

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK**  
2 **DE BLOUW LLP**

3 Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)  
4 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)  
5 Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)  
6 2255 Calle Clara  
7 La Jolla, CA 92037  
8 Telephone: (858)551-1223  
9 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232  
10 Email: [Kyle@bamlawca.com](mailto:Kyle@bamlawca.com)  
11 Website: [www.bamlawca.com](http://www.bamlawca.com)

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN**

ISAAC RODRIGUEZ, MARIA ALVAREZ,  
CECILIO GUZMAN VIVEROS, KATE  
LOPEZ and GILBERTO SERRATOR  
MORENO, individuals, on behalf of  
themselves and on behalf of all persons  
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FEGHALI FOODS, a Corporation; and  
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **BCV-23-100142**

**DECLARATION OF KYLE NORDREHAUG**  
**IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR**  
**PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS**  
**SETTLEMENT**

Hearing Date: May 30, 2024  
Hearing Time: 8:30 a.m.

Judge: Hon. T. Mark Smith  
Dept.: T-2

Action Filed: January 17, 2023  
Trial Date: Not set

1 I, Kyle Nordrehaug, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a partner of the law firm of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP,  
3 counsel for Plaintiffs Rodriguez, Maria Alvarez, Cecilio Guzman Viveros, Kate Lopez, and  
4 Gilberto Serrato Moreno (“Plaintiffs”) in this matter. As such, I am fully familiar with the facts,  
5 pleadings and history of this matter. The following facts are within my own personal knowledge,  
6 and if called as a witness, I could testify competently to the matters stated herein.

7 2. This declaration is being submitted in support of Plaintiffs’ unopposed motion for  
8 preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement with Defendant Feghali Foods  
9 (“Defendant”), which motion seeks entry of an order: (1) preliminarily approving the proposed  
10 settlement of this class action with Defendant; (2) for settlement purposes only, conditionally  
11 certifying the Class, which is comprised of “all individuals who were employed by Defendant in  
12 California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period”; (3)  
13 provisionally appointing Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class; (4) provisionally appointing  
14 Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, Aparajit Bhowmik, Nicholas J. De Blouw, Jeffrey S.  
15 Herman, Sergio J. Puche, and Trevor G. Moran of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw  
16 LLP as Class Counsel; (5) approving the form and method for providing class-wide notice;  
17 (6) directing that notice of the proposed settlement be given to the class; (7) appointing Apex Class  
18 Action as Administrator, and (8) scheduling a final approval hearing date, proposed for October 1,  
19 2024 which is at least 120 days from preliminary approval, to consider Plaintiffs’ motion for final  
20 approval of the settlement and for approval of attorneys’ fees and expenses. Attached hereto as  
21 Exhibit #1 is a copy of the fully executed Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement  
22 (“Agreement”) along with exhibits thereto. The form of the Agreement is based upon the Los  
23 Angeles County Superior Court model form for a class and PAGA settlement. This Declaration  
24 incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms defined therein shall have  
25 the same meaning as set forth in the Agreement.

26  
27  
28

1 Fairness of Settlement

2 3. As consideration for this Settlement, the non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount  
3 of Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$800,000) (the “Gross Settlement Amount”) is to be paid by  
4 Defendant, as set forth in the Agreement. The Gross Settlement Amount will settle all issues  
5 pending in the Action between the Parties and will be made in full and final settlement of the  
6 Released Class Claims in exchange for the payments to Participating Class Members from the Net  
7 Settlement Amount, and includes (a) the costs of administration of the settlement, (b) all attorneys'  
8 fees and costs, (c) Class Representative Service Payments, and (d) the PAGA Penalties payment  
9 allocated 75% to the LWDA and 25% to the Aggrieved Employees. (Agreement at ¶ 1.25.)

10 4. The relief provided in the Settlement will benefit all members of the Class. The  
11 Settlement does not grant preferential treatment to Plaintiffs or segments of the Class in any way.  
12 Payments to the Class Members are all determined under a neutral methodology. Each  
13 Participating Class Member will receive the same opportunity to participate in and receive payment  
14 through a neutral formula that is based upon the Class Workweeks for that individual.

15 5. On February 16, 2024, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation session  
16 presided over Tagore Subramaniam, a respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class  
17 actions. In preparation for the mediation, Defendant provided Class Counsel with redacted payroll,  
18 time and employment data, along with other information regarding the Class Members, various  
19 internal documents, and other compensation and employment-related materials. Class Counsel  
20 analyzed the data with the assistance of damages expert Berger Consulting and prepared and  
21 submitted a mediation brief to the mediator. The final settlement terms were negotiated and set forth  
22 in the Agreement now presented for this Court’s approval. Importantly, Plaintiffs and Class  
23 Counsel believe that this Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate.

24 6. Based upon 1,669 Class Members who worked an estimated 65,000 work weeks  
25 (Agreement at ¶ 4.1), the Gross Settlement Amount provides an average value of \$473 per Class  
26 Member and \$12.30 per workweek and after deductions the Net Settlement Amount provides an  
27 average recovery of \$229.67 per Class Member and a recovery of \$5.89 per workweek. The  
28 calculations to compensate for the amount due for the Class at the time of the mediation were

1 calculated by Berger Consulting, Plaintiffs' damage expert. As to the Class whose claims are at  
2 issue in this Action, Plaintiffs used the expert to analyze the data and determine the potential unpaid  
3 wages for the employees. The maximum potential damages were calculated to be \$121,111 for the  
4 alleged unpaid overtime premium wages, \$1,187,057 for the alleged unpaid wages for off-the-clock  
5 work at 1 hour per workweek, \$2,763 for the alleged unpaid wages due to miscalculation of the  
6 regular rate when paying wages, \$9,183 for the alleged underpayment of meal period premiums and  
7 sick pay, \$199,154 for alleged meal period damages based upon a 10% potential violation rate for  
8 shifts worked and after deducting the meal premiums actually paid by Defendant, \$3,554,307 for  
9 alleged rest period damages based upon a 76.8% potential violation rate for shifts worked observed  
10 in the time records, \$159,235 for alleged unreimbursed business expenses for personal cell phone  
11 usage at \$5 per month. As a result, the total damage valuation was calculated that Defendant was  
12 subject to a maximum damage claim in the amount of \$5,232,810. As to potential penalties,  
13 Plaintiffs calculated that potential waiting time penalties were a maximum of \$3,137,331, and  
14 potential wage statement penalties were a maximum of \$1,406,200.<sup>1</sup> Defendant vigorously disputed  
15 Plaintiffs' calculations and exposure theories. Consequently, the Gross Settlement Amount of  
16 \$800,000 represents more than 15% of the maximum value of the alleged damages at issue in this  
17 case at the time this Settlement was negotiated.<sup>2</sup> The above maximum calculations should then be  
18 adjusted in consideration for both the risk of class certification and the risk of establishing class-  
19 wide liability on all claims. Given the amount of the settlement as compared to the potential value  
20 of claims in this case and the defenses asserted by Defendant, this settlement is fair and reasonable.

---

21  
22 <sup>1</sup> While Plaintiffs alleged claims for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code Sections 203  
23 and 226, at mediation Plaintiffs recognized that these claims were subject to additional, separate  
24 defenses asserted by Defendant, including, a good faith dispute defense as to whether any premium  
25 wages for meal or rest periods or other wages were owed given Defendant's position that Plaintiffs  
26 and Class Members were properly compensated. *See Nordstrom Commission Cases*, 186 Cal. App.  
4th 576, 584 (2010) ("There is no willful failure to pay wages if the employer and employee have a  
good faith dispute as to whether and when the wages were due.").

27 <sup>2</sup> Because the PAGA claim is not a class claim and primarily is paid to the State of California,  
28 Plaintiffs have not included the PAGA claim in this discussion of the value of the class claims. The  
PAGA claim is addressed in the Decl. Nordrehaug at ¶33.

1 Procedural History of the Litigation

2 7. On October 31, 2022, Plaintiff Rodriguez filed with the LWDA and served on  
3 Defendants a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 identifying the alleged Labor Code violations  
4 to recover civil penalties on behalf of Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations.  
5 The PAGA Notice by Plaintiff Rodriguez is attached hereto as Exhibit #3 for the Court's reference.

6 8. On January 17, 2023, Plaintiff Rodriguez filed a class action Complaint against  
7 Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern. This class action  
8 Complaint asserted class claims against Defendants for: (1) unfair competition in violation of Cal.  
9 Bus & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; (2) failure to to pay minimum wages in violation of Cal. Labor  
10 Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1; (3) failure to pay overtime wages in violation of Cal. Labor Code  
11 §§ 510, 1194 & 1198; (4) failure to provide required meal periods in violation of Cal. Labor Code  
12 §§ 226.7 and 512; (5) failure to provide required rest periods in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§  
13 226.7 and 512; (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Cal. Labor  
14 Code § 226; (7) failure to provide requires expense reimbursement in violation of Cal. Labor Code  
15 § 2802; (8) failure to provide wages when due in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203;  
16 and (9) failure to pay sick wages in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 233, 246. On April 4,  
17 2023, Plaintiff Rodriguez filed a dismissal without prejudice of the Class Action, which the Court  
18 ordered that same date.

19 9. On January 17, 2023, Plaintiff Rodriguez filed a separate Representative Action  
20 Complaint against Defendant (the "PAGA Action"). Plaintiff Rodriguez's Representative Action  
21 Complaint asserted one cause of action against Defendant for Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor  
22 Code §§ 2699, et seq. for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, et seq., 210, 218, 221,  
23 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of  
24 Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). As  
25 part of this Settlement, the Parties are stipulating to the filing of a First Amended Class and  
26 Representative Action Complaint in the PAGA Action that: (i) adds all claims and parties originally  
27 filed in the Class Action that was dismissed without prejudice, and (ii) adds Maria Alvarez, Cecilio  
28 Guzman Viveros, Kate Lopez, and Gilberto Serrato Moreno as named Plaintiffs and Class

1 Representatives. The First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint shall be the  
2 operative complaint in the Action (the "Operative Complaint")

3 10. Over the course of litigation, the Parties engaged in the investigation of the claims,  
4 including in formal discovery and the production of documents, class data, and other information,  
5 allowing for the full and complete analysis of liabilities and defenses to the claims in the Action.  
6 The information for mediation obtained by Plaintiffs included: (1) data concerning the class; (2)  
7 redacted payroll data and time punch data for the Class; (3) Defendant's wage and hour policies; (4)  
8 the employment files for the Plaintiffs; and, (5) samples of wage statements provided by Defendant.  
9 As such, Class Counsel received the data and information for the Class, which was sufficient for  
10 Plaintiffs' expert to prepare the valuations of the claims for the Class.

11 11. Class Counsel has extensive experience in litigating wage and hour class actions in  
12 California. The Parties have vigorously litigated the Action since inception. During the course of  
13 litigation, the Parties each performed analysis of the merits and value of the claims. Plaintiffs and  
14 Defendant have engaged in significant informal discovery, research and investigation in connection  
15 with the Action. Class Counsel has thoroughly analyzed the value of the claims during the  
16 prosecution of this Action and utilized an expert to perform an analysis of the data and valuation of  
17 the claims.

18 12. Plaintiffs and Defendant agreed to discuss resolution of the Action through a  
19 mediation. Prior to mediation, the Parties engaged in the above investigation and the exchange of  
20 documents and information in connection with the Action. On February 16, 2024, the Parties  
21 participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Tagore Subramaniam, a respected and  
22 experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. Following the mediation, each side,  
23 represented by its respective counsel, were able to agree to settle the Action based upon a  
24 mediator's proposal which was memorialized in a memorandum of understanding. The Parties then  
25 negotiated the final terms of the settlement as set forth in the Agreement. At all times, the  
26 negotiations were arm's length and contentious.

27 13. Although a settlement has been reached, Defendant denies any liability or  
28

1 wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims alleged in the Action and further denies that, for  
2 any purpose other than settlement, the Action is appropriate for class and/or representative  
3 treatment. Defendant contends, among other things, that it has complied at all times with the  
4 California Labor Code, applicable Wage Order, and all other laws and regulations. Further,  
5 Defendant contends that class certification is inappropriate for any reason other than for settlement.  
6 Plaintiffs contend that Defendant violated California wage and hour laws. Plaintiffs further contend  
7 that the Action is appropriate for class certification on the basis that the claims meet the requisites  
8 for class certification. Without admitting that class certification is proper, Defendant has stipulated  
9 that the above Class may be certified for settlement purposes only. (Agreement at ¶ 2.9.) The  
10 Parties agree that certification for settlement purposes is not an admission that class certification is  
11 proper. Further, the Agreement is not admissible in this or any other proceeding as evidence that  
12 the Class could be certified absent a settlement. Solely for purposes of settling the Action, the  
13 Parties stipulate and agree that the requisites for establishing class certification with respect to the  
14 Class are satisfied.

15       14. Class Counsel has conducted an investigation into the facts of the class action.  
16 Informal discovery was obtained, which included the production of more than a thousand pages of  
17 relevant documents. Class Counsel engaged in a thorough review and analysis of the relevant  
18 documents and data with the assistance of an expert. Accordingly, the agreement to settle did not  
19 occur until Class Counsel possessed sufficient information to make an informed judgment regarding  
20 the likelihood of success on the merits and the results that could be obtained through further  
21 litigation. In addition, Class Counsel previously negotiated settlements with other employers in  
22 actions involving nearly identical issues and analogous defenses. Based on the foregoing data and  
23 their own independent investigation, evaluation and experience, Class Counsel believes that the  
24 settlement with Defendant on the terms set forth in the Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate  
25 and is in the best interest of the Class in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the  
26 risk of significant delay, defenses asserted by Defendant, and potential appellate issues.

1 Settlement Terms and Plan of Allocation

2           15.     The Gross Settlement Amount is Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$800,000).  
3 (Agreement at ¶ 1.25.) Under the Settlement, the Gross Settlement Amount consists of the  
4 following elements: (1) payment of the Individual Class Payments to the Participating Class  
5 Members; (2) Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment; (3)  
6 Administration Expenses Payment; (4) the Class Representative Service Payments to the Plaintiffs;  
7 and (5) the PAGA Penalties payment. (Agreement at ¶ 1.25.) The Gross Settlement Amount does  
8 not include Defendant’s share of payroll taxes. (Agreement at ¶ 3.1.) The Gross Settlement  
9 Amount shall be all-in with no reversion to Defendant. (Agreement at ¶ 3.1.)

10           16.     Within fourteen (14) days of the Effective Date, Defendant shall deposit the  
11 Gross Settlement Amount with the Administrator. (Agreement at ¶ 4.3.) The distribution of  
12 Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members along with the other Court-approved  
13 distributions shall be made by the Administrator within fourteen (14) days after Defendant funds the  
14 Gross Settlement Amount. (Agreement at ¶ 5.1.)

15           17.     The amount remaining in the Gross Settlement Amount after the deduction of  
16 Court-approved amounts for Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Class  
17 Representative Service Payments, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation  
18 Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment (called the “Net Settlement  
19 Amount”) shall be allocated to Class Members as their Individual Class Payments. (Agreement at  
20 ¶¶ 1.31 and 3.2.) From the Net Settlement Amount, the Individual Class Payment for each  
21 Participating Class Member will be calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the  
22 total number of Class Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class  
23 Period, and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member’s Class Workweeks.  
24 (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(e).) Workweeks will initially be based on Defendant’s records, however, Class  
25 Members will have the right to challenge the number of Workweeks.

26           18.     Class Members may choose to opt-out of the Settlement by following the directions  
27 in the Class Notice. (Agreement at ¶ 8.5, Ex. A.) The Class Notice provides that Class Members  
28 shall have sixty (60) days from the date that the Class Notice is mailed to them (the “Response



1 Deadline”) to request exclusion (opt-out) or to submit a written objection. (Agreement at ¶¶ 1.45,  
2 8.5, 8.7.) All Class Members who do not "opt out" will be deemed Participating Class Members  
3 who will be bound by the Settlement and will be entitled to receive an Individual Class Payment.  
4 (Agreement at ¶ 8.5(c).) All Aggrieved Employees, including those who submit an opt-out request,  
5 will still be paid their allocation of the PAGA Penalties and will remain subject to the release of the  
6 Released PAGA Claims regardless of their request for exclusion. (Agreement at ¶¶ 6.3 and 8.5(d).)  
7 Finally, the Class Notice advises the Class Members of their right to object to the Settlement and/or  
8 dispute their Workweeks. (Agreement at ¶¶ 8.6 and 8.7, Ex. A.)

9         19. A Participating Class Member must cash his or her Individual Class Payment check  
10 within 180 days after it is mailed. (Agreement at ¶ 5.2.) Any settlement checks not cashed within  
11 180 days will be voided and any funds represented by such checks sent to a Court-approved  
12 nonprofit organization or foundation consistent with Code of Civil Procedure Section 384(b) ("Cy  
13 Pres Recipient"). The Parties have agreed on the Court Appointed Special Advocates of Kern  
14 County as the Cy Pres Recipient, subject to Court approval. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense  
15 Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the  
16 intended Cy Pres Recipient. (Agreement at ¶ 5.4.)

17         20. Subject to Court approval, the Parties have agreed on Apex Class Action to  
18 administer the settlement in this action (“Administrator”). (Agreement at ¶ 1.2.) The Administrator  
19 will be paid for settlement administration in an amount not to exceed \$20,000. (Agreement at ¶  
20 3.2(c).) Apex Class Action provided an estimate of \$18,400 for administration expenses.

21         21. Subject to Court approval, the Agreement provides for Class Counsel to be awarded  
22 a sum not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, as the Class Counsel Fees Payment.  
23 (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(b).) Class Counsel will also be allowed to apply separately for an award of  
24 Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment in an amount not to exceed \$30,000. (Agreement at ¶  
25 3.2(b).) Subject to Court approval, the Agreement provides for a payment of no more than \$10,000  
26 each to the Plaintiffs as the Class Representative Service Payments. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(a).)

27         22. Subject to Court approval, the PAGA Penalties will be paid from the Gross  
28

1 Settlement Amount for PAGA penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act, Cal.  
2 Labor Code Section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"). The PAGA Penalties are \$50,000. (Agreement at ¶  
3 3.2(d).) Pursuant to the express requirements of Labor Code § 2699(i), the PAGA Payment shall be  
4 allocated as follows: 75% shall be allocated to the Labor Workforce Development Agency  
5 ("LWDA") as its share of the civil penalties and 25% allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments to  
6 be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees based on the number of their respective PAGA Pay  
7 Periods. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(d).) As set forth in the accompanying proof of service, the LWDA has  
8 been served with this motion and the Agreement.

9  
10 Risks of Continued Litigation and Standards for Approval

11 23. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of continuing to  
12 litigate and trying this Action against Defendant through possible appeals which could take several  
13 years. Class Counsel has also taken into account the uncertain outcome and risk of litigation,  
14 especially in complex class actions such as this Action. Class Counsel is also mindful of and  
15 recognize the inherent problems of proof under, and alleged defenses to, the claims asserted in the  
16 Action. Based upon their evaluation, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have determined that the  
17 Settlement set forth in the Agreement is in the best interest of the Class Members.

18 24. Here, a number of defenses asserted by Defendant present serious threats to the  
19 claims of the Plaintiffs and the other Class Members. Defendant asserted that Defendant's practices  
20 complied with all applicable Labor laws. Defendant argued that Class Members were properly paid  
21 for all time worked and that all work time was properly recorded. Defendant maintained there was  
22 no miscalculation of the regular rate when paying wages to the Plaintiffs and the Class. Defendant  
23 contends that its meal and rest period policies fully complied with California law and Defendant did  
24 not fail to provide the opportunity for legally required meal and rest breaks. Defendant could argue  
25 that its payment of meal period premiums is evidence of its lawful practices. Defendant contend  
26 that there was no failure to pay for business expenses and any cell phone usage was merely  
27 convenient and voluntary such that reimbursement was not legally required. Finally, Defendant  
28 could argue that the Supreme Court decision in *Brinker v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012)

1 and the existence of arbitration agreements, weakened Plaintiffs' claims, on liability, class-wide  
2 damages, and class certifiability. Defendant also argues that based on its facially lawful practices,  
3 Defendant acted in good faith and without willfulness, which if accepted would negate the claims  
4 for waiting time penalties and/or inaccurate wage statements. If successful, Defendant's defenses  
5 could eliminate or substantially reduce any recovery to the Class. While Plaintiffs believe that  
6 these defenses could be overcome, Defendant maintains these defenses have merit and therefore  
7 present a serious risk to recovery by the Class.

