiff and Class Counsel do not object, the amount of federal income tax withholding will be based upon a flat withholding rate for supplemental wage payments in accordance with Treas. Reg. § 31.3402(g)-1(a)(2) as amended or supplemented. Income tax withholding will also be made pursuant to applicable state and/or local withholding codes or regulations.

For withholding tax characterization purposes and payment of taxes, the Net Settlement Amount shall be deemed and is allocated by the Parties as follows ("Net Settlement Allocation"):

- (1) 33 1/3 % as wages; and
- 66 2/3 % as penalties and interest. (2)

Forms W-2 and/or Forms 1099 will be distributed at times and in the manner required by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the "Code") and consistent with this Agreement, by the Settlement Administrator. If the Code, the regulations promulgated thereunder, or other applicable tax law, is changed after the date of this Agreement, the processes set forth in this Section may be modified in a manner to bring Defendant into compliance with any such changes.

Finally, any and all Employer Taxes which Defendant normally would be responsible for paying based on the Net Settlement Payments made to the individual Class Members will be paid by Defendant in addition to and not as a deduction from the Settlement Amount based on the stipulated Net Settlement Allocation.

## XVI. PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT ALLOCATION

#### Α. **PAGA Payment Amount.**

In order to implement the terms of this Settlement and to settle claims alleged under the Private Attorneys' General Act, California Labor Code section 2698 et seq., the Parties agree to allocate \$25,000.00 from the Settlement Amount as penalties authorized by the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (PAGA Settlement). Seventy-five percent (75%) of the PAGA Settlement (totaling \$18,750) will be paid to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and 25% of the PAGA Settlement (totaling \$6,250) will be distributed to the PAGA Employees, through the Settlement Administrator and at no additional cost to Defendant. A Request to be Excluded does not exclude a PAGA Employee from the release of claims under California Labor

1

10

11

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Code § 2698, et seq. under the PAGA Release set forth in this Agreement, and a PAGA Employee will receive his or her Individual PAGA Settlement Payment even if he or she submits a valid Request to be Excluded.

Within twenty one (21) calendar days following the date the settlement is funded pursuant to Section XI(B), the Settlement Administrator shall disburse the 75% of the PAGA Settlement to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Plaintiff's counsel will provide notice to the LWDA of the fact that the settlement has been approved by the court along with a copy of the settlement agreement and the court order confirming the approval of the settlement through the appropriate LWDA/DIR website.

#### В. **PAGA Distribution Formula.**

The Settlement Administrator will calculate the total number of PAGA Pay Periods for all PAGA Employees who were employed by Defendant during the PAGA Settlement Period ("Total PAGA Pay Periods"). The value of each PAGA Pay Period shall be determined by the Settlement Administrator by dividing the employees' 25% portion of the PAGA Settlement (\$6,250) by the total number of Pay Periods available to PAGA Employees who do not opt out in accordance with Section IX(C) above ("Pay Period Point Value").

An "Individual PAGA Settlement Payment" for each PAGA Employee will then be determined by multiplying a PAGA Employee's workweeks worked during the PAGA Settlement Period ("Eligible Pay Periods") by the Pay Period Point Value. Eligible Pay Periods are calculated as the number of days between a PAGA Employee's start date and end date working as an hourlypaid or non-exempt employee for Defendant during the PAGA Settlement Period, divided by 14. Where a PAGA Employee has worked multiple eligible stints or tenures during the PAGA Settlement Period, the number of Eligible Pay Periods in each eligible stint will be added together to produce a total number of Eligible Pay Periods for that PAGA Employee. The Individual PAGA Settlement Payment will be reduced by any required legal deductions, for each participating PAGA Employee.

#### C. Taxation and Allocation.

The PAGA Settlement comprises payments for penalties and interest. It shall not be deemed as wages and no contribution regarding taxes are to be paid by Defendant regarding any portion of the PAGA

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

Settlement. Forms 1099 regarding the PAGA Settlement will be distributed at times and in the manner required by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the "Code") and consistent with this Agreement, by the Settlement Administrator.

