

1 Dawson Morton (SBN 320811)
Santos Gomez (SBN 172741)
2 LAW OFFICES OF SANTOS GOMEZ
1003 Freedom Boulevard
3 Watsonville, CA 95076
Ph: (831) 228-1560
4 Fax: (831) 228-1542
dawson@lawofficesofsantosgomez.com
5 santos@lawofficesofsantosgomez.com

6 James M. Finberg (SBN 114850)
Eve H. Cervantez (SBN 164709)
7 Connie K. Chan (SBN 284230)
ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
8 177 Post Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94108
9 Ph: (415) 421-7151
Fax: (415) 362-8064
10 jfinberg@altshulerberzon.com
ecervantez@altshulerberzon.com
11 cchan@altshulerberzon.com

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class*

13
14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15 SAN JOSE DIVISION

16 RIGOBERTO SARMIENTO, GUSTAVO
LUEVANO-VACA, and others similarly situated,

17
18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20 FRESH HARVEST, INC., FRESH FOODS,
21 INC., RAVA RANCHES, INC., and SMD
LOGISTICS, INC.

22 Defendants.
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No.: 5:20-cv-7974-BLF

PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION FOR
APPROVAL OF ATTORNEYS'
FEES, COSTS AND SERVICE
PAYMENTS; BRIEF IN SUPPORT

Date: October 26, 2023
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Ctrm: Courtroom 3, U.S. District
Court, 280 South First St, Fifth
Floor, San Jose, Ca.

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

ecervantez@altshulerberzon.com
jfinberg@altshulerberzon.com
cchan@altshulerberzon.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2 I. INTRODUCTION1

3 II. SUMMARY OF APPLICABLE SETTLEMENT TERMS1

4 III. PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR COUNSEL ACHIEVED SIGNIFICANT LITIGATION

5 SUCCESS2

6 IV. THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE PLAINTIFFS’ ATTORNEYS’

7 FEES AND COSTS3

8 A. FEES ARE APPROPRIATE UNDER BOTH THE LODESTAR AND

9 PERCENTAGE OF THE FUNDS METHOD3

10 1. FEES LESS THAN 24.5% OF THE BASE SETTLEMENT

11 AMOUNT ARE APPROPRIATE3

12 2. PLAINTIFFS’ FEES ARE ALSO APPROPRIATE UNDER A

13 LODESTAR ANALYSIS4

14 a. THE HOURS SPENT WERE REASONABLY

15 NECESSARY5

16 b. PLAINTIFFS’ COUNSEL’S RATES ARE REASONABLE

17 FOR EXPERIENCED WAGE AND HOUR CLASS ACTION

18 ATTORNEYS5

19 B. PLAINTIFFS’ COSTS ARE REASONABLE.....7

20 V. SERVICE AWARDS ARE JUSTIFIED BY PLAINTIFFS’ SIGNIFICANT

21 PARTICIPATION AND THE CONDUCT AND REPUTATIONAL RISK PLAINTIFFS

22 FACED.....7

23 VI. CONCLUSION.....10

24

25

26

27

28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Bakhtiar v. Info. Res., Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 4472606 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2021)	9
<i>Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.</i> , 306 F.R.D. 245 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	3, 4
<i>Black v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123676 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2019).....	4, 9
<i>In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011)	3
<i>Bower v. Cycle Gear, Inc.</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112455 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2016).....	4
<i>Camacho v. Bridgeport Financial, Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 973 (9th Cir. 2008)	6
<i>Castaneda v. Burger King Corp.</i> , 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78299 (N.D. Cal. July 12, 2010).....	5
<i>Chess v. Volkswagen Grp. Of Am., Inc.</i> , 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 164145 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 20, 2022)	6
<i>Fischel v. Equitable Life Assur. Soc’y of U.S.</i> , 307 F.3d 997 (9th Cir. 2002)	4
<i>Gomez-Gasca v. Future Ag Mgmt.</i> , 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195663 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2020).....	6, 9
<i>Guam Soc’y of Obstetricians & Gynecologists v. Ada</i> , 100 F.3d 691 (9th Cir. 1996)	6
<i>Harris v. Marhoefer</i> , 24 F.3d 16 (9th Cir. 1994)	7
<i>McDonald v. CP OpCo, LLC</i> , 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80501 (N.D. Cal. May 13, 2019)	3, 4, 7, 9
<i>Miguel-Sanchez v. Mesa Packing, LLC</i> , 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 202330 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2021).....	6
<i>Ontiveros v. Zamora</i> , 303 F.R.D. 356 (E.D. Cal. 2014)	5, 7