8         25. There was also a significant risk that, if the Action was not settled, Plaintiffs would  
9 be unable to obtain a certified class and maintain the certified class through trial, and thereby not  
10 recover on behalf of any employees other than themselves. At the time of the mediation, Defendant  
11 forcefully opposed the propriety of class certification, arguing that individual issues precluded class  
12 certification. Defendant contended that the existence of arbitration agreements with class waivers  
13 could be a threat to class certification and/or the recovery of class-wide damages. Further, as  
14 demonstrated by the California Supreme Court decision in *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.*, 59  
15 Cal. 4th 1 (2014), there are significant hurdles to overcome for a class-wide recovery even where  
16 the class has been certified. While other cases have approved class certification in wage and hour  
17 claims, class certification in this action was hotly disputed and the maintenance of a certified class  
18 through trial was by no means a foregone conclusion.

19         26. This settlement is therefore certainly entitled to preliminary approval. Were this  
20 case to go to trial, the Plaintiffs and the other class members would need to prove, among other  
21 things, that wages were owed on a class-wide basis. This was and is a substantial risk.

22         27. Plaintiffs will apply to the Court for Class Representative Service Payments in  
23 consideration for their service and for the risks undertaken on behalf of the Class. (Agreement at ¶  
24 3.2(a).) Plaintiffs performed their duties admirably by working with Class Counsel over the course  
25 of the litigation. The Declaration of the Plaintiffs are submitted herewith in support. At this stage,  
26 the requested service award is within the accepted range of awards for purposes of preliminary  
27 approval. See e.g. *Andrews v. Plains All Am. Pipeline L.P.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172183, at \*11  
28 (C.D. Cal. 2022) (finding that the requested service awards of \$15,000 each are appropriate);

1 *Reynolds v. Direct Flow Med., Inc.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149865, at \*19 (N.D. Cal. 2019)  
2 (granting request for \$12,500 service award); *Mathein v. Pier 1 Imps. (U.S.), Inc.*, 2018 U.S. Dist.  
3 LEXIS 71386 (E.D. Cal. 2018) (awarding \$12,500 where average class member payment was  
4 \$351); *Louie v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.*, 2008 WL 4473183, \*7 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 06,  
5 2008) (awarding \$25,000 service award to each of six plaintiffs in overtime class action); *Glass v.*  
6 *UBS Fin. Servs.*, 2007 WL 221862, \*16-17 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (awarding \$25,000 service award in  
7 overtime class action and a pool of \$100,000 in enhancements ).

8         28.       The stage of the proceedings at which this Settlement was reached also militates in  
9 favor of preliminary approval and ultimately, final approval of the Settlement. Class Counsel has  
10 conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of the class action. Class Counsel began  
11 investigating the Class Members' claims before the Action were filed, and during the course of  
12 litigation, Class Counsel and engaged in informal discovery to obtain necessary information. Class  
13 Counsel conducted a review and analysis of the relevant documents and data. Class Counsel was  
14 also experienced with these claims, as Class Counsel previously litigated and settled similar claims  
15 in other actions. Accordingly, the agreement to settle did not occur until Class Counsel possessed  
16 sufficient information to make an informed judgment regarding the likelihood of success on the  
17 merits and the results that could be obtained through further litigation.

18         29.       Based on the foregoing data and their own independent investigation and evaluation,  
19 Class Counsel is of the opinion that the Settlement with Defendant for the consideration and on the  
20 terms set forth in the Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interest of the  
21 Class in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant delay, defenses  
22 asserted by Defendant, and numerous potential appellate issues. There can be no doubt that  
23 Counsel for both parties possessed sufficient information to make an informed judgment regarding  
24 the likelihood of success on the merits and the results that could be obtained through further  
25 litigation.

1 Class Certification Issues

2 30. Plaintiffs contend that the proposed settlement meet all of the requirements for class  
3 certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 as demonstrated below, and therefore,  
4 the Court may appropriately approve the Class as defined in the Agreement. This Court should  
5 conditionally certify the Class for settlement purposes only, defined as follows:

6 All individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a  
7 non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.

8 (Agreement at ¶ 1.5.)

9 The Class Period is from February 16, 2020 through the date of preliminary approval. (Agreement  
10 at ¶ 1.13).

11 a. **Numerosity** - Here, Plaintiffs assert that the 1,669 current and former  
12 employees that comprise the Class can be identified based on Defendant's records and are  
13 sufficiently numerous for class certification.

14 b. **Common Issues Predominate** - Here, Plaintiffs contend that common  
15 questions of law and fact are present, specifically the common questions of whether Defendant's  
16 employment practices were lawful, whether Defendant failed to provide meal and rest periods to  
17 Class Members, whether Class members were lawfully compensated for all hours worked, whether  
18 Defendant miscalculated the regular rate when paying Class Member overtime, meal period  
19 premiums and/or sick pay, whether Defendant failed to provide required expense reimbursement,  
20 and whether Class Members are entitled to damages and penalties as a result of these practices.  
21 Plaintiffs contend that certification of this Class is appropriate because Defendant allegedly  
22 engaged in uniform practices with respect to the Class Members. As a result, these common  
23 questions of liability could be answered on a class wide basis.

24 c. **Typicality** - In this Action, Plaintiffs contend that the typicality requirement  
25 is fully satisfied. Plaintiffs, like every other member of the Class, were employed by Defendant as  
26 non-exempt employees, and, like every other member of the Class, were subject to the same  
27 employment practices. Plaintiffs, like every other member of the Class, also claim owed  
28 compensation as a result of the Defendant's uniform company policies and practices. Thus, the

1 claims of Plaintiffs and the members of the Class arise from the same course of conduct by  
2 Defendant, involve the same issues, and are based on the same legal theories.

3 d. **Adequacy** - Plaintiffs contend that the Class Members are adequately  
4 represented here because Plaintiffs and representing counsel (a) do not have any conflicts of interest  
5 with other class members, and (b) will prosecute the case vigorously on behalf of the class. This  
6 requirement is met here. First, Plaintiffs are well aware of their duties as the representatives of the  
7 Class and have actively participated in the prosecution of this case to date. Plaintiffs effectively  
8 communicated with Class Counsel, provided documents and information to Class Counsel, and  
9 participated in the investigation and resolution of the Action. The personal involvement of the  
10 Plaintiffs was essential to the prosecution of the Action and the monetary settlement reached.  
11 Second, Plaintiffs retained competent counsel who are experienced in employment class actions and  
12 who have no conflicts. Third, there is no antagonism between the interests of the Plaintiffs and  
13 those of the Class. Both the Plaintiffs and the Class Members seek monetary relief under the same  
14 set of facts and legal theories.

15 31. Class Counsel's Adequacy of Representation and Absence of Conflict: Blumenthal  
16 Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP is experienced in prosecuting class action lawsuits and can  
17 competently represent the Class. Other lawyers at my firm and I have extensive class litigation  
18 experience. We have handled a number of class actions and complex cases and have acted both as  
19 counsel and as lead and co-lead counsel in a variety of these matters. We have successfully  
20 prosecuted and obtained significant recoveries in numerous class action lawsuits and other lawsuits  
21 involving complex issues of law and fact. My firm is particularly experienced in wage and hour  
22 employment law class actions, including claims for misclassification, overtime, expense  
23 reimbursement, unlawful deduction of wages, and missed rest and meal periods. Blumenthal  
24 Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP has been involved as class counsel in over hundreds of wage  
25 and hour class actions. Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP has been found to be  
26 adequate counsel by the courts throughout California. We have been approved as experienced class  
27 counsel by both state and federal courts in California in contested class certification proceedings. A  
28 true and correct copy of the resume of my firm is attached hereto as Exhibit #2. The Class in this

1 settlement is defined as “all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and  
2 classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.” I have reviewed my  
3 firm’s cases and representation of other plaintiffs and there is no conflict or representation which  
4 would prevent my firm from representing the interests of the Class this case. My firm only  
5 represents employees, and not employers. My firm has never represented Defendant nor any  
6 affiliate of the Defendant. My firm’s only interest in the subject matter of this litigation is to ensure  
7 a recovery to the Class and to maximize that recovery. Finally, our allegiance to the Class and the  
8 claims of the Class is not inconsistent with our allegiance to pursue the claims on behalf of other  
9 employees and classes as the claims are all against different and distinct employers. I can think of  
10 no conflict that would arise in our representation of the Class and our adequate representation of the  
11 Class is evidenced by the successful prosecution of the class claims to reach an excellent recovery  
12 for the Class. Moreover, neither the Plaintiffs nor Class Counsel have any affiliation with the  
13 proposed Administrator for this settlement. Thus, the adequacy requirement for my firm is  
14 satisfied.

15           32. The Class Notice, drafted jointly and agreed upon by the Parties through their  
16 respective counsel and to be approved by the Court, includes all relevant information. (*See Exhibit*  
17 *“A” to the Agreement.*) In accordance with the Agreement, Defendant will provide to the  
18 Administrator a confidential electronic spreadsheet containing the Class Data. (Agreement at ¶  
19 4.2.) Within 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will mail the Class Notice to  
20 all Class Members via first-class U.S. Mail using the most current mailing address information  
21 available. (Agreement at ¶ 8.4(b).) The Class Notice Packet shall include a Spanish translation.  
22 (Agreement at ¶ 1.11.) The Class Notice will include, among other information: (i) information  
23 regarding the Action; (ii) the impact on the rights of the Class Members if they do not opt out,  
24 including a description of the applicable release; (iii) information to the Class Members regarding  
25 how to opt out and how to object to the Settlement; (iv) the estimated Individual Class Payment for  
26 each of the Class Members; (v) the amount of attorneys’ fees and expenses to be sought; (vi) the  
27 amount of the Plaintiffs’ service award request; and (vii) the anticipated expenses of the  
28 Administrator. The Class Notice will state that the Class Members shall have forty-five (45) days

1 from the date that the Class Notice is mailed to them (the “Response Deadline”) to request  
2 exclusion (opt-out) or to submit a written objection. (Agreement at ¶¶ 1.45, 8.5, 8.7.) Class  
3 Members shall be given the opportunity to object to the Settlement and the request for attorneys’  
4 fees and expenses, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing. (Agreement at ¶ 8.7.) Class  
5 Members who do not submit a timely and proper request to opt-out will automatically receive a  
6 payment of their Individual Class Payment. This notice program was designed to meaningfully  
7 reach the Class Members and it advises them of all pertinent information concerning the Settlement.  
8

9 33. The PAGA Claim -

10 a. **Approval of PAGA Settlements.** The decision in *O'Connor v. Uber*, 201  
11 F.Supp.3d 1110, 1133 (N.D. Cal. 2016), and the LWDA's Response therein is illustrative. The  
12 LWDA first states that "when viewing the monetary relief allocated to PAGA claims under a  
13 settlement, the LWDA recognizes that the PAGA sum need not necessarily be viewed through the  
14 same lens as the relief obtained by absent class members on other claims (i.e., the percentage of  
15 recovery-to-exposure on the PAGA claims need not necessarily equal the percentage of recovery on  
16 the other claims)." (LWDA Response at p.3). The LWDA also indicated that the payment of  
17 money to the aggrieved employees furthers the purposes of PAGA and that the Court considers that  
18 primary consideration. "The LWDA recognizes that this Court does not review the PAGA  
19 allocation in isolation, but rather reviews the settlement as a whole, to determine whether it is  
20 fundamentally fair, reasonable and adequate, with primary consideration for the interests of absent  
21 class members." (LWDA Response at p.4).

22 b. **Valuation of the PAGA Claim.** For mediation, Plaintiff calculated the  
23 value of the alleged PAGA claim as to Aggrieved Employees for civil penalties to be between  
24 \$973,600 and \$1,947,200 for a single violation in every one of the 19,472 pay periods at issue in the  
25 PAGA Period, depending on whether the violation was \$50 per pay period as in the case of Labor  
26 Code § 558(a)(1) or the standard amount of \$100 per pay period for violation of Labor Code §  
27 1198. This valuation assumed that PAGA civil penalties would be awarded at the maximum rate  
28



1 per pay period but without stacking.<sup>3</sup> The PAGA allocation in the Settlement is the amount of  
2 \$50,000. This allocation is justified by several important considerations. First, the PAGA claim  
3 was subject to the same risks as the underlying class claims. Second, Defendant asserted additional  
4 defenses to the PAGA claim, not only as to liability but also as to the amount of the penalties.  
5 Importantly, Defendant argued that as a non-profit hospital, significant PAGA penalties would be  
6 unlikely and would be reduced under such particular “circumstances” under Cal. Labor Code  
7 §2699(e)(2) and/or “would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or  
8 confiscatory” under Cal. Labor Code §2699(e)(2). Defendant could also argue that no penalties  
9 prior to the PAGA notification should be awarded, and I am aware of one Court which has so ruled.  
10 These additional defenses present a risk to the PAGA claim and the potential that some or all of the  
11 PAGA penalties sought may not be awarded. Third, in *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*, 30 Cal. App.  
12 5th 504 (2018), the court affirmed a judgment which only provided for a PAGA penalty of \$5 per  
13 violation. Therefore, at trial, any PAGA penalties awarded could be significantly less than  
14 Plaintiffs’ calculation even where Plaintiff prevailed on the PAGA claim. Even if we assume that  
15 violations for all 19,472 pay periods were established, using the valuation from *Carrington* results  
16 in a potential recovery of only \$97,360 under PAGA. This means that the PAGA allocation in the  
17 Agreement is a reasonable percentage of this potential PAGA recovery. Fourth, the interests of  
18 PAGA are also served by the Class recovery under the reasoning of the LWDA in *O’Connor v.*  
19 *Uber*.

20 c. **Comparable PAGA Settlements.** In reaching the settlement of the PAGA  
21 claim, Class Counsel was also aware of what allocations other Courts have approved for similar  
22 PAGA settlements as compared to the total settlement amount. A class settlement that allocates  
23 approximately 6% of the total settlement value to resolve the PAGA claims applicable to the class  
24 is also supported by what has been approved in other wage-and-hour class settlements. Indeed,

---

25  
26 <sup>3</sup> Stacking is where more than one civil penalty is imposed in a pay period for the same conduct.  
27 The valuation of between \$973,600 and \$1,947,200 is the civil penalty amount without stacking. If  
28 stacking is permitted, then the valuation increases with each additional penalty added to each pay  
period. Plaintiff, however, is not aware of any PAGA award which permitted stacking and in the  
cases cited herein, only one penalty per pay period was assessed.

1 Courts typically approve PAGA settlement amounts in the range of between 0.27 to 2 percent of the  
2 total settlement. See *Davis v. Brown Shoe Co.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149010 (E.D. Cal. 2015)  
3 (PAGA Payment of \$5,000 in a \$1.5 million class settlement); *Zamora v. Ryder Integrated*  
4 *Logistics, Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 184096 (S.D. Cal. 2014) (\$7,500 payment to LWDA for  
5 PAGA on a \$1.5 million class settlement); *Lusby v. Gamestop Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42637  
6 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (PAGA Payment of \$5,000 in a \$500,000 class settlement); *Cruz v. Sky Chefs,*  
7 *Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist Lexis 17693 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (approving payment of \$10,000 to the LWDA  
8 for PAGA out of \$1,750,000 class settlement); *Chu v. Wells Fargo Investments, LLC*, 2011 WL  
9 672645, \*1 (N.D. Cal. 2011) (approving PAGA payment of \$7,500 to the LWDA out of \$6.9  
10 million common-fund settlement); *Franco v. Ruiz Food Products, Inc.*, 2012 WL 5941801, \*13  
11 (E.D. Cal. 2012) (approving PAGA payment of \$7,500 to the LWDA out of \$2.5 million  
12 common-fund settlement); *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.*, 2009 WL 928133, \*9 (N.D. Cal. 2009)  
13 (approving PAGA allocation that was .49% of \$408,420.32 gross settlement); *Garcia v. Gordon*  
14 *Trucking, Inc.*, 10-cv-00324-AWI-SKO, Dkt. 149-3, 165 (E.D. Cal.) (approving a class settlement  
15 of \$3,700,000, with \$10,000 allocated to the PAGA claim); *McKenzie v. Federal Express Corp.*,  
16 CV 10-02420 GAF (PLAx), Dkt. 139 & 141 (C.D. Cal.) (court approved a settlement in an amount  
17 of \$8.25 million, with \$82,500 allotted to the PAGA claim); *DeStefan v Frito-Lay,*  
18 8:10-cv-00112-DOC (C.D. Cal.) (court approved a class settlement of \$2 million, with \$10,000  
19 allocated to PAGA); *Martino v. Ecolab Inc.*, No. 3:14CV04358 (N.D. Cal. 2017) (\$100,000 allotted  
20 as PAGA penalties or 0.48% of \$21,000,000 settlement amount); *East v. Comprehensive*  
21 *Educational Services Inc.*, Fresno Superior Court Case No. 11-CECG-04226 (2015) (\$10,000  
22 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.13% of \$7,595,846 settlement amount); *Bararsani v. Coldwell*  
23 *Banker Residential Brokerage Company*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC495767 (2016)  
24 (\$10,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.22% of \$4,500,000 settlement amount); *Moppin v. Los*  
25 *Robles Medical Center*, No. 5:15CV01551 (C.D. Cal. 2017) (\$15,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or  
26 0.40% of \$3,775,000 settlement amount); *Scott-George v. PVH Corporation*. No., 2:13CV00441  
27 (E.D. Cal. 2017) (\$15,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.46% of \$3,250,000 settlement amount);  
28 *Nehrlich v. RPM Mortgage Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No.

1 30-2013-00666783-CU-OE-CXC (2017) (\$10,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.40% of  
2 \$2,500,000 settlement amount); *Rubio v. KTI Incorporated*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case  
3 No. CIVDS-14-06132 (2015) (\$1,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.18% of \$550,000 settlement  
4 amount); *Gray v. Mountain View Child Care Inc.*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No.  
5 CIVDS-14-02285 (2016) (\$2,500 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.37% of \$675,000 settlement  
6 amount); *Perez v. West Coast Liquidators Inc. d/b/a Big Lots*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case  
7 No. CIVDS-14-17863 (2016) (\$3,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.33% of \$900,000 settlement  
8 amount); *Penaloza vs. PPG Industries Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC471369 (2013)  
9 (\$5,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.38% of \$1,300,000 settlement amount); *Mejia v. DHL*  
10 *Express (USA) Inc.*, No. 2:15CV00890 (C.D. Cal. 2017) (\$5,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or  
11 0.34% of \$1,450,000 settlement amount).