## XVII. COURT APPROVAL

This Agreement and the Settlement is contingent upon Final Approval by the Court and the entry of judgment. Named Plaintiff and Defendant agree to take all steps as may be reasonably necessary to secure both Preliminary Approval and Final Approval of the Settlement, to the extent not inconsistent with the terms of this Agreement, and will not take any action adverse to each other in obtaining court approval, and, if necessary, appellate approval, of the Settlement in all respects. Named Plaintiff and Defendant expressly agree that they will not file any objection to the terms of the Settlement or assist or encourage any person or entity to file any such objection.

In the event it becomes impossible to secure approval of the Settlement, the Parties shall be restored to their respective positions in the Litigation, as of the date of the hearing on the Motion for Preliminary Approval, except as otherwise provided in Section XVIII, below.

### XVIII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

#### Α. Stay of Litigation.

Named Plaintiff and Defendant agree to the stay of all discovery in the Litigation, pending Final Approval of the Settlement by the Court.

#### В. Interpretation of the Agreement.

This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between Named Plaintiff and Defendant. Except as expressly provided herein, this Agreement has not been executed in reliance upon any other written or oral representations or terms, and no such extrinsic oral or written representations or terms shall modify, vary or contradict its terms. In entering into this Agreement, the Parties agree that this Agreement is to be construed according to its terms and may not be varied or contradicted by extrinsic evidence. The Agreement will be interpreted and enforced under the laws of the State of California, both in its procedural and substantive aspects, without regard to its conflict of laws provisions. Any claim arising out of or relating to the Agreement, or the subject matter hereof, will be resolved solely and exclusively in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of

Los Angeles, and Named Plaintiff and Defendant hereby consent to the personal jurisdiction of the Court over them solely in connection therewith. Named Plaintiff, on her own behalf and on behalf of the Settlement Class, and Defendant participated in the negotiation and drafting of this Agreement and had available to them the advice and assistance of independent counsel. As such, neither Named Plaintiff nor Defendant may claim that any ambiguity in this Agreement should be construed against the other.

The terms and conditions of this Agreement constitute the exclusive and final understanding and expression of all agreements between Named Plaintiff and Defendant with respect to the Settlement of the Litigation. The Agreement may be modified only by a writing signed by the original signatories and approved by the Court.

## C. Further Cooperation.

Named Plaintiff and Defendant and their respective attorneys shall proceed diligently to prepare and execute all documents, to seek the necessary approvals from the Court, and to do all things reasonably necessary or convenient to consummate the Agreement as expeditiously as possible.

## D. Confidentiality of Documents.

After the expiration of any appeals period, Named Plaintiff, the Settlement Administrator, and Class Counsel shall maintain the confidentiality of all documents, deposition transcripts, declarations and other information obtained in the lawsuit, unless necessary for appeal or such documents are ordered to be disclosed by the Court or by a subpoena. After the expiration of any appeals period, Named Plaintiff and her counsel shall destroy or delete documents or copies or digital records of documents produced by Defendant and its counsel regarding the Settlement Class members such as wage statements and payroll records, other than documents which pertain directly to Named Plaintiff.

## E. Counterparts.

The Agreement may be executed in one or more actual or non-original counterparts, all of which will be considered one and the same instrument and all of which will be considered duplicate originals.

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

#### F. Authority.

Each individual signing below warrants that he or she has the authority to execute this Agreement on behalf of the party for whom or which that individual signs.

#### G. No Third-Party Beneficiaries.

Named Plaintiff, members of the Settlement Class, and Defendant are direct beneficiaries of this Agreement, but there are no third-party beneficiaries.

#### Η. Modification.

This Agreement may not be changed, altered, or modified, except in a writing signed by the Parties, and approved by the Court. Notwithstanding the forgoing, the Parties agree that any dates contained in this Agreement may be modified by agreement of the Parties in writing without Court approval if the Parties agree and cause exists for such modification. This Agreement may not be discharged except by performance in accordance with its terms or by a writing signed by the Parties.

#### I. Deadlines Falling on Weekends or Holidays.

To the extent that any deadline set forth in this Agreement falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, that deadline shall be continued until the following business day.

#### J. Severability.

In the event that any one or more of the provisions contained in this Agreement shall for any reason be held invalid, illegal, or unenforceable in any respect, such invalidity, illegality, or unenforceability shall in no way effect any other provision if Defendant's Counsel and Class Counsel, on behalf of the Parties and the Settlement Class, mutually elect in writing to proceed as if such invalid, illegal, or unenforceable provision had never been included in this Agreement.

## APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:

Date: 2/10/2022	, 2022	ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF:
		Docusigned by:
		By: EFC36537AF1644F
		LETICIA RODRIGUEZ, Plaintiff

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC 3055 Wilshire Blvd, 12 <sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, CA 90010-1137	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	Date: 2/+ , 2022  ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT:  By: Structure Name: Jeff Casaretto Position: Managaing Nember For MODESTO RESTAURANT GROUP, LLC  APPROVED AS TO FORM:  Date: February 10 , 2022  WILSHIRE LAW FIRM  By: Justin I/ Marquez Benjaginin H. Haber Rachel J. Vinson Attorneys for Plaintiff  Date: February 7 , 2022  CALL & JENSEN  By: Jacqueline Beaumont L. Lisa Sandoval Attorneys for Defendant
	26	
	27	
	28	
		26
		STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT

## Wilshire Law Firm, PLC Transaction Detail by Account All Transactions

2/8/2022

Accrual Basis

<u>Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Num</u>	Memo	<u>Amount</u>	<b>Balance</b>
COS					
EXPERT FEES					
	6/30/2021	12111491	Expert Fees	159.50	159.50
	7/6/2021	535210	Mediation Fee	5,150.00	5,150.00
	12/14/2021	5318	Expert Fees	8,250.00	8,250.00
Total EXPERT FEES				13,559.50	13,559.50
Legal Expenses					
	1/25/2021	E-439456	Printing Cost	4.00	4.00
	1/26/2021		PAGA Fee	75.00	75.00
	3/22/2021	E-459542	Printing Cost	29.25	29.25
	5/7/2021	E-498860	Printing Cost	1.00	1.00
	5/10/2021		Doc Retrieval	2.35	2.35
	5/10/2021		Court Call	94.00	94.00
	11/24/2021		Doc Retrieval	5.80	5.80
	11/24/2021		Doc Retrieval	7.80	7.80
	11/24/2021		Doc Retrieval	10.20	10.20
	11/24/2021		Doc Retrieval	14.20	14.20
	12/13/2021	845458138	Legal Research	370.16	370.16
Total Legal Expenses				613.76	613.76
Process Service Fees					
	1/28/2021	33808	Attorney Services	1,663.50	1,663.50
	1/29/2021	33987	Attorney Services	139.60	139.60
	2/1/2021	34036	Attorney Services	45.00	45.00
	5/10/2021	36700	Attorney Services	250.00	250.00
	5/27/2021	37211	Attorney Services	85.00	85.00
	11/8/2021	41859	Attorney Services	85.00	85.00
	11/17/2021	41954	Attorney Services	85.00	85.00
	12/7/2021	42692	Attorney Services	85.00	85.00
Total Process Service Fees				2,438.10	2,438.10
Other Costs					
	11/11/2021		Lunch meeting	176.88	176.88
	11/30/2021		Lunch during	140.96	140.96
	12/6/2021		Dinner meeting	38.60	38.60
Total Other Costs				356.44	356.44
TOTAL				16,967.80	16,967.80



Class Members 1400
Opt Out Rate 1%
Opt Outs Received 14
Total Class Claimants 1386
Subtotal Admin Only \$11,750.00

WILL NOT EXCEED \$11,750.00

For 1400 Class Members

Firm: Wilshire Law Firm, PLC

**CASE ASSUMPTIONS** 

## January 20, 2022

Contact Number: 949.566.1455

## Case: Rodriguez v. Modesto Restaurant Group Opt-Out wLanguage

Phoenix Contact: Jodey Lawrence Requesting Attorney: Justin Marquez

Email: Jodey@phoenixclassaction.com

Contact Number: (213) 381-9988, Ext. 345

Email: justin@wilshirelawfirm.com

Assumptions and Estimate are based on information provided by counsel. If class size changes, PSA will need to adjust this Estimate accordingly. Estimate is based on 1400 Class Members. PSA assumes class data will be sent in Microsoft Excel or other usable format with no or reasonable additional formatting needed. A rate of \$150 per hour will be charged for any additional analysis or programming.