1 *Rodriguez v. West Publishing Corp.*,
 2 563 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2009)7

3 *Roes, 1-2 v. SFBSC Mgmt., LLC*,
 4 944 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 2019)7

5 *Schuchardt v. Law Office of Rory W. Clark*,
 6 314 F.R.D. 673 (N.D. Cal. April 28, 2016)5

7 *Sillah v. Command Int’l Sec. Servs.*,
 8 2016 WL 692830 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2016)5

9 *Six (6) Mexican Workers v. Arizona Citrus Growers*,
 10 904 F.2d 1301 (9th Cir. 1990)3

11 *Stetson v. Grissom*,
 12 821 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2016)4

13 *Taylor v. Shutterfly*,
 14 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 237069 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2021)5

15 *United Steelworkers of Am. v. Phelps Dodge Corp.*,
 16 896 F.2d 403 (9th Cir. 1990)6

17 *Walsh v. CorePower Yoga LLC*,
 18 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 163991 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2017).....9

19 *Watson v. Tennant Co.*,
 20 2020 WL 1325014 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2020)9

21 *Zubia v. Shamrock Foods Co.*,
 22 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 223446 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2017)4

23 **State Statutes**

24 Cal. Lab. Code § 98.6(b)(3)9

25 **Other Authorities**

26 F. R. C. P. 23(h)3

27

28

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 In this class action settlement for a Base Settlement Amount of \$2,031,000 (encompassing a
3 Gross Settlement Amount of \$1,656,724 in new funds and prior out of court payments made during
4 the litigation of \$374,276), Plaintiffs seek approval of \$497,017.20 in attorneys' fees and
5 reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses in the amount of \$54,495.47 (plus additional costs of
6 approximately \$5,000 or less for translation fees to be submitted before the hearing on Final
7 Settlement Approval). Plaintiffs also seek approval for service payments in the amount of \$15,000
8 each to the two named Plaintiffs.

9 Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiffs seek a fee award of 30% of the new
10 payment amount (less than 24.5% of the Base Settlement Amount). Settlement Agreement, ECF
11 219-2 at 14. This is in line with existing Ninth Circuit standards and is reasonable considering the
12 results obtained for the class and the extensive work performed by Plaintiffs' counsel. *See generally*
13 *Cervantez Decl.* Through settlement, Plaintiffs achieved an average gross recovery of \$10,469 per
14 class member (*Morton Decl.* ¶15), obtained wages for truck drivers that Defendants previously
15 claimed were "baseless," (ECF 28-1 at 2) and also protected class members from facing efforts by
16 Defendants to reclaim any prior out-of-court payments. ECF 219 [Preliminary Approval Motion] at
17 14. Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendant will pay \$1,656,724 in new funds and will not be able to
18 reclaim \$374,276 already paid by Defendants to class members. ECF 219 at 13; ECF 219-1 at ¶13.
19 This amount represents approximately 25% of Defendants' liability and a 34% gross recovery. ECF
20 219-1 at ¶15. And each of the 194 Class Members will receive an average award of \$7,307.73,
21 including prior out-of-court payments, and an average cash payment of \$5,378.47. *Morton Decl.* ¶
22 15.

23 **II. SUMMARY OF APPLICABLE SETTLEMENT TERMS**

24 The full terms of the settlement are described in Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval,
25 ECF 219 at 25-27, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, ECF 219-2. The material terms of the
26 Settlement with respect to fees and costs are:

- 27 • An application by Plaintiffs for an award of attorney's fees of up to \$497,017.20 (30% of the
28 new money). ECF 219-2 at 14.

- 1 • An Award of Litigation Costs up to \$75,000. ECF 219-2 at 14.
- 2 • An Award of Service Payments to the named Plaintiffs in the amount of \$15,000 each. ECF
- 3 219-2 at 15.