12  
13 34. Attorneys' Fees - The Class Counsel Fees Payment is capped at one-third of the  
14 Gross Settlement Amount. A fee award that is capped at one-third of the common fund is fair and  
15 reasonable, and at the time of final approval, my firm will present lodestar to further support the  
16 reasonableness of the requested fee award. My firm has been regularly awarded attorney's fees  
17 equal to one-third of the common fund in Court-approved wage and hour class settlements. Some  
18 of the class action awards obtained by Class Counsel in similar employment actions throughout the  
19 state bear out the reasonableness of a fee and costs award equivalent to one-third (1/3) of the total  
20 settlement value: On December 4, 2018, in *Panda Express Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles  
21 Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4919) Judge Carolyn Kuhl awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee  
22 award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 1, 2019, in *Solarcity Wage and Hour*  
23 *Cases* (San Mateo Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4945) Judge Marie Weiner awarded Class  
24 Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On July 30, 2019, in *Erickson v.*  
25 *John Muir Health*, (Contra Costa Superior Court Case No. MSC18-00307) Judge Edward Weil  
26 awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On December  
27 18, 2019, in *Velasco v. Lemonade Restaurant Group*, (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No.  
28 BC672235) Judge William Highberger awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and

1 hour class settlement. On January 31, 2020, in *El Pollo Loco Wage and Hour Cases* (Orange  
2 County Superior Court Case No. JCCP 4957) Judge William Claster awarded Class Counsel a one-  
3 third award in a wage and hour class settlement. On December 3, 2020, in *Blackshear v. California*  
4 *Fine Wine & Spirits* (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2018-00245842) Judge Christopher  
5 Krueger awarded BNBD a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On June 2,  
6 2021, in *Pacia v. CIM Group, L.P.* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC709666), Judge Amy  
7 D. Hogue awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On  
8 November 8, 2021, in *Securitas Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No.  
9 JCCP4837) Judge David Cunningham awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class  
10 settlement. On March 17, 2022, in *See's Candies Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles Superior  
11 Court Case No. JCCP5004) Judge Maren Nelson awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour  
12 class action settlement. On April 12, 2022, in *O'Donnell v. Okta, Inc.*, (San Francisco Superior  
13 Court Case No. CGC-20-587665) Judge Richard Ulmer awarded a one-third fee award in a wage  
14 and hour class action settlement. On June 30, 2022, in *Armstrong, et al. v. Prometric LLC* (Los  
15 Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV29967), Judge Maren E. Nelson awarded a one-third fee  
16 award in a wage and hour class action. On July 13, 2022, in *Crum v. S&D Carwash Management*  
17 *LLC*, (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 2019-00251338), Judge Christopher E. Krueger  
18 awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On August 10, 2022, in  
19 *Spears, et al. v. Health Net of California, Inc.*, (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2017-  
20 00210560-CU-OE-GDS), Judge Christopher E. Krueger awarded a one-third fee award in a wage  
21 and hour class action settlement. On September 7, 2022, in *Lucchese, et al. v. Kone, Inc.*, (San  
22 Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-20-588225), Judge Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. awarded a one-  
23 third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On November 4, 2022, in *Infinity Energy*  
24 *Wage and Hour Cases* (San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP5139), Judge Keri Katz awarded  
25 a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On February 1, 2023, in *Hogan v.*  
26 *AECOM Technical Services, Inc.* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV40072), Judge  
27 Stuart Rice awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 28,  
28 2023, in *Farthing v. Milestone Technologies* (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-

1 591251), Judge Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class  
2 action settlement. On March 2, 2023, in *Leon v. Calaveras Materials* (Kings County Superior  
3 Court Case No. 21C-0105), Judge Melissa D’Morias awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and  
4 hour class settlement. On June 20, 2023, in *Gonzalez v. Pacific Western Bank* (San Bernardino  
5 County Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2127657) Judge David Cohn awarded a one-third fee  
6 award in a wage and hour class settlement, On June 30, 2023, in *Aguirre v. Headlands Ventures*  
7 (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2021-00297290), Judge Jill Talley approved a  
8 one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On August 5, 2023, in *Correia v. Gallo*  
9 *Glass Company* (Stanislaus County Superior Court Case No. CV-21-006459) Judge Sonny Sandhu  
10 approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On September 15, 2023, in  
11 *Moran v. Sharp Healthcare* (San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2019-00050203), Judge  
12 Richard Whitney awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On October  
13 10, 2023, in *Arango v. Schlumberger Technology*, (Orange County Case No.  
14 30-2019-01056839-CU- OE-CXC), Judge William Claster approved a one-third fee award in a  
15 wage and hour class action. On October 16, 2023, in *Flores v. Walmart*, (San Bernardino County  
16 Superior Court Case No. CIVDS2023061) Judge Joseph T. Ortiz awarded a one-third fee award in a  
17 wage and hour class settlement. On October 20, 2023, in *Pond v. Glen Ivy Hot Springs* (Riverside  
18 County Superior Court Case No. CVRI2104986), Judge Harold W. Hopp awarded a one-third fee  
19 award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 17, 2023, in *Silva v. Woodward HRT*  
20 (Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 21STCV42692), Judge Maren Nelson awarded a  
21 one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 20, 2023, in *Steele v.*  
22 *Legoland California* (San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2021-00052868), Judge  
23 Carolyn M. Caietti awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On  
24 November 29, 2023, in *Ochoa-Andrade v. See’s Candies* (San Mateo County Superior Court Case  
25 no. 22-CIV-02481), Judge Marie Weiner approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class  
26 settlement. A fee award equal to one-third of the common fund is therefore reasonable in light of  
27 the fees that have been awarded in other similar cases.

28

1           35.     Class Representative Service Payments - The reasonableness of the requested service  
2 award is also established by reference to the amounts that other California courts have found to be  
3 reasonable in wage and hour class action settlements: *Zamora v. Balboa Life & Casualty, LLC*,  
4 Case No. BC360036, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Mar. 7, 2013)(awarding \$25,000 service  
5 award); *Aguiar v. Cingular Wireless, LLC*, Case No. CV 06-8197 DDP (AJWx)(C.D. Cal. Mar. 17,  
6 2011)(awarding \$14,767 service award); *Magee v. American Residential Services, LLC*, Case No.  
7 BC423798, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Apr. 21, 2011)(awarding \$15,000 service award);  
8 *Mares v. BFS Retail & Commercial Operations, LLC*, Case No. BC375967, Los Angeles County  
9 Superior Court (June 24, 2010)(awarding \$15,000 service award); *Baker v. L.A. Fitness Int'l, LLC*,  
10 Case No. BC438654, L.A. County Superior Court (Dec. 12, 2012)(awarding \$10,000 service  
11 awards to three named plaintiffs); *Blue v. Coldwell banker Residential Brokerage Co.*, Case No.  
12 BC417335, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Mar. 21, 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award);  
13 *Buckmire v. Jo-Ann Stores, Inc.*, Case No. BC394795, Los Angeles County Superior Court (June,  
14 11, 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service awards); *Coleman v. Estes Express Lines, Inc.*, Case No.  
15 BC429042, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Oct. 3, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award);  
16 *Ethridge v. Universal Health Services, Inc.*, Case No. BC391958, Los Angeles County Superior  
17 Court (May 27, 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Hickson v. South Coast Auto Ins.*  
18 *Marketing, Inc.*, Case No. BC390395, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Mar. 27,  
19 2012)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Hill v. sunglass Hut Int'l, Inc.*, Case No. BC422934, Los  
20 Angeles County Superior Court (July 2, 2012)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Kambamba v.*  
21 *Victoria's Secret Stores, LLC*, Case No. BC368528, Los Angeles County Superior Court, (Aug. 19,  
22 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award together with additional compensation for their general  
23 release); *Nevarez v. Trader Joe's Co.*, Case No. BC373910, Los Angeles County Superior Court  
24 (Jan. 29, 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Ordaz v. Rose Hills Mortuary, L.P.*, Case No.  
25 BC386500, Los Angeles County Superior Court, (Mar. 19, 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service award);  
26 *Sheldon v. AHMC Monterey Park Hosp. LP*, Case No. BC440282, Los Angeles County Superior  
27 Court (Feb. 22, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Silva v. Catholic Mortuary Services, Inc.*,  
28 Case No. BC408054, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Feb. 8, 2011)(awarding \$10,000

1 enhancement award); *Weisbarth v. Banc West Investment Services, Inc.*, Case No. BC422202, Los  
2 Angeles County Superior Court (May 24, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Lazar v. Kaiser*  
3 *Foundation Health Plan*, Case No. 14-cv-273289, Santa Clara County Superior Court (Dec. 28,  
4 2015) (awarding \$10,000 service award); *Acheson v. Express, LLC*, Case No. 109CV135335, Santa  
5 Clara County Superior Court (Sept. 13, 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Bejarano v.*  
6 *Amerisave Mortgage Corp.*, Case No. EDCV 08-00599 SGL (Opx)(C.D. Cal. June 22,  
7 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Carbajal v. Sally Beauty Supply LLC*, Case No. CIVVS  
8 1004307, San Bernardino County Superior Court (Aug. 6, 2012)(awarding \$10,000 service award);  
9 *Contreras v. Serco Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-04526-CAS-JEMx (C.D. Cal. Sep. 10, 2012)(awarding  
10 \$10,000 service award); *Guerro v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co.*, Case No. RIC 10005196, Riverside  
11 County Superior Court (July 16, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Kisliuk v. ADT Security*  
12 *Services Inc.*, Case No. CV08-03241 DSF (RZx)(C.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2011)(awarding \$10,000  
13 service award); *Morales v. BCBG Maxazria Int'l Holdings, Inc.*, Case No. JCCP 4582, Orange  
14 County Superior Court (Jan. 24, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Barrett v. Doyon Security*  
15 *Services, LLC*, Case No. BS900199, BS900517, San Bernardino County Superior Court (Apr. 23,  
16 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Zirpolo v. UAG Stevens Creek II*, Santa Clara Superior  
17 Court Case no. 17CV313457 (July 10, 2018) (awarding \$10,000 service award); *Taylor v. TIC - The*  
18 *Industrial Company*, U.S.D.C. Central District of California Case No. EDCV 16-186-VAP (Aug. 1,  
19 2018) (awarding \$10,000 service award).

20  
21 36. Potentially Related Other Actions - Besides this Action, I not aware of any other  
22 pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement.  
23 (Agreement at ¶ 2.10.)

24  
25 37. Administration - After seeking bids from qualified administrators, the estimate from  
26 Apex Class Action is was selected, as it provided for an estimate of \$18,400 to perform the  
27 settlement administration for a Class of up to 1,835, with any difference between the actual  
28 expenses and the budget of \$20,000 to be retained in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to

1 the Class. I have used Apex Class Action successfully as the administrator in more than ten class  
2 settlements in the last couple years and know them to be competent and experienced. My firm has  
3 no relationship or connection with Apex Class Action, and thus no conflict of interest exists.  
4 Attached hereto as Exhibit #4 is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of Sean Hartranft from  
5 Apex Class Action which includes the estimate for administration from Apex Class Action for this  
6 matter.

7

8 Service on the LWDA:

9 38. At the same time as the filing and service of this declaration, I am also serving the  
10 LWDA with the entire motion for preliminary approval which includes the Class Action and PAGA  
11 Settlement Agreement. This service is verified by the accompanying proof of service.

12

13 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing  
14 is true and correct. Executed this 1st day of May, 2024, at La Jolla, California.

15

16 By: /s/ Kyle Nordrehaug  
17 Kyle R. Nordrehaug, Esq.  
18 Attorney for Plaintiffs

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



**EXHIBIT #1**

## CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) is made by and between plaintiffs Isaac Rodriguez, Maria Alvarez, Cecilio Guzman Viveros, Kate Lopez, and Gilberto Serrato Moreno (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) and defendant Feghali Foods, (“Defendant”). The Agreement refers to Plaintiffs and Defendant collectively as the “Parties,” or individually as “Party.”

This Settlement Agreement is subject to the approval of the Court, pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(c), (d) and (e), and is made for the sole purpose of attempting to consummate settlement of the Action on a class-wide basis subject to the following terms and conditions. As detailed below, in the event the Court does not enter an order granting final approval of the Class Settlement, as defined below, or the conditions precedent are not met for any reason, this Agreement is void and of no force or effect whatsoever.

### 1. DEFINITIONS

In addition to other terms defined in this Agreement, the terms below have the following meaning in this Agreement:

- 1.1. “Action” collectively means the Plaintiff’s lawsuits alleging wage and hour violations against Defendant captioned: (1) *Isaac Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods*, Case No. BCV-23-100142, initiated on January 17, 2023 and pending in Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern; (2) *Isaac Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods*, Case No. BCV-23-100130 initiated on January 17, 2023 in Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern, and subsequently dismissed, without prejudice, on April 4, 2023.
- 1.2. “Administrator” means Apex Class Action, the neutral entity the Parties have agreed to appoint to administer the Settlement.
- 1.3. “Administration Expenses Payment” means the amount the Administrator will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount to reimburse its reasonable fees and expenses in accordance with the Administrator’s “not to exceed” bid submitted to the Court in connection with Preliminary Approval.
- 1.4. “Aggrieved Employees” means all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period.
- 1.5. “Class” means all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.
- 1.6. “Class Counsel” means Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, Aparajit

Bhowmik, Nicholas J. De Blouw, Jeffrey S. Herman, Sergio J. Puche, and Trevor G. Moran of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP.

- 1.7. “Class Counsel Fees Payment” and “Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment” mean the amounts to be paid to Class Counsel for fees and expenses, respectively, as approved by the Court, to compensate Class Counsel for their legal work in connection with the Action, including their pre-filing investigation, their filing of the Action, all related litigation activities, all Settlement work, all post-Settlement compliance procedures, and related litigation expenses billed in connection with the Action.
- 1.8. “Class Data” means Class Member identifying information in Defendant’s possession including the Class Member’s name, last-known mailing address, Social Security number, email address (if known and available to Defendant), and number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods.
- 1.9. “Class Member” means a member of the Class, as either a Participating Class Member or Non-Participating Class Member (including a Non- Participating Class Member who qualifies as an Aggrieved Employee).
- 1.10. “Class Member Address Search” means the Administrator’s investigation and search for current Class Member mailing addresses using all reasonably available sources, methods and means including, but not limited to, the National Change of Address database, skip traces, and direct contact by the Administrator with Class Members by use of available email addresses, phone numbers, social security numbers, credit reports, LinkedIn and Facebook.
- 1.11. “Class Notice” means the COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL, to be mailed to Class Members in English with a Spanish translation, if applicable in the form, without material variation, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.
- 1.12. “Class Notice Packet” means the Class Notice to be provided to the Class Members by the Administrator in the form set forth as Exhibit A to this Agreement (other than formatting changes to facilitate printing by the Administrator).
- 1.13. “Class Period” means the period of time from February 16, 2020 through the date of preliminary approval.
- 1.14. “Class Workweek” means any workweek during the Class Period in which a Class Member worked for Defendant for at least one day.
- 1.15. “Class Representative” means the named Plaintiffs in the Operative Complaint in the Action seeking Court approval to serve as a Class Representative.

- 1.16. “Class Representative Service Payment(s)” means the service payments made to the Plaintiffs as Class Representative in order to compensate for initiating the Action, performing work in support of the Action, undertaking the risk of liability for Defendant’s expenses, and for the general release of all claims by the Plaintiffs.
- 1.17. “Court” means the Superior Court of California, County of Kern.
- 1.18. “Defendant” means Feghali Foods.
- 1.19. “Defense Counsel means Vanessa Franco Chavez and Catherine E. Bennett of Klein, DeNatale, Goldner Cooper, Rosenlieb & Kimball, LLP.
- 1.20. “Effective Date” means the date by when both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment on its Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement; and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (i) the expiration of the period for filing any appeal, writ, or other appellate proceeding opposing the Settlement has elapsed without any appeal, writ, or other appellate proceeding having been filed; (ii) the dismissal of any appeal, writ, or other appellate proceeding opposing the Settlement with no right to pursue further remedies or relief; or (iii) upon the expiration of any time to file a petition for rehearing and the expiration of any time to file any petition in the California Supreme Court or the Supreme Court of the United States following a final appellate opinion or order upholding the Court’s final order with no right to pursue further remedies or relief. In the event there is a motion to set aside the judgment filed within 15 days after notice to Class Members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b), or a motion to intervene filed within 60 days after notice to Class Members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b), “the expiration of the period for filing any appeal, writ, or other appellate proceeding opposing the Settlement” (as that phrase is used in (b)(i)-(iii), above) will be based on the later of the court’s ruling or order on any such motion or entry of final order and judgment certifying the class and approving this Settlement. In this regard, it is the intention of the Parties that the Settlement shall not become effective until the Court’s order approving the Settlement is completely final and there is no further recourse by an appellant or objector who seeks to contest the Settlement.
- 1.21. “Employer Taxes” means employer-funded taxes and contributions imposed on the wage portions of the Individual Class Payments under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and any similar state and federal taxes and contributions required of employers, such as for unemployment insurance.
- 1.22. “Employee’s Taxes and Required Withholding” means the employee’s share of any and all applicable federal, state or local payroll taxes, including those collected under authority of the FICA, FUTA, or SUTA on the portion of any Individual Class Payment that constitutes wages. The Employee’s Taxes and Required Withholdings will be withheld from the Individual Class Payments paid to Participating Class Members.

- 1.23. “Final Approval” means the Court’s order granting final approval of the Settlement substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C to this Agreement and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.
- 1.24. “Final Approval Hearing” means the Court’s hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement to determine whether to approve finally and implement the terms of this Agreement and enter the Judgment.
- 1.25. “Gross Settlement Amount” means Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$800,000) which is the total amount to be paid by Defendant as provided by this Agreement except as provided in Paragraph 9 below. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment and the Administration Expenses Payment. This Gross Settlement Amount is an all-in amount without any reversion to Defendant, and excludes any Employer Taxes, if any, due on the portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages which shall not be paid from the Gross Settlement and shall be the separate additional obligation of Defendant.
- 1.26. “Individual Class Payment” means the Participating Class Member’s pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount calculated according to the number of Class Workweeks worked during the Class Period, less Employee’s Taxes and Required Withholding.
- 1.27. “Individual PAGA Payment” means the Aggrieved Employee’s pro rata share of 25% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period.
- 1.28. “Judgment” means the judgment entered by the Court based upon Final Approval substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C to this Agreement and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.
- 1.29. “LWDA” means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the agency entitled, under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).
- 1.30. “LWDA PAGA Payment” means the 75% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).
- 1.31. “Net Settlement Amount” means the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment. The Net Settlement Amount is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments.

- 1.32. “Non-Participating Class Member” means a Class Member who opts out of the Class Settlement by submitting a valid and timely Request for Exclusion to the Administrator.
- 1.33. “PAGA” means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698. et seq.).
- 1.34. “PAGA Notice” means Plaintiff Rodriguez’s October 31, 2022 letter to Defendant and the LWDA providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a).
- 1.35. “PAGA Pay Period” means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period.
- 1.36. “PAGA Penalties” means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees (\$12,500) and the 75% to LWDA (\$37,500) in settlement of PAGA claims.
- 1.37. “PAGA Period” means the period of time from October 31, 2021 through the date of preliminary approval.
- 1.38. “Participating Class Member” means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.
- 1.39. “Plaintiffs” means Isaac Rodriguez, Maria Alvarez, Cecilio Guzman, Viveros, Kate Lopez, and Gilberto Serrato Moreno, the named plaintiffs in the Action.
- 1.40. “Preliminary Approval” means the Court’s Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit B to this Agreement and incorporated by this reference herein.
- 1.41. “Released Class Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 6.2 below.
- 1.42. “Released PAGA Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 6.3 below.
- 1.43. “Released Parties” means: Defendant and each of its former, future, and present parent, joint venturers, and affiliated corporations and partnerships; their directors, officers, shareholders, principals, owners, members, managers, partners, customers, employees, agents, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors, assigns, subsidiaries.
- 1.44. “Request for Exclusion” means a Class Member’s submission of a written request to be excluded from the Class Settlement signed by the Class Member.
- 1.45. “Response Deadline” means forty-five (45) calendar days after the Administrator mails Class Notice Packet to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees and shall be the last

date on which Class Members may: (a) submit Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) submit his or her Objection to the Settlement. Class Members to whom Class Notice Packets are resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have an additional 14 calendar days beyond the Response Deadline has expired.

1.46. “Settlement” means the disposition of the Action and all related claims effectuated by this Agreement and the Judgment.

## 2. RECITALS

### **The Class Action**

2.1. On January 17, 2023, Plaintiff Rodriguez commenced this Action by filing a Class Action Complaint against Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern (The “Class Action”). Plaintiff Rodriguez’s Class Action Complaint asserted claims that Defendant:

- (a) Violated California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.;
- (b) Failed to pay minimum wages in violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
- (c) Failed to pay overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code § 510, et seq.;
- (d) Failed to provide required meal periods in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- (e) Failed to provide required rest periods in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- (f) Failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code § 226;
- (g) Failed to reimburse employees for required expenses in violation of California Labor Code § 2802;
- (h) Failed to provide wages when due in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203; and
- (i) Failed to pay sick pay wages in violation of California Labor Code §§ 204, 233, 246.

2.2. On April 4, 2023, Plaintiff Rodriguez filed a dismissal without prejudice of the Class Action, which the Court ordered that same date.

### **The PAGA Action**

2.3. On January 17, 2023, Plaintiff Rodriguez filed a separate Representative Action Complaint against Defendant (the “PAGA Action”). Plaintiff Rodriguez’s Representative Action Complaint asserted one cause of action against Defendant for Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699, et seq. for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197,

1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

- 2.4. On April 25, 2023, Defendant filed an answer to Plaintiff Rodriguez's Representative Action Complaint, asserting thirteen (13) affirmative defenses.

### **Pleading Amendment**

- 2.5. As part of this Agreement, the Parties stipulated to the filing of a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint in the PAGA Action that: adds all claims and parties originally filed in the Class Action that was dismissed without prejudice, and adds Maria Alvarez, Cecilio Guzman Viveros, Kate Lopez, and Gilberto Serrato Moreno as named Plaintiffs and Class Representatives. The First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint shall be the operative complaint in the Action (the "Operative Complaint"), which will be filed once this Agreement has been executed by all the Parties and no later than the date of Plaintiff's motion for preliminary approval.
- 2.6. Defendant denies the allegations in the Operative Complaint, denies any failure to comply with the laws identified in the Operative Complaint and denies any and all liability for the causes of action alleged.

### **Mediation and Settlement**

- 2.7. On February 16, 2024, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Tagore Subramaniam, Esq., a respected mediator of wage and hour representative and class actions. This Agreement replaces and supersedes the Memorandum of Understanding and any other agreements, understandings, or representations between the Parties.
- 2.8. Prior to mediation, Plaintiffs obtained sufficient documents and information to sufficiently investigate the claims such that Plaintiff's investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 ("*Dunk/Kullar*").
- 2.9. This Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or will be construed as an admission by Defendant that the claims in the Action of Plaintiffs or the Class have merit or that Defendant bears any liability to Plaintiffs or the Class on those claims or any other claims, or as an admission by Plaintiffs that Defendant's defenses in the Action have merit. The Parties agree to certification of the Class for purposes of this Settlement only. If for any reason the settlement does not become effective, Defendant reserves the right to contest certification of any class for any reason and reserves all available defenses to the claims in the Action.