Case & Database Setup / Toll Free Setup &	Call Center / NCOA (USPS)		
Administrative Tasks:	Rate	Hours/Units Line It	em Estimate
Programming Manager	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Programming Database & Setup	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Toll Free Call Setup	\$105.14	1	\$105.14
Call Center & Long Distance	\$2.50	140	\$350.00
NCOA (USPS)	\$0.25	1400	\$350.00
		Total	\$1,205.14

<sup>\*</sup> Up to 120 days after disbursement

Data Merger & Scrub / Notice Packet, Opt-	Out Form & Postage /Translation	on / Website	
Project Action	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Notice Packet Formatting	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Data Merge & Duplication Scrub	\$0.15	1,400	\$210.00
Notice Packet & Opt-Out Form	\$0.95	1,400	\$1,330.00
Estimated Postage (up to 2 oz.)*	\$0.70	1,400	\$980.00
Language Translation	\$750.00	1	\$750.00
Website	\$200.00	1	\$200.00
		Total	\$3,670.00

<sup>\*</sup> Prices good for 90 days. Subject to change with the USPS Rate or change in Notice pages or Translation, if any.



## CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION SOLUTIONS

Skip Tracing & Remailing Notice Packets / Tracking & Programming Undeliverables			
Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Case Associate	\$50.00	2	\$100.00
Skip Tracing Undeliverables	\$1.00	280	\$280.00
Remail Notice Packets	\$0.95	280	\$266.00
Estimated Postage	\$0.70	280	\$196.00
Programming Undeliverables	\$50.00	2	\$100.00
		Total	\$942.00

<b>Database Programming / Processing Opt-Outs,</b>	Deficiencies or Disputes		
Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Programming Claims Database	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Non Opt-Out Processing	\$150.00	1	\$150.00
Case Associate	\$50.00	2	\$100.00
Opt-Outs/Deficiency/Dispute Letters	\$4.00	35	\$140.00
Case Manager	\$75.00	2	\$150.00
		Total	\$740.00

Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Programming Calculations	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Disbursement Review	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Programming Manager	\$95.00	2	\$190.00
QSF Bank Account & EIN	\$75.00	3	\$225.00
Check Run Setup & Printing	\$100.00	3	\$300.00
Mail Class Checks, W2 and 1099 *	\$0.95	1,386	\$1,316.70
Estimated Postage Checks, W2 and 1099	\$0.56	1,386	\$776.16
		Total	\$3,207.86

<sup>\*</sup> Checks are printed on 8.5 x 11 in. sheets with W2/1099 Tax Filing



## CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION SOLUTIONS

Tax Reporting & Reconciliation / Re-Issua	nce of Checks / Conclusion Repo	orts and Declarations	
Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Case Supervisor	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Remail Undeliverable Checks	\$1.50	20	\$30.00
(Postage Included)			
Case Associate	\$60.00	2	\$120.00
Reconcile Uncashed Checks	\$85.00	2	\$170.00
Conclusion Reports	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Case Manager Conclusion	\$75.00	2	\$150.00
Final Reporting & Declarations	\$115.00	1	\$115.00
IRS & QSF Annual Tax Reporting *	\$1,000.00	1	\$1,000.00
(State Tax Reporting Included)			
		Total	\$1,985.00

<sup>\*</sup> All applicable California State & Federal taxes, which include SUI, ETT, and SDI, and FUTA filings. Additional taxes are Defendant's responsibilty.

Estimate Total: \$11,750.00



SS ACTION ADMINISTRATION SOLUTIONS

## TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Provisions: The case estimate is in good faith and does not cover any applicable taxes and fees. The estimate does not make any provision for any services or class size not delineated in the request for proposal or stipulations. Proposal rates and amounts are subject to change upon further review, with Counsel/Client, of the Settlement Agreement. Only pre-approved changes will be charged when applicable. No modifications may be made to this estimate without the approval of PSA (Phoenix Settlement Administrators). All notifications are mailed in English language only unless otherwise specified. Additional costs will apply if translation into other language(s) is required. Rates to prepare and file taxes are for Federal and California State taxes only. Additional charges will apply if multiple state tax filing(s) is required. Pricing is good for ninety (90) days.