4 **III. PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR COUNSEL ACHIEVED SIGNIFICANT LITIGATION**
5 **SUCCESS**

6 Plaintiffs overcame Defendants’ legal challenges to the complaint which Defendant Fresh
7 Harvest characterized as “baseless,” ECF 28-1 at 2, claimed “incontrovertible evidence” showed
8 Defendant would prevail, *id.*, and claimed the suit was a product of a “flawed interpretation of
9 federal law,” and would result in “a manifest injustice” if the lawsuit were allowed to proceed, ECF
10 72-1 at 5. Plaintiffs also overcame Defendants’ counterclaim, Defendants’ nonparticipation
11 agreements, and Defendants’ efforts to silence Plaintiffs and buy off class members. Plaintiffs’
12 counsels’ litigation work included the following:

- 13 • Defeating early summary judgment motions filed by Defendants Fresh Harvest and
- 14 SMD Logistics;
- 15 • Dismissing a counterclaim filed against named Plaintiff Gustavo Luevano-Vaca, and
- 16 Defendants’ attempt to appeal that dismissal;
- 17 • Filing numerous discovery motions resulting in seven orders compelling production
- 18 of documents;
- 19 • Defeating a motion to preclude communications with class members and for
- 20 sanctions;
- 21 • Obtaining a protective order to protect the named Plaintiff residing in Mexico.

22 Obtaining the successful result here required far more of Class Counsel than in the ordinary
23 wage and hour class action lawsuit: Plaintiffs invalidated the out-of-court settlement agreement
24 Defendant Fresh Harvest obtained from Plaintiff Luevano-Vaca and dismissed Defendants’
25 counterclaim, despite Defendants’ claim that there was “no viable argument” to invalidate the
26 settlement. ECF 72-1 at 11. Plaintiffs defeated early summary judgment motions filed by
27 Defendants Fresh Harvest and SMD Logistics, in part by compelling discovery Defendants refused
28 to produce voluntarily. *See, e.g.*, ECF 84. Plaintiffs responded to Defendants’ numerous motions

1 including motions claiming class members had been offered bribes (ECF 88-1) and obtained a
 2 protective order after Defendants sent an individual to visit Plaintiff Luevano-Vaca in Mexico and
 3 connected the Plaintiff with an attorney for Defendants. ECF 199. *See generally* Cervantez Decl.
 4 ¶¶17-20. In addition, the costs were necessarily incurred in this heavily litigated proceeding which
 5 involved numerous multilingual documents and multinational activities with witnesses and parties
 6 in both the U.S. and Mexico. Similarly, Named Plaintiffs faced risks beyond those normally
 7 encountered by wage and hour plaintiffs, and deserve a \$15,000 service award.

8 **IV. THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE PLAINTIFFS' ATTORNEYS' FEES AND**
 9 **COSTS**

10 Pursuant to Rule 23(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a court may award
 11 “reasonable attorney’s fees” that are “authorized by law or by the parties’ agreement.” Fed. R. Civ.
 12 P. 23(h). Courts in the Ninth Circuit have discretion to use either the lodestar method or the
 13 percentage of the fund method to approve fee requests. *In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.*,
 14 654 F.3d 935, 942 (9th Cir. 2011) (providing “[w]here a settlement produces a common fund for the
 15 benefit of the entire class, courts have discretion to employ either the lodestar method or the
 16 percentage-of-recovery method.”); *McDonald v. CP OpCo, LLC*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80501, at
 17 *17 (N.D. Cal. May 13, 2019) (“The Court has discretion in a common fund case to choose either
 18 (1) the lodestar method or (2) the percentage-of-the-fund when calculating reasonable attorneys’
 19 fees.”)

20 **A. Fees Are Appropriate Under Both the Lodestar and Percentage of the Funds**
 21 **Method.**

22 **1. Fees Less Than 24.5% of the Base Settlement Amount Are Appropriate.**

23 Plaintiffs seek a fee award equal to 30% of the new money Gross Settlement Amount, which
 24 is slightly less than 24.5% of the Base Settlement Amount. The proposed fee award is within the 25
 25 percent range that is the “benchmark” for attorneys’ fees from class action common settlement
 26 funds. *Six (6) Mexican Workers v. Arizona Citrus Growers*, 904 F.2d 1301, 1311 (9th Cir. 1990).
 27 “[F]ederal courts have consistently approved of attorney fee awards over the 25% benchmark,
 28 specifically at a rate of 30% or higher[.]” *Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.*, 306 F.R.D. 245, 260