- 2.10. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement.
- 2.11. The Parties agree that this Agreement is for settlement purposes only and if, for any reason, the Agreement is not approved, the Agreement will be of no force or effect. In such event, nothing in this Agreement shall be used or construed by or against any party as a determination, admission, or concession of any issue of law or fact in the Action; and the Parties do not waive, and instead expressly reserve, their respective rights with respect to the prosecution and defense of this Action as if this Agreement never existed.
- 2.12. The Court has not granted class certification.
- 2.13. The Agreement set forth herein intends to achieve the following: (1) an entry of an order approving the Settlement; (2) entry of judgment of the Action; (3) discharge of Released Parties from liability for any and all of the Released Claims; and (4) discharge of Defendant from liability for any and all claims arising out of the Action.

### **3. MONETARY TERMS**

- 3.1. Gross Settlement Amount. Except as otherwise provided by Paragraph 9 below, Defendant promises to pay \$800,000 and no more as the Gross Settlement Amount. This amount is all-inclusive of all payments contemplated in this resolution, excluding any employer-side payroll taxes on the portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages which shall be separately paid by Defendant to the Administrator. Defendant has no obligation to pay the Gross Settlement Amount (or any payroll taxes) prior to the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.3 of this Agreement. The Administrator will disburse the entire Gross Settlement Amount without asking or requiring Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees to submit any claim as a condition of payment. None of the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendant.
- 3.2. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, the Administrator will make the following payments out of the Gross Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in the Final Approval.
- (a) To Plaintiffs: Class Representative Service Payments to the Class Representatives of not more than \$10,000 each (in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representative is entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member). Defendant will not oppose Plaintiffs' requests for Class Representative Service Payments that do not exceed this amount. As part of the motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment, Plaintiffs will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payments no later than 16 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves Class Representative Service Payments less than the amount requested, the

Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payments using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiffs assume full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payments.

- (b) To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be \$266,666, and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than \$30,000. Defendant will not oppose requests for these payments provided that do not exceed these amounts. Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel will file a motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment no later than 16 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiffs' Counsel arising from any claim to any portion any Class Counsel Fee Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and holds Defendant harmless, and indemnifies Defendant, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these payments.
- (c) To the Administrator: An Administration Expenses Payment not to exceed \$20,000 except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Expenses Payment is less, or the Court approves payment less than \$20,000, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members.
- (d) To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of \$50,000 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 75% (\$37,500) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% (\$12,500) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.
- i. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties (\$12,500) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.
  - ii. If the Court approves PAGA Penalties of less than the amount requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

- (e) To Each Participating Class Member: An Individual Class Payment calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Class Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Class Workweeks.
- i. Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. 15% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form. 85% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for non-wages, expense reimbursement, interest, and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.
  - ii. Effect of Non-Participating Class Members on Calculation of Individual Class Payments. Non-Participating Class Members will not receive any Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will retain amounts equal to their Individual Class Payments in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members on a pro rata basis.

#### 4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING

- 4.1. Class Workweeks and Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods. Based on its records, Defendant has represented that the Class consists of approximately 1,669 Class Members who collectively worked a total of 65,000 Class Workweeks during the Class Period through February 16, 2024, and 1,059 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 19,472 PAGA Pay Periods.
- 4.2. Class Data. Not later than 15 days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, Defendant will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of this Settlement and for no other purpose, and restrict access to the Class Data to Administrator employees who need access to the Class Data to effect and perform under this Agreement. Class Counsel shall not receive a copy of the Class Data or any content thereof unless Defendant expressly agrees to disclosure of information for purposes of this Settlement. Defendant has a continuing duty to immediately notify Class Counsel if it discovers that the Class Data omitted Class Member identifying information and to provide corrected or updated Class Data as soon as reasonably feasible. Without any extension of the deadline by which Defendant must send the Class Data to the Administrator, the Parties and their counsel will expeditiously use best efforts, in good faith, to reconstruct or otherwise resolve any issues related to missing or omitted Class Data.

4.3. Funding of the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than 14 days after the Effective Date. At least five (5) business days prior to Defendant's deadline for funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator shall calculate the total Employer Taxes due on the wage portion of the Individual Class Payments and issue Defendant instructions and the amount of the Employer Taxes.

## **5. PAYMENTS FROM THE GROSS SETTLEMENT AMOUNT**

5.1. Within 14 days after Defendant funds the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment.

5.2. The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and/or Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Class Members via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. The face of each check shall prominently state the "void date", which is 180 days after the date of mailing, when the check will be voided. Before checks are mailed, the Administrator shall update address information through the National Change of Address database. The Administrator will cancel all checks not cashed by the void date. The Administrator will send checks for Individual Class Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator will send checks for Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as Aggrieved Employees (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. Before mailing any checks, the Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National Change of Address Database. If a Participating Class Member's or Aggrieved Employee's check is not cashed within 120 days after its last mailing to the affected individual, the Administrator will also send the individual a notice informing him or her that unless the check is cashed by the void date, it will expire and become non-negotiable, and offer to replace the check if it was lost or misplaced but not cashed.

5.3. The Administrator must conduct a Class Member Address Search for all other Class Members whose checks are returned undelivered without USPS forwarding address. Within 7 days of receiving a returned check the Administrator must re-mail checks to the USPS forwarding address provided or to an address ascertained through the Class Member Address Search. The Administrator need not take further steps to deliver checks to Class Members whose re-mailed checks are returned as undelivered. The Administrator shall promptly send a replacement check to any Class Member whose original check was lost or misplaced, requested by the Class Member prior to the void date.

- 5.4. For any Class Member whose Individual Class Payment check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such or to a Court-approved nonprofit organization or foundation consistent with Code of Civil Procedure Section 384(b) (“Cy Pres Recipient”). The Parties agree to appoint Court Appointed Special Advocates of Kern County as the Cy Pres Recipient, subject to Court approval. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the intended Cy Pres Recipient.
- 5.5. The payment of Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments shall not obligate Defendant to confer any additional benefits or make any additional payments to Class Members (such as 401(k) contributions or bonuses) beyond those specified in this Agreement.
- 6. RELEASE OF CLAIMS.** Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all Employer Taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiffs, Participating Class Members, Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:
- 6.1. Plaintiffs’ Release. Plaintiffs and his or her respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, dependents, administrators, devisees, legatees, executors, trustees, conservators, guardians, personal representatives, successors, and assigns, whether individual, class, representative, legal, equitable, direct or indirect, or any other type of any capacity, shall and does hereby forever generally release, discharge, and agree to hold harmless the Released Parties from any and all charges, complaints, claims, liabilities, obligations, promises, agreements, controversies, damages, causes of action, suit, rights, demands, costs, losses, transactions, occurrences, or debts or expenses (including attorney fees and costs), known or unknown, at law or in equity which Plaintiffs each may now have or may become aware of after the signing of this Agreement, including, but not limited to: (a) arising out of or in any way connected with their employment with Defendant; (b) the Released Claims, (c) all claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged, based on the facts contained, in the Operative Complaint; (d) all PAGA claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged based on facts contained in the Action, Plaintiff Rodriguez’s PAGA Notice, or ascertained during the Action and released under 6.2, below, and (e) and any and all transactions, occurrences, or matters between the Parties occurring prior to the date this Agreement is fully executed. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, this release shall include, but is not limited to, any and all claims under: (a) the Americans with Disabilities Act; (b) Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; (c) the Civil Rights Act of 1991; (d) 42 U.S.C. § 1981; (e) the Age Discrimination in Employment Act; (f) the Fair Labor Standards Act; (g) the Equal Pay Act; (h) the Employee Retirement Income Securities Act, as amended; (i) the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act; (j) the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; (k) the Family and Medical Leave Act; (l) the Civil Rights Act of 1966; (m) the California Fair Employment and Housing Act; (n) the California

Constitution; (o) the California Labor Code; (p) the California Government Code; (q) the California Civil Code; and (r) any and all other federal, state, and local statutes, ordinances, regulations, rules, and other laws, and any and all claims based on constitutional, statutory, common law, or regulatory grounds as well as any other claims based on theories of wrongful or constructive discharge, breach of contract or implied contract, fraud, misrepresentation, promissory estoppel, or intentional infliction of emotional distress, negligent infliction of emotional distress, or damages under any other federal, state, or local statutes, ordinances, regulations, rules, or laws. This release is for any and all relief, no matter how denominated, including, but not limited to, back pay, front pay, vacation pay, bonuses, compensatory damages, tortious damages, liquidated damages, punitive damages, damages for pain and suffering, and attorney fees and costs. (“Plaintiffs’ Release”). Plaintiffs’ Release does not extend to any claims or actions to enforce this Agreement, or to any claims for vested benefits, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social security benefits, or workers’ compensation benefits that arose at any time, based on occurrences outside the Class Period, or claims which cannot be waived as part of this settlement as a matter of law. Plaintiffs acknowledge that Plaintiffs may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiffs now knows or believes to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that Plaintiffs’ Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiffs’ discovery of them.

(a) Plaintiffs’ Waiver of Rights Under Civil Code Section 1542. For purposes of Plaintiffs’ Release, Plaintiffs, being aware of California Civil Code section 1542, as well as any other statutes or common law principles of a similar effect, hereby forever expressly waives and relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

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 of 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.

Plaintiffs specifically acknowledge that he or she is aware of and familiar with the provisions of the above Civil Code section 1542. Plaintiffs may hereafter discover facts in addition to or different from those which he or she now knows or believes to be true with respect to the subject matter of all the claims referenced herein, but agree that, upon the funding of the entire Gross Settlement Amount and Employer Taxes, Plaintiffs shall and hereby does fully, finally, and forever settle and release any and all claims against the Released Parties, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, contingent or non-contingent, that were asserted or could have been asserted upon any theory of law or equity without regard to the subsequent discovery of existence of such different or additional facts, through the date on which this Agreement is fully executed.

## 6.2. Release by Participating Class Members

- (a) Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, dependents, administrators, devisees, legatees, executors, trustees, conservators, guardians, personal representatives, successors, and assigns, whether individual, class, representative, legal, equitable, direct or indirect, or any other type of any capacity, shall and do hereby forever release, discharge, and agree to hold harmless the Released Parties from all claims during the Class Period that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and ascertained in the course of the Action including any and all claims for: 1) unlawful business practices; 2) failure to pay minimum wages; 3) failure to pay overtime compensation; 4) failure to provide required meal periods and meal period premium pay; 5) failure to provide required rest periods and rest period premium pay; 6) failure to provide accurate and complete itemized statements; 7) failure to reimburse employees for expenses; 8) failure to pay wages when due; and 9) failure to pay sick pay wages (“Released Class Claims”). To the extent based on facts alleged on the Operative Complaint or the PAGA Letter, the Released Class Claims encompass, but are not limited to, all claims pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order, and Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 233, 246, 246.5, 510, 512, 515, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802; California Business and Profession Code §§ 17200, et seq. The Released Class Claims excludes claims, if any, by Class Members for workers compensation; unemployment; disability benefits; causes of action which may be possessed by Class Members (other than the named Plaintiffs) under state or federal discrimination statutes, including, without limitation, wrongful termination and violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act; and Class claims outside of the Class Period.
- (b) Each Participating Class Member will be bound to the release of Released Class Claims as a result of this Class Settlement and to the terms of the final judgment and the satisfaction of such judgment.
- (c) Participating Class Members will be deemed to have acknowledged and agreed that their claims for wages and/or penalties in the Action are disputed, and that their Individual Class Payments constitute payment of all sums allegedly due to them. Participating Class Members will be deemed to have acknowledged and agreed that California Labor Code Section 206.5 is not applicable to the Individual Class Payment. That section provides in pertinent part as follows:

**“An employer shall not require the execution of a release of a claim or right on account of wages due, or to become due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, unless payment of those wages has been made.”**

6.3. Release as to PAGA. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, all Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from all claims, rights, demands, liabilities and causes of action for civil penalties under the PAGA, that Aggrieved Employees have had, now have, or may have in the future against Released Parties based on any acts or omissions occurring during the PAGA Period and were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the PAGA Period facts stated in the Operative Complaint or the PAGA Notice (“Released PAGA Claims”). The Released PAGA Claims include, but are not limited to, claims for PAGA penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 246, 246.5, 510, 512, 515, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2699, et seq, 2802. Any Aggrieved Employees who submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion are still entitled to their Individual PAGA Payment and have no right or ability to opt out of the portion of this Settlement releasing the Released PAGA Claims. Released PAGA Claims excludes claims, if any, by Class Members for workers compensation; unemployment; disability benefits; causes of action which may be possessed by Class Members (other than the named Plaintiffs) under state or federal discrimination statutes, including, without limitation, wrongful termination and violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act; and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

7. **MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL.** The Parties agree to jointly prepare and file a motion for preliminary approval (“Motion for Preliminary Approval”) that complies with the Court’s procedures and instructions.

7.1. Defendant’s Responsibilities. In a declaration under penalty of perjury, Defendant will verify that the Class Members all signed arbitration agreements.

7.2. Plaintiffs’ Responsibilities. Plaintiffs will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all documents necessary for obtaining Preliminary Approval, including: (i) a draft of the notice, and memorandum in support, of the Motion for Preliminary Approval that includes an analysis of the Settlement under *Dunk/Kullar* and a request for approval of the PAGA Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699, subd. (f)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of PAGA Settlement; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from each Class Counsel firm attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members; its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (initial notice of violations (Labor Code section 2699.3, subd. (a)), Operative Complaint (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(1)), this Agreement (Labor Code section 2699, subd. .

7.3. Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than 30 days after the full execution of this Agreement; obtaining a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and for appearing in Court to advocate in favor of



the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval to the Administrator.

- 7.4. Duty to Cooperate. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed Motion for Preliminary Approval and/or the supporting declarations and documents, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve the disagreement. If the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval or conditions Preliminary Approval on any material change to this Agreement, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to modify the Agreement and otherwise satisfy the Court's concerns.

## **8. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION**

- 8.1. Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Apex Class Action to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Apex Class Action agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for payment of Administration Expenses. The Administrator's duties will include preparing, printing, and mailing the Class Notice Packet to all Class Members; posting the Class Notice Packet on the Administrator's website, conducting a National Change of Address search to update Class Member addresses before mailing the Class Notice Packets; re-mailing Class Notice Packets that are returned to the Class Member's new address; setting up a toll-free telephone number and email and a fax number to receive communications from Class Members; receiving and reviewing for validity completed Requests for Exclusion; providing the Parties with weekly status reports about the delivery of Class Notice Packets and receipt of Requests for Exclusion, objections and disputes; calculating Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments; issuing the checks to effectuate the payments due under the Settlement; issuing the tax reports required under this Settlement; and otherwise administering the Settlement pursuant to this Agreement. The Parties and their Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.
- 8.2. Employer Identification Number. The Administrator shall have and use its own Employer Identification Number for the purposes of calculating payroll tax withholdings and providing reports to the state and federal tax authorities.
- 8.3. Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") under US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1.
- 8.4. Notice to Class Members.

- (a) No later than three (3) business days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and state the number of Class Members, PAGA Members, Class Workweeks, and PAGA Pay Periods in the Class Data.
- (b) Using best efforts to perform as soon as possible, and in no event later than 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will send to all Class Members identified in the Class Data, via first-class United States Postal Service (“USPS”) mail, the Class Notice with Spanish translation, if applicable substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as Exhibit A. The Administrator will also post a copy of the Class Notice with Spanish Translation on its website at least until the date of the Final Approval Hearing. The first page of the Class Notice shall prominently estimate the dollar amounts of any Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment payable to the Class Member, and the number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if applicable) used to calculate these amounts. Before mailing Class Notices, the Administrator shall update Class Member addresses using the National Change of Address database.
- (c) Not later than 7 days after the Administrator’s receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. Other than verifying that Defendant does not have any additional information to locate or send the Class Notice, the Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.
- (d) The deadlines for Class Members’ written objections, Challenges to Class Workweeks and/or Pay Periods, and Requests for Exclusion will be extended an additional 14 days beyond the Response Deadline provided in the Class Notice for all Class Members whose notice is re-mailed. The Administrator will inform the Class Member of the extended deadline with the re-mailed Class Notice.
- (e) If the Administrator, the Parties, Defense Counsel or Class Counsel is contacted by or otherwise discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class Data and should have received Class Notice, the Parties will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, in an effort to agree on whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class Members, and the Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than 14 days after receipt of Class Notice, or the deadline dates in the Class Notice, which ever are later.

8.5. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

- (a) Class Members who wish to exclude themselves (opt-out of) the Class Settlement must send the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than the Response Deadline (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed). A Request for Exclusion is a letter from a Class Member or his/her representative that reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the Settlement and includes the Class Member's name, address and email address or telephone number. To be valid, a Request for Exclusion must be timely faxed, emailed, or postmarked by the Response Deadline.
- (b) The Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Administrator shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Administrator can reasonably ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member's desire to be excluded. The Administrator's determination shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge, though the Court may make a final determination of any dispute. If the Administrator has reason to question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Administrator may demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Administrator's determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge, except by the Court.
- (c) Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the Participating Class Members' Releases under Paragraph 6.2 of the Agreement, regardless whether the Participating Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.
- (d) Every Class Member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion is a Non-Participating Class Member and shall not receive an Individual Class Payment or have the right to object to the class action components of the Settlement. Because future PAGA claims are subject to claim preclusion upon entry of the Judgment, Non-Participating Class Members who are Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release the claims identified in Paragraph 6.3 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment. If a Class Member submits both a Request for Exclusion and an objection, only the Request for Exclusion will be accepted, and the objection will be void.

8.6. Challenges to Calculation of Class Workweeks. Each Class Member shall have until the Response Deadline (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to challenge the number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if any) allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via fax, email or mail. The

Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member to submit supporting documentation. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Class Workweeks contained in the Class Notice are correct so long as they are consistent with the Class Data. The Administrator's determination of each Class Member's allocation of Class Workweeks and/or Pay Periods shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. The Administrator shall promptly provide copies of all challenges to calculation of Class Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination as to the challenges.

8.7. Objections to Settlement.

- (a) Only Participating Class Members may object to the class action components of the Settlement and/or this Agreement, including contesting the fairness of the Settlement, and/or amounts requested for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Class Representative Service Payment.
- (b) Participating Class Members may send written objections to the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail. In the alternative, or in addition to a written objection, Participating Class Members may appear in Court (or hire an attorney to appear in Court) to present verbal objections at the Final Approval Hearing. A Participating Class Member who elects to send a written objection to the Administrator must do so not later than the Response Deadline (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice was re-mailed).
- (c) Non-Participating Class Members have no right to object to any of the class action components of the Settlement. If a Class Member submits both a Request for Exclusion and an objection, only the Request for Exclusion will be accepted, and the objection will be void.

8.8. Administrator Duties. The Administrator has a duty to perform or observe all tasks to be performed or observed by the Administrator contained in this Agreement or otherwise.

- (a) Website, Email Address and Toll-Free Number. The Administrator will establish and maintain and use an internet website to post information of interest to Class Members including the date, time and location for the Final Approval Hearing and copies of the Settlement Agreement, Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Preliminary Approval, the Class Notice, the Motion for Final Approval, the Motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and Class Representative Service Payment, the Final Approval and the Judgment. The Administrator will also maintain and monitor an email address and a toll-free telephone number to receive Class Member calls, faxes and emails. If Final Approval is granted, the Administrator will post the above-listed information of interest for at least 180 days after the date of mailing Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments.