Data Conversion and Mailing: The proposal assumes that data provided will be in ready-to-use condition and that all data is provided in a single, comprehensive Excel spreadsheet. PSA cannot be liable for any errors or omissions arising due to additional work required for analyzing and processing the original database. A minimum of two (2) business days is required for processing prior to the anticipated mailing date with an additional two (2) business days for a National Change of Address (NCOA) update.

Additional time may be required depending on the class size, necessary translation of the documents, or other factors. PSA will keep counsel apprised of the estimated mailing date.

Claims: PSA's general policy is to not accept claims via facsimile. However, in the event that facsimile filing of claims must be accepted, PSA will not be held responsible for any issues and/or errors arising out of said filing. Furthermore, PSA will require disclaimer language regarding facsimile transmissions. PSA will not be responsible for any acts or omissions caused by the USPS. PSA shall not make payments to any claimants without verified, valid Social Security Numbers. All responses and class member information are held in strict confidentiality. Additional class members are \$10.00 per opt-out.

Payment Terms: All postage charges and 50% of the final administration charges are due at the commencement of the case and will be billed immediately upon receipt of the data and/or notice documents. PSA bills are due upon receipt unless otherwise negotiated and agreed to with PSA by Counsel/Client. In the event the settlement terms provide that PSA is to be paid out of the settlement fund, PSA will request that Counsel/Client endeavor to make alternate payment arrangements for PSA charges that are due at the onset of the case. The entire remaining balance is due and payable at the time the settlement account is funded by Defendant, or no later than the time of disbursement. Amounts not paid within thirty (30) days are subject to a service charge of 1.5% per month or the highest rate permitted by law.

## **Tax Reporting Requirements**

PSA will file the necessary tax returns under the EIN of the QSF, including federal and state returns. Payroll tax returns will be filed if necessary. Under the California Employment Development Department, all taxes are to be reported under the EIN of the QSF with the exception of the following taxes: Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Employment Training Tax (ETT), employer-side taxes, and State Disability Insurance (SDI), an employee-side tax. These are reported under Defendant's EIN. Therefore, to comply with the EDD payroll tax filing requirements we will need the following information:

- 1. Defendant's California State ID and Federal EIN.
- 2. Defendant's current State Unemployment Insurance (UI) rate and Employment Training Tax (ETT) rate. This information can be found in the current year DE 2088, Notice of Contribution Rates, issued by the EDD.
- 3. Termination dates of the class members, or identification of current employee class members, so we can account for the periods that the wages relate to for each class member.
- 4. An executed Power of Attorney (Form DE 48) from Defendant. This form is needed so that we may report the UI, SDI, and ETT taxes under Defendant's EIN on their behalf. If this form is not provided we will work with the EDD auditors to transfer the tax payments to Defendant's EIN.
- 5. Defendant is responsible for reporting the SDI portion of the settlement payments on the class member's W-2. PSA will file these forms on Defendant's behalf for an additional fee and will issue an additional W-2 for each class member under Defendant's EIN, as SDI is reported under Defendant's EIN rather than the EIN of the QSF. The Power of Attorney (Form DE 48) will be needed in order for PSA to report SDI payments.

2	Rodriguez v. Modesto Restaurant Group, LLC et al. CV-21-000269
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
4	) ss COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )
5	
6	I, Min Jee Kim, state that I am employed in the aforesaid County, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is
7	3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010. My electronic service address is minjee@wilshirelawfirm.com.
8	On February 10, 2022, I served the foregoing DECLARATION OF JUSTIN F.
9	MARQUEZ IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, on the interested parties by placing a true
10	copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope by following one of the methods of service as follows:
11	Jacqueline Beaumont, Bar No. 253776
12	jbeaumont@calljensen.com L. Lisa Sandoval, Bar No. 310380
13	lsandoval@calljensen.com   CALL & JENSEN
14	A Professional Corporation 610 Newport Center Drive, Suite 700
15	Newport Beach, CA 92660 Telephone: (949) 717-3000
16	Fax: (949) 717- 3100
17	Attorneys for Defendant, Modesto Restaurant Group, LLC
18	(X) <b>BY E-MAIL:</b> I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known email
19	address or e-mail of record in this action.
20	I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the
21	foregoing is true and correct.
22	Executed on February 10, 2022 at Los Angeles, California.
23	
24	mat .
25	Min Jee Kim
26	
27	
28	1
	PROOF OF SERVICE

PROOF OF SERVICE