1 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (internal quotations omitted). In contingent litigation, “where, as here, class
2 counsel has significant experience in the particular type of litigation at issue; . . . courts have
3 sometimes awarded even more than the 25 percent benchmark percentage of the common fund.”
4 *Bellinghausen*, 306 F.R.D. at 261; *see also Black v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
5 123676, at *19 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2019) (awarding “attorneys’ fees of 30% of the total settlement
6 amount”); *Bower v. Cycle Gear, Inc.*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112455, at *17 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23,
7 2016) (awarding fees of 30% of the settlement amount in part because “results obtained for the
8 Class Members were very favorable.”) Plaintiffs’ fee request is “well within the ordinary range of
9 fees approved by courts in this district.” *McDonald*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80501, at *20.

10 Additionally, Plaintiffs’ counsel overcame significant hurdles in reaching the recovery,
11 including Defendants’ efforts to keep class members and even a named Plaintiff from participating
12 in the litigation. And, Plaintiffs’ counsel undertook risk to obtain the results here as Defendants
13 vigorously contested, at every turn, that higher wages were owed to truck drivers at all.

14 **2. Plaintiffs’ Fees Are Also Appropriate Under a Lodestar Analysis.**

15 Where a lodestar method is chosen, the Court applies “the prevailing rate as of the date of
16 the fee request.” *Stetson v. Grissom*, 821 F.3d 1157, 1166 (9th Cir. 2016). And, “the court multiplies
17 a reasonable number of hours by a reasonable hourly rate.” *Fischel v. Equitable Life Assur. Soc’y of*
18 *U.S.*, 307 F.3d 997, 1006-07 (9th Cir. 2002). “[T]he lodestar ‘cross-check’ need not be as exhaustive
19 as a pure lodestar calculation” because it only “serves as a point of comparison by which to assess
20 the reasonableness of a percentage award.” *Zubia v. Shamrock Foods Co.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
21 223446, at *16 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2017) (citation omitted). Here, Plaintiffs’ fee requests are
22 appropriate under either method.

23 As detailed below, under a lodestar calculation, Plaintiffs’ counsel’s fees easily exceed \$2.2
24 million. The fees include over \$590,000 for the Law Offices of Santos Gomez, and over \$1.7
25 million for Altshuler Berzon. Morton Decl. ¶12; Cervantez Decl. ¶24. Plaintiffs’ fee award sought
26 here of \$497,017 represents a negative .21 multiplier of the \$ 2.2 million lodestar amount. Morton
27 Decl. ¶12. Plaintiffs’ counsel will continue to work on this case, including additional
28 communications with class members, supervision of the Settlement Administrator, and preparation

1 of final approval papers, such that the negative multiplier will only increase.

2 Courts commonly approve multipliers of 1.5 or 2. *See, e.g., Ontiveros v. Zamora*, 303
 3 F.R.D. 356, 375 (E.D. Cal. 2014) (approving of fees with “a multiplier of approximately 1.54”
 4 which was 25% of the common fund); *Castaneda v. Burger King Corp.*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
 5 78299, at *9-10 (N.D. Cal. July 12, 2010) (approving fees with “a multiplier of just under two”
 6 where “the settlement also provides for injunctive relief”). Here, Plaintiffs seek far less. “The fact
 7 that Plaintiffs’ counsel are seeking substantially less in fees than they reasonably incurred further
 8 demonstrates the reasonableness of the fee request.” *Taylor v. Shutterfly*, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
 9 237069 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2021) (collecting cases); *Schuchardt v. Law Office of Rory W. Clark*, 314
 10 F.R.D. 673, 690-91 (N.D. Cal. April 28, 2016) (fractional lodestar multiplier is indication of
 11 reasonableness of fee request).

12 **a. The Hours Spent Were Reasonably Necessary.**

13 Plaintiffs’ attorneys expended 2880 hours to date. Morton Decl. ¶¶8-9 (730 hours to date);
 14 Cervantez Decl. ¶24-25 (over 2150 hours to date). These hours were all reasonably necessary to
 15 respond to the way in which Defendants litigated the case. Plaintiffs’ counsel successfully opposed
 16 Defendants’ two early summary judgment motions and motion to preclude communications with
 17 class members and for sanctions, dismissed a counterclaim, obtained a protective order, and filed
 18 numerous motions to compel discovery and/or oppose motions to quash discovery resulting in seven
 19 orders for further discovery from Defendants and third parties. Cervantez Decl. ¶20. Plaintiffs’
 20 counsel also analyzed Defendants’ payroll records and worked with an expert to prepare
 21 calculations which would lead to the ultimate resolution of this suit. And, Plaintiffs’ counsel
 22 obtained these results despite Defendants’ obtaining out-of-court releases from numerous members
 23 of the class. *See, e.g.,* ECF 144-4, 144-12, 144-18.

