1 2 3 4 5	ABYE LAW OFFICES Mikael A. Abye (SBN # 233458) mick@abyelaw.com 88 Kearny Street, Suite 1850 San Francisco, CA 94108-5523 Telephone: (415) 341-4519 Fax: (415) 358-4770 Counsel for Plaintiff MILOS ANTIC	
6		
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
10	DANIEL MARKO, JESUS CORONA, on	Case No. CGC-18-567869
11	behalf of themselves and others similarly situated and in their capacity as Private	DECLARATION OF MILOS ANTIC IN
12	Attorneys General Representatives,	SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
13	Plaintiffs,	FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
14	v.	
15	DOORDASH, INC.,	
16	Defendant.	
17		ı
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	DEGL OF MILATEL ADVE IN CUIDDORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER OF ANTING PRIAL	
	DECL. OF MIKAEL ABYE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS	

I, Mikael A. Abye, declare:

- 1. I represent class member plaintiff Milos Antic. I am admitted to practice law in California. I make these statements based on personal knowledge and would so testify if called as a witness.
- This declaration is submitted in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Order
 Granting Final Approval of Proposed Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' fees and costs.
- 3. Mr. Antic engaged me to represent him in November 2020. Mr. Antic had concerns with the then-proposed class action settlement and wanted more information about the case and his options.
- 4. On behalf of Mr. Antic, I investigated the matter. That investigation included gathering information from Mr. Antic and his work for DoorDash, researching the legal issues, reviewing relevant publicly available court and regulatory filings concerning DoorDash, and reporting findings to my client.
- 5. Mr. Antic believes that DoorDash misclassified him as an independent contractor and failed to comply with employment law requirements of California law.
- Additionally, I prepared and submitted several court filing on behalf of
 Mr. Antic, starting with objections to the then-proposed class action settlement, which I filed on November 17, 2020.
- 7. On December 28, 2020, I filed a motion to intervene in the *Marciano v.DoorDash* matter (Case No. CGC-18-567869, San Francisco Superior Court). That filing included a draft complaint prepared on behalf of Mr. Antic.
- 8. Prior to the motion to intervene was adjudicated, on behalf of Mr. Antic, I entered into discussions with class counsel regarding Mr. Antic's concerns. Those discussions resulted in Mr. Antic withdrawing his motion to intervene and joining the settlement class. In addition, I entered into a joint prosecution agreement with The Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman ("Friedman") whereby we agreed to work together and to split any net amount of attorney's fees awarded Friedman in the matter of *Cynthia Marciano and David Cristini v Doordash, Inc.* Case No. CGC-18-567869. My portion of that split is to be \$40,000. I have

received written confirmation from Mr. Antic that he approves of my fee splitting agreement with Friedman.

- 9. Subsequent to joining the class, I have reviewed and advised Mr. Antic with respect to the various iterations of the settlement documents and have provided him with updates as the case's status. I believe that the Settlement is fair and reasonable and provides significant meaningful relief to Class Members
- 10. Mr. Antic is adequate to represent the Class. He and Class Members have strong and co-extensive interests in this litigation because they all worked for Defendant during the relevant time period, suffered the same alleged injuries from the same alleged course of conduct, and there is no evidence of any conflict of interest between Mr. Antic and Class Members. Mr. Antic has also demonstrated his commitment to the Class by, among other things, retaining me as counsel, providing me with documents, extensively speaking with me to assist in identifying the claims asserted in this case. Neither Mr. Antic nor I have any conflicts of interests with the Class.
- 11. This Court should approve the proposed Incentive Award for Mr. Antic. He has advanced the interests of the Class by, among other things, speaking extensively with counsel on numerous occasions to help identify and develop the claims in this case, providing documents pertinent to the claims of the Class Members, participating in settlement discussions, and carefully reviewing the Settlement and related documents. Further, Mr. Antic took the personal risk of potentially facing intrusive discovery and disclosure to future employers that he sued a former employer after years of employment.
- 12. It is my understanding that for purposes of settlement, Defendant does not contest, the award of attorneys' fees requested is reasonable.

Experience

- 13. I have practiced law in California since December of 2004 and have represented clients in connection with a number of significant class action cases, including.
 - a) In Re Celera Corporation Sec. Litig., N.D. Cal, Case No.: 5:10cv2604
 - b) Philco Investments, Ltd., et al. v. Martin, et al., N.D. Cal, Case No.: 3:10cv2785