

1 Gregory N. Karasik (SBN 115834)
2 **Karasik Law Firm**
3 16021 Aiglon St.
4 Pacific Palisades, CA90272
5 Tel (310) 463-9761
6 Fax (310) 943-2582
7 greg@karasiklawfirm.com

8 Santos Gomez (SBN 172741)
9 **Law Offices of Santos Gomez**
10 1003 Freedom Boulevard
11 Watsonville, CA 95076
12 Tel (831) 228-1560
13 Fax (831) 228-1542
14 santos@lawofficesofsantosgomez.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff
16 JOSE MARIO MENDOZA

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 JOSE MARIO MENDOZA,

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 TRANS VALLEY TRANSPORT et al,

23 Defendants.

24 Case No. 22-cv-07164 TLT

25 **NOTICE OF ERRATA**

26 Date: October 8, 2024
27 Time: 2:00 p.m.
28 Ctrm: 9

And Related Cross-Action

29 Please take notice that page 5 of the declaration of Gregory N. Karasik submitted in support of
30 Plaintiff's motion for an award of fees, costs and an enhancement payment (Docket No. 53-1) was
31 inadvertently omitted from the declaration filed with the Court. Attached hereto is the missing page 5
32 from the declaration.

33 Dated: July 4, 2024

34 KARASIK LAW FIRM
35 LAW OFFICES OF SANTOS GOMEZ

36 By *s/ Gregory N, Karasik*
37 Gregory N. Karasik
38 Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 charge for that flight has not yet been paid). In connection with the final approval hearing on October
2 8, 2024, I will also incur a parking expense of \$60 at LAX and an expense of \$24 for BART (for travel
3 between the airport and the courthouse). So my total expenses for this case will be \$13,050.63. As set
4 forth in the declaration of Santos Gomez, his office has incurred a total of \$848.97 in litigation
5 expenses in this case so the total amount of litigation expenses by all of Plaintiff's counsel in this case
6 is \$13,899.60

7 Enhancement Payment

8 11. Plaintiff requests an enhancement payment in the amount of \$7,500. This amount is
9 well deserved because Plaintiff undertook the risk and burden of litigation, including the risks of
10 having to pay costs and attorney's fees, and the risk of potential blacklisting for suing an employer;
11 Plaintiff, over the course of more than nine years, has devoted a significant amount of time to this
12 litigation, including providing information and documents to his counsel, sitting for deposition,
13 participating in mediation and settlement conference, reviewing the settlement, and submitting
14 declarations; and Plaintiff obtained a very good result for class members. The amount of enhancement
15 payment requested by Plaintiff is also reasonable because it is equal to approximately 1.07% of the
16 Gross Settlement Amount and compares very favorably to amounts of enhancement payments awarded
17 in connection with other wage and hour class action settlements of similar magnitude. In addition, the
18 amount of enhancement payment requested by Plaintiff is only about 3.5 times the average amount of
19 settlement benefits (\$2,185) payable to class members. The moderate ratio between the amount of
20 enhancement payment and settlement benefits is lower than reflected by enhancement payments
21 awarded in many other cases, including two cases in the Northern District of California in which I was
22 counsel for the plaintiff. In the case of *Julio C. Marroquin v. Premium Packing, Inc.*, United States
23 District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 5:16-CV-06472, Judge Lucy Koh awarded the
24 plaintiff an enhancement of \$7,500 where the average amount of settlement benefits was only \$254 per
25 class member (final approval granted December 7, 2017). Similarly, in the case of *Regina Gonzales*
26 *Gomez et al v. Fernandez Brothers, Inc.*, United States District Court, Northern District of California,
27