- (b) Request for Exclusion (Opt-Outs) and Exclusion List. The Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than 7 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list (a) to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion (“Exclusion List”), along with copies of all valid and timely Requests for Exclusion; and (b) to Defense Counsel containing the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion, along with copies of all invalid or untimely Requests for Exclusion from Settlement submitted.
- (c) Class Workweek and/or PAGA Pay Period Challenges. The Administrator has the authority to address and make final decisions consistent with the terms of this Agreement on all Class Member challenges over the calculation of Class Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods. The Administrator’s decision shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.
- (d) Weekly Reports. The Administrator must, on a weekly basis, provide written reports to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel that, among other things, tally the number of: Class Notices mailed or re-mailed, Class Notices returned undelivered, Requests for Exclusion (whether valid or invalid) received, objections received, challenges to Class Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods received and/or resolved, and checks mailed for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments (“Weekly Report”). The Weekly Reports must include providing the Administrator’s assessment of the validity of Requests for Exclusion and attach copies of all Requests for Exclusion and objections received. The Administrator must, on a weekly basis, provide Defense Counsel the names and identifying information of Class Members whose Class Notices have been returned as undeliverable for the purpose of determining if Defendant can provide any additional information to successfully mail the Class Notice.
- (e) Administrator’s Declaration. Not later than 7 days before the date by which Plaintiffs are required to file the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Administrator will provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its due diligence and compliance with all of its obligations under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, its mailing of Class Notice, the Class Notices returned as undelivered, the re-mailing of Class Notices, attempts to locate Class Members, the total number of Requests for Exclusion from Settlement it received (both valid or invalid), the number of written objections and attach the Exclusion List. The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator’s declaration(s) in Court.

- (f) Posting of Final Judgment. Within 10 days after the Court has held a Final Approval Hearing and entered the Judgment certifying the Class for settlement purposes only and approving the Settlement, the Administrator will give notice of judgment to Class Members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b) by posting a copy of said Judgment on its website at a web address to be included in the Class Notice.
- (g) Final Report by Administrator. Within 10 days after the Administrator disburses all funds of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing its disbursements by employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least 7 days before any deadline set by the Court, the Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration in Court. If a second declaration attesting to the distribution of uncashed checks is required, the Administrator shall provide this second declaration at least 7 days before any deadline for a second declaration and Class Counsel shall be responsible for filing the second declaration with the Court.

**9. CLASS SIZE MODIFICATION AND ESCALATOR CLAUSE.** Based on its records, Defendant provided figures as to the Class size as set forth in paragraph 4.1 above. Should the Class Workweeks worked by the Class Members during the Class Period ultimately increase by more than 10%, Defendant, at its option, can either choose to: (1) cut off the end date for the Class Period as of the date on which the number of total Class Workweeks exceeds 71,500, or (2) increase the Gross Settlement Amount on a proportional basis equal to the percentage increase in number of Class Workweeks worked by the Class Members above the 10%. For example, if there was an 11% increase in the number of Class Workweeks during the Class Period, Defendant could agree to increase the Gross Settlement Amount by 1% or end the Class Period as of the date the total number of Class Workweeks exceeded 71,500.

**10. DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO WITHDRAW.** Neither side shall encourage any Class Member to opt out. If the number of valid Requests for Exclusion identified in the Exclusion List exceeds 5% of the total of all Class Members, Defendant may, but is not obligated, elect to withdraw from the Settlement. The Parties agree that, if Defendant withdraws, the Settlement shall be void ab initio, have no force or effect whatsoever, and that neither Party will have any further obligation to perform under this Agreement; provided, however, Defendant will remain responsible for paying all Administration Expenses incurred as of the date Defendant makes this election to withdraw. Defendant must notify Class Counsel and the Court of its election to withdraw not later than 7 days after the Administrator sends the final Exclusion List to Defense Counsel. Invalid Requests for Exclusion will have no effect on this threshold for an election.

**11. MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL.** Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, not later than 16 court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs will file in Court, a

motion for final approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the PAGA settlement under Labor Code section 2699(l), a Proposed Final Approval Order and a proposed Judgment (collectively “Motion for Final Approval”). Plaintiffs shall provide drafts of these documents to Defense Counsel not later than 7 days prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval.

- 11.1. Response to Objections. Each Party retains the right to respond to any objection raised by a Participating Class Member, including the right to file responsive documents in Court no later than five (5) court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered or accepted by the Court.
- 11.2. Duty to Cooperate. If the Court does not grant Final Approval or conditions Final Approval on any material change to the Settlement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Class Members), the Parties will expeditiously work together in good faith to address the Court’s concerns by revising the Agreement as necessary to obtain Final Approval. The Court’s decision to award less than the amounts requested for a Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Administration Expenses Payment shall not constitute a material modification to the Agreement within the meaning of this paragraph.
- 11.3. Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court. The Parties agree that, after entry of Judgment, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the Parties, Action, and the Settlement under C.C.P. section 664.6 solely for purposes of (i) enforcing this Agreement and/or Judgment, (ii) addressing settlement administration matters, and (iii) addressing such post-Judgment matters as are permitted by law.
- 11.4. Waiver of the Right to Appeal. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment reflected set forth in this Settlement, the Parties, their respective counsel, and all Participating Class Members who did not object to the Settlement as provided in this Agreement, waive all rights to appeal from the Judgment, including all rights to post-judgment and appellate proceedings, the right to file motions to vacate judgment, motions for new trial, extraordinary writs, and appeals. The waiver of appeal does not include any waiver of the right to oppose such motions, writs or appeals. If an objector appeals the Judgment, the Parties’ obligations to perform under this Agreement will be suspended until such time as the appeal is finally resolved and the Judgment becomes final, except as to matters that do not affect the amount of the Net Settlement Amount.
- 11.5. Appellate Court Orders to Vacate, Reverse, or Materially Modify Judgment. If the reviewing Court vacates, reverses, or modifies the Judgment in a manner that requires a material modification of this Agreement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Class Members), this Agreement shall be null and void. The Parties shall

nevertheless expeditiously work together in good faith to address the appellate court's concerns and to obtain Final Approval and entry of Judgment, sharing, on an equal basis, any additional Administration Expenses reasonably incurred at the time of remittitur. An appellate decision to vacate, reverse, or modify the Court's award of the Class Representative Service Payment or any payments to Class Counsel shall not constitute a material modification of the Judgment within the meaning of this paragraph, as long as the Gross Settlement Amount remains unchanged.

**12. AMENDED JUDGMENT.** If any amended judgment is required under Code of Civil Procedure section 384, the Parties will work together in good faith to jointly submit a proposed amended judgment.

### **13. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS**

13.1. No Admission of Liability, Class Certification or Representative Manageability for Other Purposes. This Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or should be construed as an admission by Defendant that any of the allegations in the Operative Complaint have merit or that Defendant has any liability for any claims asserted; nor should it be intended or construed as an admission by Plaintiffs that Defendant's defenses in the Action have merit. The Parties agree that class certification and representative treatment is for purposes of this Settlement only, and that the Parties' settlement shall not constitute, in this or any other proceeding, an admission of any kind by Defendant, including without limitation, that certification of a class for trial purposes is or would be warranted, appropriate or proper; or that Plaintiffs could establish any of the requisite elements for class treatment of any of the claims in the Action. If, for any reason the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval, Final Approval or Judgment pursuant to this Agreement, or the settlement is termination or otherwise rendered null and void, then certification of the Class shall be automatically vacated, shall be void ab initio, of no force or effect, and shall not constitute evidence or a binding determination that the requirements for certification of a class for trial purposes in this Action or in any other action which have been, are or can be, satisfied. Further, if the Parties' class and PAGA agreement is not finally approved or if it is terminated for any reason, Plaintiffs agree that they will promptly dismiss all the class and individual wage claims in the amended complaint without prejudice and agree to stay the remaining representative PAGA action pending arbitration of Plaintiffs' respective individual claims. Plaintiffs agree that the Parties' settlement shall not constitute, in this or any other proceeding, an admission of any kind by Defendant, that Defendant waived the right to compel arbitration. The Settlement, this Agreement and Parties' willingness to settle the Action will have no bearing on, and will not be admissible in connection with, any litigation (except for proceedings to enforce or effectuate the Settlement and this Agreement).

13.2. Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel separately agree that, until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of



Settlement is filed, they and each of them will not disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly, specifically or generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity except: (1) to the Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement confidential; (2) counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency. This confidentiality clause extends to the parties' use of social media people often use to communicate during their daily lives, such as X (formerly Twitter), Facebook, blogs, Instagram, and the like. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel separately agree not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any conversation or other communication, before the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, with any third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class Counsel's communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

- 13.3. No Solicitation. The Parties separately agree that they and their respective counsel and employees have not and will not solicit any Class Member to opt out of or object to the Settlement, or appeal from the Judgment. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to restrict Class Counsel's ability to communicate with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.
- 13.4. Integrated Agreement. Upon execution by all Parties and their counsel, this Agreement together with its attached exhibits shall constitute the entire agreement between the Parties relating to the Settlement, superseding any and all oral representations, warranties, covenants, or inducements made to or by any Party.
- 13.5. Attorney Authorization. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and represent that they are authorized by Plaintiffs and Defendant, respectively, to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any amendments to this Agreement.
- 13.6. Cooperation. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts, in good faith, to implement the Settlement by, among other things, modifying the Settlement Agreement, submitting supplemental evidence and supplementing points and authorities as requested by the Court. In the event the Parties are unable to agree upon the form or content of any document necessary to implement the Settlement, or on any modification of the Agreement that may become necessary to implement the Settlement, the Parties will seek the assistance of a mediator and/or the Court for resolution.

- 13.7. Prior Assignments. The Parties separately represent and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity and portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action, or right released and discharged by the Party in this Settlement.
- 13.8. Tax Advice. Neither Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendant nor Defense Counsel are providing any advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Settlement be relied upon as such within the meaning of United States Treasury Department Circular 230 (31 CFR Part 10, as amended) or otherwise.
- 13.9. Modification of Agreement. This Agreement, and all parts of it, may be amended, modified, changed, or waived only by an express written instrument signed by all Parties or their representatives, and approved by the Court.
- 13.10. Agreement Binding on Successors. This Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors of each of the Parties.
- 13.11. Applicable Law. All terms and conditions of this Agreement and its exhibits will be governed by and interpreted according to the internal laws of the state of California, without regard to conflict of law principles.
- 13.12. Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Except as otherwise specifically provided for herein, each party shall bear her or its own attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses, taxable or otherwise, incurred by them or arising out of the Action and shall not seek reimbursement thereof from any other party in this Agreement. In any suit or court action to enforce the terms of this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover her or its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
- 13.13. Cooperation in Drafting. The Parties have cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Agreement. This Agreement will not be construed against any Party on the basis that the Party was the drafter or participated in the drafting.
- 13.14. Confidentiality. To the extent permitted by law, all agreements made, and orders entered during Action and in this Agreement relating to the confidentiality of information shall survive the execution of this Agreement.
- 13.15. Use and Return of Class Data. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Cal. Evid. Code §1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by Defendant in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or in connection with the Settlement, may be used only with respect to this Settlement, and no other purpose, and may not be used in any way that violates any existing contractual agreement, statute, or rule of court. Not later than 90 days after the date when the Court discharges the Administrator's obligation to provide a Declaration confirming the final pay out of all Settlement funds, Plaintiffs shall destroy, all paper and electronic versions of Class Data received from Defendant unless, prior to the Court's discharge of the

Administrator's obligation, Defendant makes a written request to Class Counsel for the return, rather than the destruction, of Class Data.

- 13.16. Headings. The descriptive heading of any section or paragraph of this Agreement is inserted for convenience of reference only and does not constitute a part of this Agreement.
- 13.17. Calendar Days. Unless otherwise noted, all reference to "days" in this Agreement shall be to calendar days. In the event any date or deadline set forth in this Agreement falls on a weekend or federal legal holiday, such date or deadline shall be on the first business day thereafter.
- 13.18. Notice. All notices, demands or other communications between the Parties in connection with this Agreement will be in writing and deemed to have been duly given as of the third business day after mailing by United States mail, or the day sent by email or messenger, addressed as follows:

*To Plaintiffs and the Class:*

Norman B. Blumenthal  
Kyle R. Nordrehaug  
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP  
2255 Calle Clara  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
Tel.: (858) 551-1223  
Fax: (858) 551-1232  
E-Mail: [norm@bamlawca.com](mailto:norm@bamlawca.com)  
[kyle@bamlawca.com](mailto:kyle@bamlawca.com)

*To Defendant:*

Vanessa Franco Chavez  
Catherine E. Bennett  
Klein, Denatale, Goldner, Cooper, Rosenlieb & Kimball, LLP  
10000 Stockdale Highway, Suite 200  
Bakersfield, CA 93311  
Tel.: (661) 395-1000  
Fax: (661) 326-0418  
E-Mail: [vchavez@kleinlaw.com](mailto:vchavez@kleinlaw.com)  
[cbennett@kleinlaw.com](mailto:cbennett@kleinlaw.com)

- 13.19. Execution in Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts by facsimile, electronically (i.e. DocuSign), or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original. All executed counterparts and each of them will be deemed to be one and the same instrument if counsel for the Parties will

exchange between themselves signed counterparts. Any executed counterpart will be admissible in evidence to prove the existence and contents of this Agreement.

13.20. Stay of Litigation. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to CCP section 583.330 to extend the date to bring a case to trial under CCP section 583.310 for a period of not less than one (1) year starting from the date of the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding by all parties until the entry of the final approval order and judgment or if not entered the date this agreement shall no longer be of any force or effect.

13.21. Fair Settlement. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel believe and warrant that this Agreement reflects a fair, reasonable, and adequate settlement of the Action and have arrived at this Agreement through arms-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors, both current and potential.


#### 14. EXECUTION BY PARTIES AND COUNSEL

The Parties and their counsel hereby execute this Agreement.


Dated: Apr 9, 2024   
isaac.rodriguez (Apr 9, 2024 17:26 PDT)  
Plaintiff Isaac Rodriguez

Dated: Apr 9, 2024   
Maria Alvarez (Apr 9, 2024 23:03 PDT)  
Plaintiff Maria Alvarez

Dated: Apr 9, 2024   
Cecilio Guzman (Apr 9, 2024 20:58 PDT)  
Plaintiff Cecilio Guzman Viveros


Dated: Apr 9, 2024   
Kate Lopez Hernandez (Apr 9, 2024 23:20 PDT)  
Plaintiff Kate Lopez

Dated: Apr 9, 2024   
Gilberto Serrato Moreno (Apr 9, 2024 20:52 PDT)  
Plaintiff Gilberto Serrato Moreno.

Dated: April 18, 2024   
Jeffrey Feghali  
For Defendant Feghali Foods

*Approved as to form:*

Dated: 4/10/24



Kyle Nordrehaug

Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: 4/18/2024



Vanessa Franco Chavez

Klein, DeNatale, Goldner, Cooper, Rosenlieb & Kimball, LLP  
Attorneys for Defendant

**EXHIBIT A**

[NOTICE OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION AND HEARING DATE FOR  
FINAL COURT APPROVAL]

**EXHIBIT "A"**

**COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT  
AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL**

***Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods,***  
**Superior Court of the State of California, County of Kern, Case No. BCV-23-100142**

***The Superior Court for the State of California authorized this Notice. Read it carefully!  
It's not junk mail, spam, an advertisement, or solicitation by a lawyer. You are not being sued.***

**YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS MAY BE AFFECTED WHETHER YOU ACT OR DO NOT  
ACT. PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY.**

**You may be eligible to receive money** from an employee class action lawsuit ("Action") against Defendant Feghali Foods ("Defendant") for alleged wage and hour violations. The Action was filed by Plaintiffs Isaac Rodriguez, Maria Alvarez, Cecilio Guzman Viveros, Kate Lopez, and Gilberto Serrato Moreno ("Plaintiffs") and seeks payment of (1) wages and other relief on behalf of all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period (February 16, 2020 through \_\_\_\_\_) ("Class Members"), and (2) penalties and other relief on behalf of all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period (October 31, 2021 through \_\_\_\_\_) ("Aggrieved Employees").

The Parties have reached a settlement, pending court approval. ***The Court has not ruled on the merits of Plaintiffs' claims or Defendant's defenses.*** Defendant adamantly denies that is has done anything wrong and disputes all the claims in the Action.

The proposed Settlement has two main parts: (1) a Class Settlement requiring Defendant to fund Individual Class Payments to Class Members, and (2) a PAGA Settlement requiring Defendant to fund the PAGA Penalties to pay penalties to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and to Aggrieved Employees.

Based on Defendant's records, and the Parties' current assumptions, **your Individual Class Payment is estimated to be <<\$ \_\_\_\_\_>> (less withholding), and your share of the PAGA Penalties is estimated to <<be \$ \_\_\_\_\_>>.** The actual amount you may receive likely will be different and will depend on a number of factors. (If \$0.00 is stated, then according to Defendant's records you are not eligible for that payment.)

The above estimates are based on Defendant's records showing that **you worked << \_\_\_\_\_>> Class Workweeks** during the Class Period and **you worked << \_\_\_\_\_>> pay periods** during the PAGA Period. If you believe that you worked more workweeks and/or pay periods during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section 5 of this Notice below.

The Court has already preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and approved this Notice. The Court has not yet decided whether to grant final approval. Your legal rights are affected whether you act or do not act. Read this Notice carefully. You will be deemed to have carefully read and understood it. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will decide whether to finally approve the Settlement and how much of the Settlement will be paid to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs’ attorneys (“Class Counsel”). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Defendant to make payments under the Settlement and requires Class Members and Aggrieved Employees to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Defendant.

If you worked for Defendant during the Class Period and/or the PAGA Period, you have two basic options under the Settlement:

- (1) **Do Nothing.** You don’t have to do anything to participate in the proposed Settlement and be eligible for an Individual Class Payment, and/or a share of the PAGA Penalties. As a Participating Class Member, though, you will give up your right to assert Class Period wage claims against Defendant as described below in Section 4 below.
- (2) **Opt-Out of the Class Settlement.** You can exclude yourself from the Class Settlement (opt-out) by submitting the written Request for Exclusion or otherwise notifying the Administrator in writing. If you opt-out of the Settlement, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment, however you will preserve your right to personally pursue Class Period wage claims against Defendant. If you are an Aggrieved Employee, you remain eligible for a share of the PAGA Penalties. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement.

**Defendant will not retaliate against you for any actions you take with respect to the proposed Settlement.**

<b>SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT:</b>	
<b>You Don’t Have to Do Anything to Participate in the Settlement</b>	If you do nothing, you will be a Participating Class Member, eligible for an Individual Class Payment and a share of the PAGA Penalties (if any). In exchange, you will give up your right to assert the wage claims against Defendant that are covered by this Settlement (Released Class Claims).
<b>You Can Opt-out of the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement</b>	If you don’t want to fully participate in the proposed Settlement, you can opt-out of the Class Settlement by sending the Administrator a written Request for Exclusion. Once excluded, you will be a Non-Participating Class Member and no longer eligible for an Individual Class Payment. Non-Participating Class Members cannot object to any portion of the proposed Settlement. See Section 7 of this Notice.
<b>The Opt-out Deadline is _____.</b>	However, you cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement. If you are also an Aggrieved Employee and exclude yourself, you will still be paid your share of the PAGA Penalties and will remain subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims



	regardless of whether you submit a request for exclusion.
<b>Participating Class Members Can Object to the Class Settlement</b>  <b>Written Objections Must be Submitted by the Response Deadline _____</b>	<p>All Class Members who do not opt-out (“Participating Class Members”) can object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement. The Court’s decision whether to finally approve the Settlement will include a determination of how much will be paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiffs who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You can object to the Settlement and/or the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs if you think they are unreasonable.</p> <p>See Section 8 of this Notice.</p>
<b>You Can Participate in the _____ Final Approval Hearing</b>	<p>The Court’s Final Approval Hearing is scheduled to take place on _____ at _____ [a.m./p.m.], at the Kern County Superior Court, located at 1215 Truxtun Ave, Bakersfield, CA 93301, in Department ____ before Judge _____. This hearing may change as explained below in Section 9.</p> <p>You don’t have to attend but you do have the right to appear (or hire an attorney to appear on your behalf at your own cost), in person, by telephone or by using the Court’s virtual appearance platform. Participating Class Members can verbally object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing. See Section 9 of this Notice</p>
<b>You Can Challenge the Calculation of Your Workweeks / Pay Periods</b>  <b>Written Challenges Must be Submitted by the Response Deadline _____ (_____)</b>	<p>The amount of your Individual Class Payment depends on how many workweeks you worked at least one day during the Class Period. The amount of your share of the PAGA Penalties (if any) depends on how many pay periods you worked at least one day during the PAGA Period. The number of Class Period workweeks and number of PAGA Period pay periods you worked according to Defendant’s records is stated on the first page of this Notice. If you disagree with either of these numbers, you must challenge it by _____. See Section 5 of this Notice</p>

**1. What is action about?**

Plaintiffs were employees of Defendant. The Action accuses Defendant of violating California labor laws by failing to pay minimum wages, failing to pay overtime wages, failing to provide required meal periods and unpaid premiums, failing to provide required rest periods and unpaid premiums, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failing to provide required expense reimbursement, failing to provide wages when due, failure to pay sick wages, and engaging in unfair competition. Plaintiffs also seek civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). The First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint, filed \_\_\_\_\_, 2024, is the Operative Complaint in the Action.