24 **b. Plaintiffs’ Counsel’s Rates Are Reasonable For Experienced Wage**
 25 **and Hour Class Action Attorneys.**

26 “A party seeking attorney’s fees bears the burden of demonstrating that the requested rates
 27 are ‘in line with the prevailing market rate of the relevant community.’” *Sillah v. Command Int’l*
 28 *Sec. Servs.*, 2016 WL 692830, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2016) (quoting *Carson v. Billings Police*

1 *Dep't*, 470 F.3d 889, 891 (9th Cir. 2006)). “Generally, . . . the relevant community is the forum in
2 which the district court sits.” *Camacho v. Bridgeport Financial, Inc.*, 523 F.3d 973, 979 (9th Cir.
3 2008).

4 The declarations submitted herewith detail the billing rates of Plaintiffs’ counsel that were
5 used to calculate their respective lodestars. Cervantez Decl. ¶¶17-27; Morton Decl. ¶¶8-9. Such
6 “[a]ffidavits of the plaintiffs’ attorney and other attorneys regarding prevailing fees in the
7 community, and rate determinations in other cases. . . are satisfactory evidence of the prevailing
8 market rate.” *United Steelworkers of Am. v. Phelps Dodge Corp.*, 896 F.2d 403, 407 (9th Cir. 1990);
9 *Guam Soc’y of Obstetricians & Gynecologists v. Ada*, 100 F.3d 691, 696 (9th Cir. 1996).

10 Attorneys Dawson Morton and Santos Gomez are bilingual and have over twenty years of
11 experience representing migrant and seasonal farm laborers. Morton Decl. ¶¶ 3-7. Their specialized
12 experience representing foreign agricultural workers helped guide the successful results obtained
13 here. Altshuler Berzon attorneys, particularly lead partner Eve Cervantez, also have decades of
14 experience litigating complex wage and hour class actions, and are frequently recognized for their
15 excellence in this work. Cervantez Decl. ¶¶4-9. Class Counsel’s fees have previously been
16 approved in this district as “reasonable and commensurate with those charged by attorneys with
17 similar experience in the market[.]” *Gomez-Gasca v. Future Ag Mgmt.*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
18 195663, at *16 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2020) (finding Mr. Morton and Gomez showed “skill and
19 diligence”); *Miguel-Sanchez v. Mesa Packing, LLC*, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 202330, at *30 (N.D.
20 Cal. Oct. 20, 2021) (concluding that Mr. Morton and Mr. Gomez’s requested rates in 2021 were
21 “reasonable”); Morton Decl. ¶11, Cervantez Decl. ¶31 (collecting cases approving Altshuler Berzon
22 rates). These rates are appropriate in the San Francisco Bay Area legal community and are well
23 supported by case law from the Northern District. *See, e.g., Chess v. Volkswagen Grp. Of Am., Inc.*,
24 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 164145, at *27-28 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 20, 2022) (approving 2022 rates
25 “rang[ing] from \$1,100 for partners with over 30 years of experience to \$550-800 for associates
26 with multiple years of experience,” and citing *Carlotti v. ASUS Computer Int’l*, 2020 U.S. Dist.
27 LEXIS 108917, at *15 (N.D. Cal. June 22, 2020) (approving hourly rates of \$950 to \$1,025 for
28 partners, \$450 to \$900 for other attorneys, and \$225 to \$275 for legal assistants)). Whether the

1 Court applies a percentage of the fund or lodestar approach, Plaintiffs' fee request of \$497,017 is
2 appropriate and reasonable.