Defendant denies that is has done anything wrong and disputes all the claims in the Action.

## **2. What does it mean that the action has settled?**

So far, the Court has made no determination whether Defendant or Plaintiffs are correct on the merits. In the meantime, Plaintiffs and Defendant hired an experienced, neutral mediator in an effort to resolve the Action by negotiating an to end the case by agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations were successful. By signing a lengthy written settlement agreement (“Agreement”) and agreeing to jointly ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Action and enforcing the Agreement, Plaintiffs and Defendant have negotiated a proposed Settlement that is subject to the Court’s Final Approval. Both sides agree the proposed Settlement is a compromise of disputed claims. By agreeing to settle, Defendant does not admit any violations or concede the merit of any claims. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel strongly believe the Settlement is a good deal for you because they believe that: (1) Defendant have agreed to pay a fair, reasonable and adequate amount considering the strength of the claims and the risks and uncertainties of continued litigation; and (2) Settlement is in the best interests of the Class Members. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine Final Approval.

## **3. What are the terms of the Settlement?**

**Gross Settlement Amount.** Defendants has agreed to pay an “all in” amount of **Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$800,000) (the “Gross Settlement Amount”)** to fund the settlement of the Action. The Gross Settlement Amount includes all payments of Individual Class Payments, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payments, the Administration Expenses Payment, and the PAGA Penalties for civil penalties under PAGA. Any employer-side payroll taxes on the portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages shall be separately paid by Defendant. Defendant shall fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant’s share of payroll taxes, by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than 14 days after the Effective Date. The “Effective Date” means the date the Judgment is no longer subject to appeal. Within 14 days after Defendants fund the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members.

**Court Approved Deductions from Gross Settlement Amount.** The proposed payments, subject to Court approval, will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount before payments of Individual Class Payments are made to Class Members who do not request exclusion (“Participating Class Members”). At the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve the following deductions from the Gross Settlement, the amounts of which will be decided by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing:

- **Administration Expenses Payment.** Payment to the Administrator, estimated not to exceed \$20,000, for expenses, including expenses of notifying the Class Members of the Settlement, processing opt outs, and distributing settlement checks and tax forms.

- Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Payment to Class Counsel of reasonable attorneys' fees not to exceed one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which presently equals \$266,666, and an additional amount to reimburse actual litigation costs incurred by the Plaintiffs not to exceed \$30,000. Class Counsel has been prosecuting the Action on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class on a contingency fee basis (that is, without being paid any money to date) and has been paying all litigation costs and expenses. The amounts stated are what Class Counsel will be requesting and the final amounts to be paid will be decided at the Final Approval Hearing.
- Class Representative Service Payments. Class Representative Service Payments in an amount not more than \$10,000 each to the Plaintiffs as service awards, or such lesser amount as may be approved by the Court, to compensate them for services on behalf of the Class in initiating and prosecuting the Action, and for the risks they undertook. The amount stated is what Plaintiffs will be requesting and the final amount to be paid will be decided at the Final Approval Hearing.
- PAGA Penalties. A payment of \$50,000 relating to Plaintiffs' claim under PAGA, \$37,500 of which will be paid to the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"). The remaining \$12,500 will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees as Individual PAGA Payments. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties (\$12,500) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment. "PAGA Pay Period" means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period, which is October 31, 2021, through \_\_\_\_\_.

Participating Class Members have the right to object to any of these deductions. The Court will consider all objections.

Calculation of Payments to Class Members. After all of the payments of the court-approved Attorneys' Fees and Costs, the Class Representative Service Payments, the PAGA Penalties, and the Administration Expenses Payment are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the remaining portion, the "Net Settlement Amount", shall be distributed as Individual Class Payments to the Participating Class Members. The Net Settlement Amount is estimated to be at least \$\_\_\_\_\_. The Administrator will pay an Individual Class Payment from the Net Settlement Amount to each Participating Class Member. The Individual Class Payment for each Participating Class Member will be calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Class Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Class Workweeks. "Class Workweek" means any workweek during the Class Period in which a Class Member worked for Defendant for at least one day. The number of Class Workweeks will be based on Defendant's records; however, Class Members may challenge the number of Class Workweeks as explained below.

**If the Settlement is approved by the Court and you do not exclude yourself, you will automatically be mailed a check for your Individual Class Payment to the same address as this Class Notice. You do not have to do anything to receive a payment.** If your address has changed, you must contact the Administrator to inform them of your correct address to ensure you receive your payment.

Tax Matters. Fifteen Percent (15%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment is in settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). Accordingly, the Wage Portion is subject to wage withholdings, and shall be reported on IRS Form W-2. Eighty-Five Percent (85%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment is in settlement of claims for non-wages, expense reimbursement, interest and penalties allegedly due to employees (collectively the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portion shall not be subject to wage withholdings and shall be reported on IRS Form 1099. The employee portion of all applicable income and payroll taxes will be the responsibility of the Participating Class Members. Neither Class Counsel nor Defendant's Counsel intend anything contained in this Class Notice to constitute advice regarding taxes or taxability. The tax issues for each Participating Class Member are unique to him/her, and each Participating Class Member may wish to consult a tax advisor concerning the tax consequences of the payments received under the Settlement.

Conditions of Settlement. This Settlement and your receipt of the Individual Class Payment is conditioned upon the Court entering an order granting final approval of the Settlement and entering judgment.

The Proposed Settlement Will be Void if the Court Denies Final Approval. It is possible the Court will decline to grant Final Approval of the Settlement or decline to enter a Judgment. Plaintiffs and Defendant have agreed that, in either case, the Settlement will be void: Defendant will not pay any money and Class Members will not release any claims against Defendant.

Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check issued will show the date when the check expires (the void date). If you don't cash it by the void date, your check will be automatically cancelled, and the funds represented by such checks to a charity, which are currently is proposed to be Court Appointed Special Advocates of Kern County.

Administrator. The Court has appointed a neutral company, Apex Class Action (the "Administrator") to send this Notice, calculate and make payments, and process Class Members' Requests for Exclusion. The Administrator will also decide Class Member challenges over Workweeks, mail and re-mail settlement checks and tax forms, and perform other tasks necessary to administer the Settlement. The Administrator's contact information is contained in Section 9 of this Notice.

#### **4. What Do I Release Under the Settlement?**

Released Class Claims. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, dependents, administrators, devisees, legatees, executors, trustees, conservators, guardians, personal representatives, successors, and

assigns, whether individual, class, representative, legal, equitable, direct or indirect, or any other type of any capacity, shall and do hereby forever release, discharge, and agree to hold harmless the Released Parties from all claims during the Class Period that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and ascertained in the course of the Action including any and all claims for: 1) unlawful business practices; 2) failure to pay minimum wages; 3) failure to pay overtime compensation; 4) failure to provide required meal periods and meal period premium pay; 5) failure to provide required rest periods and rest period premium pay; 6) failure to provide accurate and complete itemized statements; 7) failure to reimburse employees for expenses; 8) failure to pay wages when due; and 9) failure to pay sick pay wages (“Released Class Claims”). To the extent based on facts alleged on the Operative Complaint or the PAGA Letter, the Released Class Claims encompass, but are not limited to, all claims pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order, and Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 233, 246, 246.5, 510, 512, 515, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802; California Business and Profession Code §§ 17200, et seq. The Released Class Claims excludes claims, if any, by Class Members for workers compensation; unemployment; disability benefits; causes of action which may be possessed by Class Members (other than the named Plaintiffs) under state or federal discrimination statutes, including, without limitation, wrongful termination and violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act; and class claims outside of the Class Period.

This means that, if you do not timely and formally exclude yourself from the settlement, you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendants and any other Released Party about the Released Class Claims resolved by this Settlement. It also means that all of the Court’s orders in the Action will apply to you and legally bind you.

Released PAGA Claims. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, all Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from all claims, rights, demands, liabilities and causes of action for civil penalties under the PAGA, that Aggrieved Employees have had, now have, or may have in the future against Released Parties based on any acts or omissions occurring during the PAGA Period and were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the PAGA Period facts stated in the Operative Complaint or the PAGA Notice (“Released PAGA Claims”). The Released PAGA Claims include, but are not limited to, claims for PAGA penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 246, 246.5, 510, 512, 515, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2699, et seq, 2802. Released PAGA Claims excludes claims, if any, by Class Members for workers compensation; unemployment; disability benefits; causes of action which may be possessed by Class Members (other than the named Plaintiffs) under state or federal discrimination statutes, including, without limitation, wrongful termination and violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act; and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

Released Parties. The Released Parties are: Defendant and each of its former, future, and present parent, joint venturers, and affiliated corporations and partnerships; their directors, officers, shareholders, principals, owners, members, managers, partners, customers, employees, agents, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors, assigns, subsidiaries.

**5. How much will my payment be?**

Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual Class Payments by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Class Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Class Workweeks.

**Defendant's records reflect that you worked <<\_\_\_\_>> Class Workweeks during the Class Period (February 16, 2020 through \_\_\_\_\_).**

**Based on this information, your estimated Individual Class Payment from the Net Settlement Amount is <<\_\_\_\_>>.**

**Defendant's records reflect that you worked <<\_\_\_\_>> PAGA Pay Periods during the during the PAGA Period (October 31, 2021, through \_\_\_\_\_). Based on this information your estimated Individual PAGA Payment is <<\_\_\_\_>>.**

If you wish to challenge the information set forth above, then you must submit a written, signed dispute challenging the information along with supporting documents, to the Administrator at the address provided in this Class Notice no later than the Response Deadline, which is \_\_\_\_\_ [forty-five (45) days after the mailing of the Class Notice or an additional 14 days in the case of re-mailing]. You may also fax the dispute to \_\_\_\_\_ or email the dispute to \_\_\_\_\_ by no later than the Response Deadline. Any dispute should include credible written evidence and will be resolved by the Administrator.

You need to support your challenge by sending copies of pay stubs or other records. The Administrator will accept Defendant's calculation of Class Workweeks based on Defendant's records as accurate unless you send copies of records containing contrary information. You should send copies rather than originals because the documents will not be returned to you. The Administrator will resolve Class Workweek challenges based on your submission and on input from Class Counsel (who will advocate on behalf of Participating Class Members) and Defendant's Counsel. The Administrator's decision is final. You can't appeal or otherwise challenge its final decision.

**6. How can I get a payment?**

To get money from the Settlement, you do not have to do anything. A check for your Individual Class Payment will be mailed automatically to the same address as this Class Notice.

**Your check will be sent to the same address as this Class Notice. If you change your address, be sure to notify the Administrator as soon as possible. Section 9 of this Class Notice has the Administrator's contact information.**

**7. What if I don't want to be a part of the Settlement?**

If you do not wish to participate in the Settlement, you may exclude yourself from the Class portion of the Settlement or “opt out.” **If you opt out, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment from the Settlement, and you will not be bound by its terms, which means you will retain the right to sue Defendant for the Released Class Claims.** However, Aggrieved Employees who opt out will still be paid their allocation of the PAGA Penalties and will remain subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims regardless of whether they submit a request for exclusion.

To opt out, you must submit to the Administrator a written, signed and dated request to opt-out postmarked no later than the Response Deadline which is \_\_\_\_\_. You may also fax your request to opt out to \_\_\_\_\_ or email the dispute to \_\_\_\_\_ by no later than the Response Deadline. The request to opt-out should state in substance that you wish to be excluded from the class settlement in the *Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods* lawsuit. The request to opt-out should state the Class Member’s full name, address and email address or telephone number. Please include the name and number of the case, which is *Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods*, Case No. BCV-23-100142. The request to opt-out must be completed and signed by you. No other person may opt-out for a living member of the Class.

The address for the Administrator is \_\_\_\_\_. Written requests for exclusion that are postmarked after \_\_\_\_\_, or are incomplete or unsigned will be rejected, and those Class Members will remain bound by the Settlement and the release described above.

## **8. How do I Object to the Settlement?**

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. Before deciding whether to object, you may wish to see what Plaintiffs and Defendant are asking the Court to approve. At least sixteen (16) court days before the Final Approval Hearing, scheduled for \_\_\_\_\_, Class Counsel and Plaintiffs will file in Court a Motion for Final Approval that includes, among other things, the reasons why the proposed Settlement is fair, and the amounts Class Counsel is requesting for attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses and Plaintiffs is requesting as Class Representative Service Payment. Upon reasonable request, Apex Class Action (whose contact information is below) will send you copies of these documents at no cost to you. You can also view them on Apex Class Action’s website at \_\_\_\_\_ for *Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods* or on the website for the California Superior Court for the County of Kern (<https://www.kern.courts.ca.gov/online-services/case-information-search>) and entering the Case No. BCV-23-100142.

A Participating Class Member who disagrees with any aspect of the Agreement, the Motion for Final Approval may wish to object, for example, that the proposed Settlement is unfair, or that the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs are too high or too low. **The Response Deadline for sending written objections to the Administrator is \_\_\_\_\_** [forty-five (45) days after the date of the Notice or an additional 14 days after the Notice in the case of re-mailing]. You may also fax the dispute to \_\_\_\_\_ or email the dispute to \_\_\_\_\_ by no later than this Response Deadline. Be sure to tell the Administrator what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. Make sure you identify the Action, *Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods*, Case No. BCV-23-100142, and

include your name, current address, email or telephone number, and approximate dates of employment for Defendant and sign the objection. The Administrator's contact information is as follows:

Administrator:

Name of Company: Apex Class Action LLC

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Alternatively, a Participating Class Member can object (or personally retain a lawyer to object at your own cost) by attending the Final Approval Hearing. You (or your attorney) should be ready to tell the Court what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. You also have the option to appear at the hearing remotely through the Court's procedure at <https://www.kern.courts.ca.gov/online-services/remote-court-hearings>. Check the Court's website for the most current information. See Section 9 of this Notice (immediately below) for specifics regarding the Final Approval Hearing

The addresses for Parties' counsel are as follows:

**CLASS COUNSEL:**

Kyle Nordrehaug

Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik DeBlouw LLP

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Tel.: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

E-Mail: [kyle@bamlawca.com](mailto:kyle@bamlawca.com)

**COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT:**

Vanessa Franco Chavez

Klein, Denatale, Goldner, Cooper, Rosenlieb & Kimball, LLP

10000 Stockdale Highway, Suite 200

Bakersfield, CA 93311

Tel: (661) 395-1000

E-mail: [vchavez@kleinlaw.com](mailto:vchavez@kleinlaw.com)

**9. Can I Attend the Final Approval Hearing?**

You can, but don't have to, attend the Final Approval Hearing at \_\_\_\_\_ (Pacific Standard Time) on \_\_\_\_\_, in Department T-2 of the Superior Court of California, County of Kern, at 1215 Truxtun Ave, Bakersfield, CA 93301, before Judge T. Mark Smith. At this hearing, the Court will consider whether the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The purpose of this hearing is for the Court to determine whether to grant final approval to the Settlement and to fix the amounts to be paid as attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel and as



service payments to Plaintiffs. If there are objections, the Court will consider them. **You are not required to attend** the Final Approval Hearing, although any Class Member is welcome to attend the hearing using the procedure at <https://www.kern.courts.ca.gov/online-services/remote-court-hearings/remote-hearing-information>, or by telephone using Courtcall (<https://www.courtcall.com/>) at 888-882-6878.

It's possible the Court will reschedule the Final Approval Hearing. If the hearing is continued, notice will be posted on Apex Class Action's website at \_\_\_\_\_ under *Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods*. In addition, hearing dates are posted on the Internet via the Case Information page for the California Superior Court for the County of Kern (<https://www.kern.courts.ca.gov/online-services/case-information-search>) and entering the Case No. BCV-23-100142.

#### **10. How Can I Get More Information?**

You may call the Administrator at \_\_\_\_\_ or write to *Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods* Administrator, c/o \_\_\_\_\_.

This Class Notice summarizes the proposed settlement. More details are in the Settlement Agreement. You may receive a copy of the Settlement Agreement, the Judgment, the motion for attorneys' fees, costs and service award, the motion for final approval or other Settlement documents by going to Apex Class Action's website at \_\_\_\_\_ under *Rodriguez v. Feghali Foods*. You may get more details by examining the Court's file on the Internet via the Case Information page for the California Superior Court for the County of Kern (<https://www.kern.courts.ca.gov/online-services/case-information-search>) and entering the Case No. BCV-23-100142. If you wish to view the Court files in person, you do so at the Clerk's Office at the Metropolitan Division Justice Courthouse, 1215 Truxtun Ave, Bakersfield, CA 93301.

**PLEASE DO NOT CALL THE COURT ABOUT THIS NOTICE.**

#### **IMPORTANT:**

- **What if Your Address Changes** - To receive your check, you should immediately notify the Administrator if you move or otherwise change your mailing address.
- **What if You Fail to Cash a Check** - Settlement checks will be null and void 180 days after issuance if not deposited or cashed, and this expiration date is printed on the check. In such events, the Administrator shall direct all unclaimed funds to be paid to a *cy pres* beneficiary, which is currently proposed to be Court Appointed Special Advocates of Kern County.
- **What if You Lose Your Check** - If your check is lost or misplaced, you should contact the Administrator immediately to request a replacement.

**EXHIBIT B**

[ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL]

**EXHIBIT "B"**

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF KERN

ISAAC RODRIGUEZ, MARIA ALVAREZ,  
CECILIO GUZMAN VIVEROS, KATE  
LOPEZ and GILBERTO SERRATOR  
MORENO, individuals, on behalf of  
themselves and on behalf of all persons  
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FEGHALI FOODS, a Corporation; and DOES  
1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

**CASE NO.: BCV-23-100142**

**[PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY  
APPROVAL ORDER**

Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Hearing Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge: Hon. T. Mark Smith  
Dept: T-2

Date Filed: January 17, 2023  
Trial Date: Not set

This matter came before the Honorable T. Mark Smith of the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County Kern, on \_\_\_\_\_[DATE], for hearing on the unopposed motion by Plaintiffs Isaac Rodriguez, Maria Alvarez, Cecilio Guzman Viveros, Kate Lopez, and Gilberto Serrato Moreno ("Plaintiffs") for preliminary approval of the Settlement with Defendant

1 Feghali Foods (“Defendant”). The Court, having considered the briefs, argument of counsel and  
2 all matters presented to the Court and good cause appearing, hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs’ Motion  
3 for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

4

5 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

6 1. The Court preliminarily approves the Class Action and PAGA Settlement  
7 Agreement (“Agreement”) attached as Exhibit \_\_\_ to the Declaration of Kyle Nordrehaug in  
8 Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. This is based  
9 on the Court’s determination that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is within the range of  
10 possible final approval, pursuant to the provisions of Section 382 of the California Code of Civil  
11 Procedure and California Rules of Court, rule 3.769.

12 2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all  
13 terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Agreement.

14 3. The Gross Settlement Amount that Defendant shall pay is Eight Hundred Thousand  
15 Dollars (\$800,000). It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount and  
16 terms are fair, adequate and reasonable as to all potential Class Members when balanced against  
17 the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability  
18 and damages issues. It further appears that investigation and research have been conducted such  
19 that counsel for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further  
20 appears to the Court that the Settlement will avoid substantial additional costs by all Parties, as  
21 well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the Action.  
22 It further appears that the Settlement has been reached as the result of serious and non-collusive,  
23 arm’s-length negotiations.

24 4. The Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement appears to be within the range of  
25 reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. The  
26 Court has reviewed the monetary recovery that is being granted as part of the Settlement and  
27 preliminarily finds that the monetary settlement made available to the Class is fair, adequate, and  
28

1 reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant  
2 risks relating to certification, liability, and damages issues.

3         5.         The Agreement specifies for an attorneys' fees award not to exceed one-third of the  
4 Gross Settlement Amount, an award of litigation expenses incurred, not to exceed \$30,000, and  
5 proposed Class Representative Service Payments to the Plaintiffs in an amount not to exceed  
6 \$10,000 each, which are payable out of the Gross Settlement Amount. The Court will not approve  
7 the amount of attorneys' fees and costs, nor the amount of any service award, until the Final  
8 Approval Hearing. Plaintiffs will be required to present evidence supporting these requests,  
9 including lodestar, prior to final approval.

10         6.         The Court recognizes that Plaintiffs and Defendant stipulate and agree to  
11 representative treatment and certification of a class for settlement purposes only. This stipulation  
12 will not be deemed admissible in this or any other proceeding should this Settlement not become  
13 final. For settlement purposes only, the Court conditionally certifies the Class which consists of  
14 "all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt  
15 employee at any time during the Class Period." The "Class Period" is February 16, 2020 through  
16 \_\_\_\_\_.