3 **B. Plaintiffs' Costs Are Reasonable.**

4 Class counsel are entitled to reimbursement of "out-of-pocket expenses that would normally
5 be charged to a fee paying client." *Harris v. Marhoefer*, 24 F.3d 16, 19 (9th Cir. 1994). "There is no
6 doubt that an attorney who has created a common fund for the benefit of the class is entitled to
7 reimbursement of reasonable litigation expenses from that fund." *Ontiveros v. Zamora*, 303 F.R.D.
8 356, 375 (E.D. Cal. 2014) (internal citation omitted). The class settlement specifies that Plaintiffs
9 may request reimbursement of costs in an amount up to \$75,000. ECF 219-2 at 14.

10 Here, Plaintiffs have incurred \$54,495.47 in litigation costs to date. Morton Decl. ¶14;
11 Cervantez Decl. ¶¶33-34. These costs are filing and service costs, copying and mailing costs,
12 transcript costs, travel expenses, legal research costs, expert damages calculations, mediation
13 expenses, and translation expenses. Morton Decl. ¶13 & Ex. 3; Cervantez Decl. ¶33 & Ex. C.
14 These costs are of the type commonly awarded. *McDonald*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80501, at *21
15 (approving "costs include filing fees, copying costs, postage, legal research, couriers, service of
16 process, and other costs that would normally be charged to a paying client"). Plaintiffs anticipate
17 incurring some additional translation expenses for their final approval motion and will update their
18 litigation costs prior to the final approval hearing. Plaintiffs do not expect their litigation costs to
19 exceed \$60,000, or \$15,000 less than the maximum amount permitted by the Settlement.

20 **V. SERVICE AWARDS ARE JUSTIFIED BY PLAINTIFFS' SIGNIFICANT**
21 **PARTICIPATION AND THE CONDUCT AND REPUTATIONAL RISK**
22 **PLAINTIFFS FACED**

23 Plaintiffs seek an enhancement award of \$15,000 each for the two named Plaintiffs. This is
24 a reasonable incentive award and amounts to approximately one and a half times the average gross
25 class recovery and approximately three times the average cash class recovery. ECF 219-1 at ¶16.
26 These awards are intended "to compensate class representatives for work done on behalf of the
27 class, to make up for financial or reputational risk undertaken in bringing the action[.]" *Rodriguez v.*
28 *West Publishing Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 958-59 (9th Cir. 2009); *Roes, 1-2 v. SFBSC Mgmt., LLC*, 944

1 F.3d 1035, 1057 (9th Cir. 2019).

2 The Plaintiffs spent substantial time, in excess of 60 and 70 hours each, assisting with the
3 litigation of the case. Sarmiento Decl. ¶7 (more than 60 hours); Luevano-Vaca Decl. ¶7 (more than
4 70 hours). Plaintiff Sarmiento flew to Los Angeles during a global pandemic to attend a deposition
5 in the office of Defendant Fresh Harvest's counsels' office after Defendants refused to take a video
6 deposition or set the deposition closer to Plaintiff's work. Sarmiento Decl. ¶¶4-5. Both Plaintiffs
7 fielded calls from co-workers about the litigation and about Defendants' efforts to obtain releases
8 from class members, and worked with counsel to provide declarations in support of or opposition to
9 various motions. Sarmiento Decl. ¶¶3-4, 6-7; Luevano-Vaca Decl. ¶¶3-7.

10 Plaintiffs were both subjected to extraordinary risks, beyond those normally encountered in
11 wage and hour class actions. Defendants filed a counterclaim against Plaintiff Luevano-Vaca, and
12 attempted to appeal this Court's dismissal of the counterclaim to the Ninth Circuit. Both Plaintiffs
13 also experienced personal visits from Defendants' representatives. Plaintiff Luevano-Vaca
14 experienced multiple visits to his home, first from Defendants' employees and then from an
15 individual Defendants appear to have contracted. Defendant Luevano-Vaca was also put in direct
16 telephone contact with an attorney for the Fresh Harvest defendants. Luevano-Vaca Decl. ¶¶ 2, 9.
17 Plaintiff Sarmiento was visited, in person, by a human resources person from Defendant Fresh
18 Foods and received a call from Defendant Fresh Harvest's human resources staff. Sarmiento Decl.
19 ¶5. And, it was clearly communicated to Plaintiff Luevano-Vaca and Plaintiff Sarmiento that
20 continuing the litigation came at the expense of continued employment. Sarmiento Decl. ¶8;
21 Luevano-Vaca Decl. ¶2.

22 The \$15,000 incentive award is not disproportionate to Plaintiffs' individual recoveries, nor
23 to the total class settlement amount, and represents just over one and a half times the average gross
24 class recovery of \$10,469, Morton Decl. ¶15, and compensates for significant time and reputational
25 and financial risks, Sarmiento Decl. ¶¶4, 7-8; Luevano-Vaca Decl. ¶¶2-4, 6-9. The amount of
26 incentive payment sought by Plaintiffs in this case is higher than the typical \$10,000 award because
27 of (1) the counterclaim Defendants brought against Plaintiff Luevano-Vaca purportedly for
28 violating the illegal pre-litem contracts Defendants sought to enforce on Plaintiffs and the Class, (2)

1 the retaliatory conduct directed at Plaintiffs including individual out-of-court visits by Defendants
2 or their agents, (3) loss of continued employment opportunities, and (4) an in-person deposition
3 with Defendants during a pandemic. The reputational risk has included visits at their homes, being
4 the subject of a counterclaim, and fears that rumors will be spread about the Plaintiffs to impede
5 their future employment. Luevano-Vaca Decl. ¶8 (“blaming us for suing them”); Sarmiento Decl.
6 ¶9 (“came to my house”).

7 Here, the gross recovery per class member is approximately \$10,469 and the net recovery is
8 in excess of \$7,300. Morton Decl. ¶15. Plaintiffs seek a service payment that is one and a half times
9 the average class recovery or just over two times the average net class member recovery of \$7,300,
10 which is in line with other court decisions. *Watson v. Tennant Co.*, 2020 WL 1325014, at *6 (E.D.
11 Cal. Mar. 20, 2020) (approving “class representative payment of \$25,000.00” where settlement
12 class had an average payment of over \$8,000); *Walsh v. CorePower Yoga LLC*, 2017 U.S. Dist.
13 LEXIS 163991, at *40 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2017) (approving “a \$10,000 service award for Plaintiff”
14 in employment litigation); *Black.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123676, at *21 (approving “a \$10,000
15 service award” which was “approximately 3.2 times” average recovery); *McDonald*, 2019 U.S.
16 Dist. LEXIS 80501, at *23-24 (rejecting a service award of “7.5 times the recovery of an average
17 class member” and awarding one of \$10,000 or 5 times the average class recovery); *Gomez-Gasca*,
18 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195663, at *18-19 (approving \$10,000 service award or 4 times the average
19 class recovery). Additionally, here, Plaintiffs could have made retaliation claims that would have
20 provided them \$10,000 in liquidated damages under California law. Cal. Lab. Code § 98.6(b)(3) (“a
21 civil penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars . . . to be awarded to the employee” for an
22 employer’s retaliatory acts). Here, the service award is appropriate given the risks Plaintiffs
23 confronted, their experiences as named Plaintiffs including personal visits, an in-person deposition
24 involving significant travel during a global pandemic, and defeating a counterclaim and summary
25 judgment, and the significant results obtained for class members. *Bakhtiar v. Info. Res., Inc.*, 2021
26 WL 4472606, at *10 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2021) (approving \$15,000 service award where plaintiff
27 “ha[d] shown that her efforts and contributions to this litigation, and the risks she undertook as a
28 result thereof, were greater than those of the average lead plaintiff.”)

1 **VI. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs' request for \$497,017.20 in attorneys' fees and
3 \$54,495.47 in litigation expenses, and service awards of \$15,000 to each Named Plaintiff, should be
4 approved.

5 DATED: June 27, 2023

6 By: /s/ Dawson Morton
7 DAWSON MORTON
8 SANTOS GOMEZ
9 LAW OFFICES OF SANTOS GOMEZ
10 1003 Freedom Boulevard
11 Watsonville, CA 95076
12 Ph: 831-228-1560
13 Fax: 831-228-1542
14 dawson@lawofficesofsantosgomez.com
15 santos@lawofficesofsantosgomez.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

12 DATED: June 27, 2023

13 By: /s/ Eve Cervantez
14 EVE H. CERVANTEZ
15 JAMES M. FINBERG
16 CONNIE K. CHAN
17 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
18 177 Post Street, Suite 300
19 San Francisco, CA 94108
20 Ph: (415) 421-7151
21 Fax: (415) 362-8064
22 ecervantez@altshulerberzon.com
23 jfinberg@altshulerberzon.com
24 cchan@altshulerberzon.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class