17         7.         The Court concludes that, for settlement purposes only, the Class meets the  
18 requirements for certification under section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure in that:  
19 (a) the Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the Class is  
20 impracticable; (b) common questions of law and fact predominate, and there is a well-defined  
21 community of interest amongst the members of the Class with respect to the subject matter of the  
22 litigation; (c) the claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the members of the Class; (d)  
23 the Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class; (e) a  
24 class action is superior to other available methods for the efficient adjudication of this controversy;  
25 and (f) counsel for the Class is qualified to act as counsel for the Class and the Plaintiffs are  
26 adequate representatives of the Class.

27         8.         The Court provisionally appoints Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class. The  
28

1 Court provisionally appoints Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, Aparajit Bhowmik,  
2 Nicholas J. De Blouw, Jeffrey S. Herman, Sergio J. Puche, and Trevor G. Moran of Blumenthal  
3 Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP as Class Counsel for the Class.

4 9. The Agreement provides for a PAGA Penalties out of the Gross Settlement  
5 Amount of \$50,000, which shall be allocated \$37,500 to the Labor & Workforce Development  
6 Agency (“LWDA”) as the LWDA’s 75% share of the settlement of civil penalties paid under this  
7 Agreement pursuant to the PAGA and \$12,500 to the Aggrieved Employees. “Aggrieved  
8 Employees” are all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a  
9 non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period (October 31, 2021 through  
10 \_\_\_\_\_). Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (1)(2), the LWDA will be  
11 provided notice of the Agreement and these settlement terms. The Court finds the PAGA  
12 Penalties to be reasonable.

13 10. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the Class Notice attached to the  
14 Agreement as Exhibit A. The Court finds that the Class Notice appears to fully and accurately  
15 inform the Class of all material elements of the proposed Settlement, of the Class Members’ right  
16 to be excluded from the Class by submitting a written opt-out request, and of each member’s right  
17 and opportunity to object to the Settlement. The Court further finds that the distribution of the  
18 Class Notice substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Agreement and this Order meets  
19 the requirements of due process, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall  
20 constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court orders the mailing of  
21 the Class Notice by first class mail and posting of the Class Notice on the internet pursuant to the  
22 terms set forth in the Agreement. If a Class Notice Packet is returned because of an incorrect  
23 address, the Administrator will promptly search for a more current address for the Class Member  
24 and re-mail the Class Notice Packet to any new address for the Class Member no later than seven  
25 (7) days after the receipt of the undelivered Class Notice.

26 11. The Court hereby appoints Apex Class Action LLC as the Administrator. No later  
27 than fifteen (15) days after this Order, Defendant will provide the Class Data to the Administrator.

1 The Administrator will perform address updates and verifications as necessary prior to the first  
2 mailing. Using best efforts to mail it as soon as possible, and in no event later than fourteen (14)  
3 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will mail the Class Notice Packet to all  
4 Class Members via first-class regular U.S. Mail to their last known address and will post the Class  
5 Notice on its website pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.

6 12. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure for exclusion  
7 from the Settlement. Any Class Member may individually choose to opt out of and be excluded  
8 from the Class as provided in the Class Notice by following the instructions for requesting  
9 exclusion from the Class that are set forth in the Class Notice. All requests for exclusion must be  
10 postmarked or received no later than forty-five (45) calendar days after the date of the mailing of  
11 the Class Notice (“Response Deadline”). If a Class Notice Packet is re-mailed, the Response  
12 Deadline for requests for exclusion will be extended an additional fourteen (14) days. A Request  
13 for Exclusion may also be faxed or emailed to the Administrator as indicated in the Class Notice.  
14 Any such person who chooses to opt out of and be excluded from the Class will not be entitled to  
15 any recovery under the Class Settlement and will not be bound by the Class Settlement or have  
16 any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. Class Members who have not requested exclusion  
17 shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Agreement and the Judgment. A request for  
18 exclusion may only opt out that particular individual, and any attempt to effect an opt-out of a  
19 group, class, or subclass of individuals is not permitted and will be deemed invalid.

20 13. Any Class Member who has not opted out may appear at the final approval hearing  
21 and may object or express the Member’s views regarding the Settlement and may present evidence  
22 and file briefs or other papers that may be proper and relevant to the issues to be heard and  
23 determined by the Court as provided in the Class Notice. Class Members will have until the  
24 Response Deadline to submit their written objections to the Administrator. Written objections  
25 may also be faxed or emailed to the Administrator as indicated in the Class Notice. If a Class  
26 Notice Packet is re-mailed, the Response Deadline for written objections will be extended an  
27  
28

1 additional fourteen (14) days. Alternatively, Class Members may appear at the Final Approval  
2 Hearing to make an oral objection.

3 14. A final approval hearing shall be held before this Court on \_\_\_\_\_  
4 \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ in Department \_\_\_\_ of the Kern County Superior Court to hear the  
5 motion for final approval and the motion for attorneys' fees and costs, and to determine all  
6 necessary matters concerning the Settlement, including: whether the proposed settlement of the  
7 Action on the terms and conditions provided for in the Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable  
8 and should be finally approved by the Court; whether the Final Approval Order and Judgment  
9 should be entered herein; whether the plan of allocation contained in the Agreement should be  
10 approved as fair, adequate and reasonable to the Class Members; and to finally approve attorneys'  
11 fees and costs, service award, and the fees and expenses of the Administrator. All papers in  
12 support of the motion for final approval and for attorneys' fees, costs and service award shall be  
13 filed with the Court and served on all counsel no later than sixteen (16) court days before the  
14 hearing and the motion shall be heard at this final approval hearing.

15 15. Neither the Settlement nor any exhibit, document, or instrument delivered  
16 thereunder shall be construed as a concession or admission by Defendant in any way that the  
17 claims asserted have any merit or that this Action was properly brought as a class or representative  
18 action, and shall not be used as evidence of, or used against Defendant as, an admission or  
19 indication in any way, including with respect to any claim of any liability, wrongdoing, fault or  
20 omission by Defendant or with respect to the truth of any allegation asserted by any person.  
21 Whether or not the Settlement is finally approved, neither the Settlement, nor any exhibit,  
22 document, statement, proceeding or conduct related to the Settlement, nor any reports or accounts  
23 thereof, shall in any event be construed as, offered or admitted in evidence as, received as or  
24 deemed to be evidence for any purpose adverse to the Defendant, including, but not limited to,  
25 evidence of a presumption, concession, indication or admission by Defendant of any liability,  
26 fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession or damage.

27  
28



1           16.     In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms  
2 of the Agreement, or the Settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, canceled or fails to  
3 become effective for any reason, this Order shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated,  
4 and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement,  
5 and expressly reserve their respective rights regarding the prosecution and defense of this Action,  
6 including all available defenses and affirmative defenses, and arguments that any claim in the  
7 Action could not be certified as a class action and/or managed as a representative action . In such  
8 an event, the Court’s orders regarding the Settlement, including this Order, shall not be used or  
9 referred to in litigation for any purpose. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to alter the terms of  
10 the Agreement with respect to the effect of the Agreement if it is not approved.

11           17.     The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the final approval  
12 hearing and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to Class Members and  
13 retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the  
14 proposed Settlement.

15           **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 HON. T. MARK SMITH  
19 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**EXHIBIT C**

[FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT]

**EXHIBIT "C"**

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF KERN

ISAAC RODRIGUEZ, MARIA ALVAREZ,  
CECILIO GUZMAN VIVEROS, KATE  
LOPEZ and GILBERTO SERRATOR  
MORENO, individuals, on behalf of  
themselves and on behalf of all persons  
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FEGHALI FOODS, a Corporation; and DOES  
1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

**CASE NO.: BCV-23-100142**

**[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL  
ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Hearing Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge: Hon. T. Mark Smith  
Dept: T-2

Date Filed: January 17, 2023  
Trial Date: Not set

1 The unopposed motion of Plaintiffs Isaac Rodriguez, Maria Alvarez, Cecilio Guzman  
2 Viveros, Kate Lopez, and Gilberto Serrato Moreno (“Plaintiffs”) for an order finally approving the  
3 Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) with Defendant Feghali Foods  
4 (“Defendant”), attorneys’ fees and costs, service payment, and the expenses of the Administrator  
5 duly came on for hearing on \_\_\_\_\_ before the Honorable T. Mark Smith.

6 **I.**

7 **FINDINGS**

8 Based on the oral and written argument and evidence presented in connection with the  
9 motion, the Court makes the following findings:

- 10 1. All terms used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in the Agreement.  
11 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation pending before  
12 the Superior Court for the State of California, in and for the County of Kern, and over all Parties to  
13 this litigation, including the Class.

14 3. Based on a review of the papers submitted by Plaintiffs and a review of the  
15 applicable law, the Court finds that the Gross Settlement Amount of is Eight Hundred Thousand  
16 Dollars (\$800,000) and the terms set forth in the Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate.  
17 The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA  
18 Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation  
19 Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payments, and the Administration Expenses  
20 Payment. This Gross Settlement Amount is an all-in amount without any reversion to Defendant,  
21 and excludes any employer payroll taxes, if any, due on the portion of the Individual Class  
22 Payments allocated to wages which shall not be paid from the Gross Settlement and shall be the  
23 separate additional obligation of Defendant.

24 4. The Court further finds that the Settlement was the result of arm’s length  
25 negotiations conducted after Class Counsel had adequately investigated the claims and became  
26 familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of those claims. In particular, the amount of the  
27 Settlement, and the assistance of an experienced mediator in the settlement process, among other  
28

1 factors, support the Court's conclusion that the Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable,  
2 adequate, consistent, and compliant with all applicable requirements of the California Code of  
3 Civil Procedure, the California and United States Constitutions, including the Due Process clauses,  
4 the California Rules of Court, and any other applicable law, and in the best interest of each of the  
5 Parties and Class Members.

6 **Preliminary Approval of the Settlement**

7 5. On \_\_\_\_\_, the Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement. At  
8 this same time, the Court approved conditional certification of the Class for settlement purposes  
9 only.

10 **Notice to the Class**

11 6. The Court is satisfied that \_\_\_\_\_, which was appointed as the Administrator,  
12 completed the distribution of the Class Notice to the Class in a manner that comports with  
13 California Rule of Court 3.766. The Class Notice informed \_\_\_\_\_ prospective Class Members of  
14 the Agreement's terms, their rights under the Agreement to receive their settlement share, their  
15 rights to submit a request for exclusion, their rights to comment on or object to the Agreement,  
16 and their rights to appear at the Final Approval and Fairness hearing, and be heard regarding  
17 approval of the Agreement. Sufficient periods of time to respond and to act were provided by each  
18 of these procedures.

19 7. In compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order, the Court-approved Class  
20 Notice was mailed by first class mail to members of the Class at their last-known addresses on or  
21 about \_\_\_\_\_, as well as posted on the Administrator's website on the same date.  
22 Mailing of the Class Notice to their last-known addresses and posting the notice on the  
23 Administrator's website was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and was  
24 reasonably calculated to communicate actual notice of the litigation and the proposed settlement to  
25 the Class. The Class Notice given to the Class Members fully and accurately informed the Class  
26 Members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and of their opportunity to object to  
27 or comment thereon or to seek exclusion from the Settlement; was valid, due, and sufficient notice  
28

1 to all Class Members; and complied fully with the laws of the State of California, the United  
2 States Constitution, due process and other applicable law. The Class Notice fairly and adequately  
3 described the Settlement and provided Class Members adequate instructions and a variety of  
4 means to obtain additional information.

5 8. The Response Deadline for opting out or submitting written objections to the  
6 Settlement was \_\_\_\_\_, which for re-mailings was extended by fourteen (14) days. There  
7 was an adequate interval between notice and the deadline to permit Class Members to choose what  
8 to do and to act on their decision. A full and fair opportunity has been afforded to the Class  
9 Members to participate in this hearing, and all Class Members and other persons wishing to be  
10 heard have had a full and fair opportunity to be heard. Class Members also have had a full and  
11 fair opportunity to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement and Class. Accordingly, the  
12 Court determines that all Class Members who did not timely and properly submit a request for  
13 exclusion are bound by the Settlement and this Final Approval Order and Judgment.

14 **Fairness of the Settlement**

15 9. The Agreement is entitled to a presumption of fairness. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*  
16 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996).

17 a. The settlement was reached through arm's-length bargaining between the  
18 Parties during an all-day mediation before Tagore Subramaniam, Esq., an experienced mediator of  
19 wage and hour class actions. There has been no collusion between the Parties in reaching the  
20 Settlement.

21 b. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel's investigation and discovery have been  
22 sufficient to allow the Court and counsel to act intelligently.

23 c. Counsel for all Parties are experienced in similar employment class action  
24 litigation. Class Counsel recommended approval of the Agreement.

25 d. The percentage of objectors and requests for exclusion is small. \_\_\_\_\_  
26 objections were received. \_\_\_\_\_ requests for exclusion were received.

27  
28

1 e. \_\_\_\_\_ Class Members will be mailed a settlement payment, representing  
2 \_\_\_\_\_ % of the overall Class.

3 10. The consideration to be given to the Class Members under the terms of the  
4 Agreement is fair, reasonable and adequate considering the strengths and weaknesses of the  
5 claims asserted in this action and is fair, reasonable and adequate compensation for the release of  
6 Class Members' claims, given the uncertainties and significant risks of the litigation and the  
7 delays which would ensue from continued prosecution of the action.

8 11. The Agreement is finally approved as fair, adequate and reasonable and in the best  
9 interests of the Class Members.

10 **Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment**

11 12. From the Gross Settlement Amount, an award of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for attorneys'  
12 fees, representing one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for litigation  
13 costs and expenses, is reasonable, in light of the contingent nature of Class Counsel's fee, the  
14 hours worked by Class Counsel, and the results achieved by Class Counsel. The requested award  
15 has been supported by Class Counsel's lodestar and billing statement.

16 **Class Representative Service Payments**

17 13. The Agreement provides for Class Representative Service Payments of not more  
18 than \$10,000 each to the Plaintiffs, subject to the Court's approval. The Court finds that Class  
19 Representative Service Payments in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ from the Gross Settlement  
20 Amount to each of the Plaintiffs is reasonable in light of the risks and burdens undertaken by the  
21 Plaintiffs in this litigation and for their time and effort in bringing and prosecuting this matter on  
22 behalf of the Class.

23 **Administration Expenses Payment**

24 14. The Administrator shall calculate and administer the payment to be made to the  
25 Class Members, transmit payment for attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, transmit the  
26 Class Representative Service Payments to the Plaintiffs, issue all required tax reporting forms,  
27 calculate withholdings and perform the other remaining duties set forth in the Agreement. The  
28

1 Administrator has documented \$ \_\_\_\_\_ in fees and expenses, and this amount is reasonable in  
2 light of the work performed by the Administrator.

3 **PAGA Penalties**

4 15. The Agreement provides for a PAGA Penalties out of the Gross Settlement  
5 Amount of \$50,000, which shall be allocated \$37,500 to the Labor & Workforce Development  
6 Agency (“LWDA”) as the LWDA’s 75% share of the settlement of civil penalties paid under this  
7 Agreement pursuant to the PAGA and \$12,500 to be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees and  
8 allocated by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees’ 25% share of PAGA Penalties  
9 (\$12,500) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during  
10 the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee’s PAGA Pay  
11 Periods. “Aggrieved Employees” are all individuals who were employed by Defendant in  
12 California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period (October  
13 31, 2021 through \_\_\_\_\_). Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (1)(2), the  
14 LWDA was provided notice of the Agreement and these settlement terms and has not indicated  
15 any objection thereto. The Court finds the PAGA Penalties to be reasonable.

16 **II.**

17 **ORDERS**

18 Based on the foregoing findings, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

19 16. The Class is certified for the purposes of settlement only. The Class is defined as  
20 follows, which the Court deems sufficient for the purpose of rule 3.765(a) of the California Rules  
21 of Court and solely for the purposes of effectuating the Agreement:

22 All individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a  
23 non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period (February 16, 2020  
through \_\_\_\_\_).

24 17. The Court finds that an ascertainable class of \_\_\_\_ class members exists and a  
25 well-defined community of interest exists on the questions of law ad fact involved because in the  
26 context of the Agreement: (i) all related matters, predominate over any individual questions; (ii)  
27 the claims of the Plaintiff are typical of claims of the Class Members; and (iii) in negotiating,  
28



1 entering into and implementing the Agreement, Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s counsel have fairly and  
2 adequately represented and protected the interest of the Class Members.

3 18. All persons who meet the foregoing definition are members of the Class, except for  
4 those individuals who filed a valid request for exclusion (“opt out”) from the Class. [INSERT  
5 REFERENCE TO IDENTIFY ANY OPT OUTS].

6 19. The Agreement is hereby finally approved as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the  
7 best interest of the Class. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund  
8 the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant’s share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to  
9 the Administrator no later than 14 days after the Effective Date.

10 20. Class Counsel are awarded attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$\_\_\_\_\_ and  
11 costs in the amount of \$\_\_\_\_\_, payable from the Gross Settlement Amount. Class Counsel  
12 shall not seek or obtain any other compensation or reimbursement from Defendant, Plaintiffs or  
13 members of the Class.

14 21. The payment of Class Representative Service Payments from the Gross Settlement  
15 Amount in the amount of \$\_\_\_\_\_ to each of the Plaintiffs is approved.

16 22. The payment of \$\_\_\_\_\_ to the Administrator for its fees and expenses  
17 from the Gross Settlement Amount is approved.

18 23. The PAGA Penalties amount of \$50,000 is approved and is to be distributed from  
19 the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with the Agreement.

20 24. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (1)(2), Class Counsel shall  
21 submit a copy of this Final Approval Order and Judgment to the LWDA within 10 days after its  
22 entry.

23 25. Neither the Agreement nor this Settlement is an admission by Defendant, nor is this  
24 Final Approval Order and Judgment a finding, of the validity of any claims in the Action or of any  
25 wrongdoing by Defendant or that this Action is appropriate for class or representative treatment  
26 (other than for settlement purposes). Neither this Final Approval Order and Judgment, the  
27 Agreement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Agreement  
28

1 is, may be construed as, or may be used as an admission by or against Defendant of any fault,  
2 wrongdoing or liability whatsoever. The entering into or carrying out of the Agreement, and any  
3 negotiations or proceedings related thereto, shall not in any event be construed as, or deemed to be  
4 evidence of, an admission or concession with regard to the denials or defenses by Defendant.  
5 Notwithstanding these restrictions, Defendant may file in the Action or in any other proceeding  
6 this Final Approval Order and Judgment, the Agreement, or any other papers and records on file in  
7 the Action as evidence of the Settlement to support a defense of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel,  
8 release, or other theory of claim or issue preclusion or similar defense as to the Released Class  
9 Claims and/or Released PAGA Claims.

10           26.     The Court directs the Parties to effectuate the Agreement according to its terms and  
11 declares the Agreement to be binding on all Class Members who did not timely submit a Request  
12 for Exclusion and on all Aggrieved Employees, whether or not they submitted a Request for  
13 Exclusion.

14           27.     Notice of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment shall be given to all  
15 Parties by Class Counsel on behalf of Plaintiffs and all Class Members. The Final Approval Order  
16 and Judgment shall be posted on Administrator's website as set forth in the Class Notice to the  
17 Class. It shall not be necessary to send notice of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment  
18 to individual Class Members.

19           28.     If the Agreement does not become final and effective in accordance with the terms  
20 of the Agreement, then this Final Approval Order and Judgment, and all orders entered in  
21 connection herewith, shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated, and the Parties shall  
22 revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement, and expressly reserve  
23 their respective rights regarding the prosecution and defense of this Action, including all available  
24 defenses and affirmative defenses, and arguments that any claim in the Action could not be  
25 certified as a class action and/or managed as a representative action.

26 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDICATED AND DECREED THAT:**

27  
28

1           29.     Except as set forth in the Agreement and this Final Approval Order and Judgment,  
2 Plaintiff, and all members of the Class, shall take nothing in the Action.

3           30.     All Parties shall bear their own attorneys' fees and costs, except as otherwise  
4 provided in the Agreement and in this Final Approval Order and Judgment.

5           31.     Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement  
6 Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class  
7 Payments, Plaintiffs, Participating Class Members, and the LWDA will release claims against all  
8 Released Parties as follows:

9                   (a)     All Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their  
10 respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, dependents, administrators,  
11 devisees, legatees, executors, trustees, conservators, guardians, personal representatives,  
12 successors, and assigns, whether individual, class, representative, legal, equitable, direct or  
13 indirect, or any other type of any capacity, shall and do hereby forever release, discharge, and  
14 agree to hold harmless the Released Parties from all claims during the Class Period that were  
15 alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative  
16 Complaint and ascertained in the course of the Action including any and all claims for: 1)  
17 unlawful business practices; 2) failure to pay minimum wages; 3) failure to pay overtime  
18 compensation; 4) failure to provide required meal periods and meal period premium pay; 5) failure  
19 to provide required rest periods and rest period premium pay; 6) failure to provide accurate and  
20 complete itemized statements; 7) failure to reimburse employees for expenses; 8) failure to pay  
21 wages when due; and 9) failure to pay sick pay wages ("Released Class Claims"). To the extent  
22 based on facts alleged on the Operative Complaint or the PAGA Letter, the Released Class Claims  
23 encompass, but are not limited to, all claims pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order, and  
24 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 233, 246, 246.5, 510, 512, 515,  
25 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802; California Business and Profession Code §§ 17200, et  
26 seq. The Released Class Claims excludes claims, if any, by Class Members for workers  
27 compensation; unemployment; disability benefits; causes of action which may be possessed by  
28

1 Class Members (other than the named Plaintiffs) under state or federal discrimination statutes,  
2 including, without limitation, wrongful termination and violation of the Fair Employment and  
3 Housing Act; and class claims outside of the Class Period. The “Released Parties,” as used herein,  
4 are Defendant and each of its former, future, and present parent, joint venturers, and affiliated  
5 corporations and partnerships; their directors, officers, shareholders, principals, owners, members,  
6 managers, partners, customers, employees, agents, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors,  
7 assigns, subsidiaries.

8 (b) All Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves  
9 and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators,  
10 successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from all claims, rights, demands, liabilities and  
11 causes of action for civil penalties under the PAGA, that Aggrieved Employees have had, now  
12 have, or may have in the future against Released Parties based on any acts or omissions occurring  
13 during the PAGA Period and were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the  
14 PAGA Period facts stated in the Operative Complaint or the PAGA Notice (“Released PAGA  
15 Claims”). The Released PAGA Claims include, but are not limited to, claims for PAGA penalties  
16 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 246, 246.5,  
17 510, 512, 515, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2699, et seq, 2802. Released PAGA  
18 Claims excludes claims, if any, by Class Members for workers compensation; unemployment;  
19 disability benefits; causes of action which may be possessed by Class Members (other than the  
20 named Plaintiffs) under state or federal discrimination statutes, including, without limitation,  
21 wrongful termination and violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act; and PAGA claims  
22 outside of the PAGA Period.

23 (c) Plaintiffs and his or her respective former and present spouses,  
24 representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, dependents, administrators, devisees, legatees, executors,  
25 trustees, conservators, guardians, personal representatives, successors, and assigns, whether  
26 individual, class, representative, legal, equitable, direct or indirect, or any other type of any  
27  
28

1 capacity, shall and does hereby forever generally release, discharge, and agree to hold harmless  
2 the Released Parties from the Plaintiffs' Release, as set forth fully in the Agreement.

3 32. For any Class Member or Aggrieved Employee whose Individual Class Payment  
4 check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the  
5 Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to the Court Appointed Special  
6 Advocates of Kern County as the Cy Pres Recipient, which the Court approves as the cy pres  
7 beneficiary pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b).

8 33. The Court hereby enters judgment in the entire Action as of the filing date of this  
9 Order and Judgment, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Settlement. Without affecting the  
10 finality of this Order and Judgment in any way, the Court hereby retains continuing jurisdiction,  
11 including jurisdiction pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6 and rule  
12 3.769(h) of the California Rules of Court, solely for the purposes of enforcing the Agreement,  
13 addressing settlement administration matters, and addressing such post-judgment matters as may  
14 be appropriate under court rules or applicable law.

15 34. Plaintiff shall file with the Court a report regarding the status of distribution within  
16 180 days after all funds have been distributed.

17 35. This final judgment is intended to be a final disposition of the above-captioned  
18 action in its entirety and is intended to be immediately appealable. This final judgment resolves  
19 and extinguishes all claims released by the Agreement against Defendant and Released Parties.

20 36. The Court hereby sets a hearing date of \_\_\_\_\_ at  
21 \_\_\_\_\_ am/pm for a hearing on the final accounting and distribution of the settlement funds.

22 **LET JUDGMENT BE FORTHWITH ENTERED ACCORDINGLY. IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23

24 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

25

26

27

28

\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. T. MARK SMITH  
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

**EXHIBIT #2**

**Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP**

2255 Calle Clara, La Jolla, California 92037

Tel: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (885) 551-1232

**FIRM RESUME**

Areas of Practice: Employee, Consumer and Securities Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Civil Litigation, Business Litigation.

**ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES**

**Norman B. Blumenthal**

Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)

Practice Areas: Consumer and Securities Class Action, Civil Litigation, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Transactional Law

Admitted: 1973, Illinois; 1976, California

Biography: Law Clerk to Justice Thomas J. Moran, Illinois Supreme Court, 1973-1975, while on Illinois Court of Appeals. Instructor, Oil and Gas Law: California Western School of Law, 1981; University of San Diego School of Law, 1983. Sole Practitioner 1976-1987. Partner, Blumenthal & Ostroff, 1988-1995. Partner, Blumenthal, Ostroff & Markham, 1995-2001. Partner, Blumenthal & Markham, 2001-2007. Partner, Blumenthal & Nordrehaug, 2007. Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2018. Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 2018 - present.

Member: San Diego County, Illinois State and American Bar Associations; State Bar of California.

Educated: University of Wisconsin (B.A., 1970); Loyola University of Chicago (J.D., 1973);

Summer Intern (1971) with Harvard Voluntary Defenders

**Kyle R. Nordrehaug**

Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)

Practice Areas: Consumer and Securities Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Civil Litigation

Admitted: 1999, California

Biography: Associate, Blumenthal, Ostroff & Markham, 1999-2001. Associate, Blumenthal & Markham, 2001-2007. Partner, Blumenthal & Nordrehaug, 2007. Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2017

Member: State Bar of California, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, Third Circuit Court of Appeals

Educated: University of California at Berkeley (B.A., 1994); University of San Diego School of Law (J.D. 1999)

Awards: Top Labor & Employment Attorney 2016; Top Appellate Reversal - Daily Journal 2015; Super Lawyer 2015-2018

**Aparajit Bhowmik**

Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2006, California

Educated: University of California at San Diego (B.A., 2002); University of San Diego School of Law (J.D. 2006)

Biography: Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2017

Awards: Rising Star 2015

**Nicholas J. De Blouw**

Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)  
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions  
Admitted: 2011, California  
Educated: Wayne State University (B.A. 2008); California Western School of Law (J.D. 2011)

**Piya Mukherjee**

Associate Attorney  
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions  
Admitted: 2010, California  
Educated: University of California, San Diego (B.S. 2006); University of Southern California, Gould School of Law (J.D. 2010)

**Victoria Rivapalacio**

Associate Attorney  
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions  
Admitted: 2011, California  
Educated: University of California at San Diego (B.A., 2003); George Washington University Law School (J.D. 2010)

**Ricardo Ehmman**

Associate Attorney  
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions  
Admitted: 2018, California; 2004, Nevada  
Educated: University of California, San Diego (B.A. 1998); Loyola Law School (J.D. 2001)

**Jeffrey S. Herman**

Associate Attorney  
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions  
Admitted: 2011, California; 2016 Arizona  
Educated: University of Michigan (B.A. 2008); California Western School of Law (J.D. 2011)

**Charlotte James**

Associate Attorney  
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions  
Admitted: 2016, California  
Educated: San Diego State University; California Western School of Law

**Christine Levu**

Associate Attorney  
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions  
Admitted: 2012, California  
Educated: University of California, Irvine; California Western School of Law

**Andrew Ronan**

Associate Attorney  
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions  
Admitted: 2016, California  
Educated: Arizona State University; University of San Diego School of Law



**Scott Blumenthal**

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2020, New Mexico

Educated: University of Southern California; California Western School of Law

**Sergio Julian Puche**

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2013, California

Educated: University of California, Irvine; California Western School of Law

**Trevor Moran**

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2020, California

Educated: University of Rhode Island; California Western School of Law

**Adolfo Sanchez Contreras**

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2024, California; 2014, Mexico

Educated: The Juarez University

**REPORTED CASES**

Sakkab v. Luxottica Retail N. Am., Inc., 803 F.3d 425 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2015) (The panel reversed the district court's order granting Luxottica Retail North America, Inc.'s motion to compel arbitration of claims and dismissing plaintiff's first amended complaint, in a putative class action raising class employment-related claims and a non-class representative claim for civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act.);

Securitas Security Services USA, Inc. v. Superior Court, 234 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 1109 (Cal. Feb. 27, 2015) (Court of Appeal concluded the trial court correctly ruled that *Iskanian* rendered the PAGA waiver within the parties' dispute resolution agreement unenforceable. However, the Court of Appeal then ruled the trial court erred by failing to invalidate the non-severable class action waiver from the agreement and remanded the entire complaint, including class action and PAGA claims, be litigated in the Superior Court);

Sussex v. United States Dist. Court for the Dist. of Nev., 781 F.3d 1065 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2015) (The panel determined that the district court clearly erred in holding that its decision to intervene mid-arbitration was justified under *Aerojet-General*. Specifically, the panel held that the district court erred in predicting that an award issued by the arbitrator would likely be vacated because of his "evident partiality" under 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(2).);

Provost v. YourMechanic, Inc., 2020 Cal. App. Lexis 955 (Oct. 15, 2020) (Court of Appeals affirmed denial of arbitration of PAGA claim, and held in a case of first impression, that there was no additional standing rules for PAGA claim brought by independent contractor);

In re Tobacco Cases II, 41 Cal. 4th 1257 (2007); Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court, 24 Cal. 4th 906 (2001); Rocker v. KPMG LLP, 148 P.3d 703; 122 Nev. 1185 (2006); PCO, Inc. v. Christensen, Miller, Fink, Jacobs, Glaser, Weil & Shapiro, LLP, 150 Cal. App. 4th 384 (2007); Hall v. County of Los Angeles, 148 Cal. App. 4th 318 (2007); Coshov v. City of Escondido, 132 Cal. App. 4th 687 (2005); Daniels v. Philip Morris, 18 F.Supp 2d 1110 (S.D. Cal.1998); Gibson v. World Savings & Loan Asso., 103 Cal. App. 4th 1291 (2003); Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles,

75 Cal. App. 4th 445 (1999); Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles, 100 Cal.App. 4th 431 (2002); Norwest Mortgage, Inc. v. Superior Court, 72 Cal.App.4th 214 (1999); Hildago v. Diversified Transp. Sya, 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 3207 (9th Cir. 1998); Kensington Capital Mgal. v. Oakley, Inc., 1999 U.S. Dist LEXIS 385; Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P90, 411 (1999 C.D. Cal.); Lister v. Oakley, Inc., 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 384; Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P90,409 (C.D. Cal. 1999); Olszewski v. Scripps Health, 30 Cal. 4th 798 (2003); Steroid Hormone Product Cases, 181 Cal. App. 4th 145 (2010); Owen v. Macy's, Inc., 175 Cal. App. 4th 462 (2009); Taiheiyo Cement Corp. v. Superior Court, 117 Cal. App. 4th 380 (2004); Taiheiyo Cement Corp. v. Superior Court, 105 Cal.App. 4th 398 (2003); McMeans v. Scripps Health, Inc., 100 Cal. App. 4th 507 (2002); Ramos v. Countrywide Home Loans, 82 Cal.App. 4th 615 (2000); Tevssier v. City of San Diego, 81 Cal.App. 4th 685 (2000); Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court, 70 Cal. App. 4th 299 (1999); Silvas v. E\*Trade Mortg. Corp., 514 F.3d 1001 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008); Silvas v. E\*Trade Mortg. Corp., 421 F. Supp. 2d 1315 (S.D. Cal. 2006); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26544 (S.D. Cal. 2009); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 251 F.R.D. 514 (S.D. Cal. 2008); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 247 F.R.D. 598 (S.D. Cal. 2007); Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27365 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Wise v. Cubic Def. Applications, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11225 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Gabisan v. Pelican Prods., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1391 (S.D. Cal. 2009); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 630 F. Supp. 2d 1222 (S.D. Cal. 2009); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102380 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Louie v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Weltman v. Ortho Mattress, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20521 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Weltman v. Ortho Mattress, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60344 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Curry v. CTB McGraw-Hill, LLC, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5920; 97 A.F.T.R.2d (RIA) 1888; 37 Employee Benefits Cas. (BNA) 2390 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Reynov v. ADP Claims Servs. Group, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94332 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 248 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38889 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 57766 (S.D. Cal. 2007); Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers, LLC, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29503 (D. Nev. 2009); Picus v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 256 F.R.D. 651 (D. Nev. 2009); Tull v. Stewart Title of Cal., Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14171 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Keshishzadeh v. Gallagher, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 46805 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Keshishzadeh v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 116380 (S.D. Cal. 2010); In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL Docket No. 1850 (All Cases), 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94603 (D.N.J. 2008); In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig., 629 F.3d 333 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 2010); Puentes v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc., 160 Cal. App. 4th 638 (2008); Rezec v. Sony Pictures Entertainment, Inc., 116 Cal. App. 4th 135 (2004); Badillo v. Am. Tobacco Co., 202 F.R.D. 261 (D. Nev. 2001); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin., 2010 U.S. App. Lexis 23025 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010); Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 36650 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Rix v. Lockheed Martin Corp., 2011 U.S. Dist Lexis 25422 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Weitzke v. Costar Realty Info., Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist Lexis 20605 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Goodman v. Platinum Condo. Dev., LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36044 (D. Nev. 2011); Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers, LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14502 (D. Nev. 2011); Smith v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 117869 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Dobrosky v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., LLC, No. EDCV 13-0646 JGB (SPx), 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106345 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2014); Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC - Class Certification Granted, Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC, No. EDCV 16-1133 JGB (KKx), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73656 (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2017); Nelson v. Avon Products, Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court for The Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02276-BLF, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51104 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2015); Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works Inc., Class Certification Granted, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23179 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2017); Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Summary Judgment *Sua*

*Sponte* Granted for Plaintiff, Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Inc., 870 F. Supp. 2d 856 (C.D. Cal. 2012)

### **CLASS ACTION & REPRESENTATIVE CASES**

4G Wireless Wage Cases, Orange County Superior Court, JCCP No. 4736; Classic Party Rentals Wage & Hour Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP No. 4672; Abu-Arafeh v. Norco Delivery Service, Inc., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-540601; Aburto v. Verizon, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 11-cv-0088; Adkins v. Washington Mutual Bank, Class Certification Granted, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC819546; Agah v. CompUSA, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SA CV05-1087 DOC (Anx); Akers v. The San Diego Union Tribune, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No 37-2010-00088571; Altman v. SolarCity Corporation, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00023450-CU-OE-CTL; Aquino v. Macy's West Stores, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00395420; Baker v. Advanced Disability Management, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00160711; Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 07 cv 0938; Bates v. Verengo, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00619985-CU-OE-CXC; Battle v. Charming Charlie Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00005608; Behar v. Union Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00317275; Bell v. John Stewart Company, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG14728792; Bennett v. Custom Built Personal Training Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. M127596; Bermant v. Bank of America, Investment Services, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court, Civil Action No. BC342505; Bethley v. Raytheon Company, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV10-01741; Betorina v. Randstad US, L.P., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:15-cv-03646-MEJ; Beverage v. Edcoa Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 2013-00138279; Bova v. Washington Mutual Bank / JP Morgan Chase, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 07-cv-2410; Bowden v. Sunset Parking Services, LLC & LAZ Parking California, LLC - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101751-CU-OE-CTL; Briseno v. American Savings Bank, Class Certification Granted, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 774773; Brueske v. Welk Resorts, San Diego Superior Court, Case No 37-2010-00086460; Bueche v. Fidelity National Management Services, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-01114; Bunch v. Pinnacle Travel Services, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC552048; Butler v. Stericycle, Inc & Appletree Answering Services of California, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00180282; Cabral v. Creative Communication Tech., Class Certification Granted, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC402239; Cardoza v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 4:15-cv-01634-DMR; Castro v. Vivint Solar, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00031385-CU-OE-CTL; Cavazos v. Heartland Automotive Services, Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. PSC 1401759; Cohen v. Bosch Tool, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIC 853562; Comstock v. Washington Mutual Bank - Class Certification Granted, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC820803; Conley v. Norwest, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. N73741; Connell v. Sun Microsystems, Alameda Superior Court, Case No. RG06252310; Corrente v. Luxe Valet, Inc., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-15-545961; Cruz v. Redfin Corporation, U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-05234-THE; Culley v. Lincare Inc. & Alpha Respiratory Inc., U.S. District Court eastern District of California, Case No. 2:15-cv-00081-GEB-CMK; Cunningham v. Leslie's Poolmart, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02122-CAS; Curry v. California Testing Bureau/McGraw Hill, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-05-4003 JW; Daniels, et al. v. Philip Morris, (In Re Tobacco Cases II) – Class Certification Granted, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4042; Davis v. Genex

Holdings Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-13-cv-240830; Davis v. Clear Connection, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00035173-CU-OE-CTL; Day v. WDC Exploration, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00433770; Dedrick v. Hollandia Dairy, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00004311-Cu-OE-CTL; Delmare v. Sungard Higher Education - Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 07-cv-1801; Del Rio v. Tumi Stores, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00022008-CU-OE-CTL; Dewane v. Prudential, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SA CV 05-1031; Diesel v. Wells Fargo Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00441368; Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-2745; Dobrosky v. Arthur J. Gallagher Service Company, LLC, Class certification Granted, No. EDCV 13-0646 JGB (Spx); Dodds v. Zaven Tootikian, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC494402; Drumheller v. Radioshack Corporation, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV11-355; Enger v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1670; Escobar v. Silicon Valley Security & Patrol, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv272514; Fierro v. Chase Manhattan - Class Certification Granted, Settled San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIN033490; Figuroa v. Circle K Stores, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101193-CU-OE-CTL; Finch v. Lamps Plus, (Lamps Plus Credit Transaction Cases), San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4532; Fletcher v. Verizon, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1736; Francisco v. Diebold, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1889; Friend v. Wellpoint, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC345147; Frudakis v. Merck Sharp & Dohme, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. SACV 11-00146; Fulcher v. Olan Mills, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-cv-1821; Gabisan v. Pelican Products, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08 cv 1361; Galindo v. Sunrun Installation Services Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00008350-CU-OE-CTL; Gallagher v. Legacy Partners Commercial, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-221688; Ghattas v. Footlocker Retail, Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. CV 13-0001678 PA; Gibson v. World Savings, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 762321; Goerzen v. Interstate Realty Management, Co., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 679545; Gomez v. Enterprise Rent-A-Car, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:10-cv-02373; Gordon v. Wells Fargo Bank, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:11-cv-00090; Grabowski v. CH Robinson, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 10-cv-1658; Gross v. ACS Compiq Corporation, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00587846-CU-OE-CXC; Gripenstraw v. Buffalo Wild Wings, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 12-CV-00233; Gruender v. First American Title, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 06 CC 00197; Guillen v. Univision Television Group, Inc. & Univision Management Co., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-526445; Gujjar v. Consultancy Services Limited, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00365905; Gutierrez v. Five Guys Operations, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00086185-CU-OE-CTL; Handler v. Oppenheimer, Los Angeles Superior Court, Civil Action No. BC343542; Harley v. Tavistock Freebirds, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00173010; Harrington v. Corinthian Colleges – Class Certification Granted, Orange Superior Court; United States Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware; Harvey v. PQ Operations, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497964; Henshaw v. Home Depot U.S.A., United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV10-01392; Heithold v. United Education Institute, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00623416-CU-OE-CXC; Hibler v. Coca Cola Bottling, Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 11cv0298; Hildebrandt v. TWC Administration LLC & Time Warner NY Cable, LLC, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. ED-cv-13-02276-JGB; Hopkins v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Los Angeles, United states District Court, Central District of California; U.S. Court of Appeals 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit; Howard v. Southern California Permanente

Medical Group, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC586369; Hughes v. Parexel International, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC485950; Hurley v. Comcast of California/Colorado/Texas/Washington, Inc., Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-253801; Irving v. Solarcity Corporation, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV525975; Jacobs v. Nu Horizons - Settled Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 111cv194797; Jefferson v. Bottling Group LLC (Pepsi) - Class Certification Granted, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-0018010; Jones v. E\*Trade Mortgage, U.S. District Court, Southern District California Case No. 02-CV-1123 L (JAH); Kennedy v. Natural Balance - Dismissal Reversed on Appeal, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2007-00066201; Keshishzadeh v. Arthur J. Gallagher Service Co., U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0168; Kinney v. AIG Domestic Claims / Chartis, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 8:10-cv-00399; Kizer v. Tristar Risk Management, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00707394-CU-OE-CXC; Kleinberg v. Reeve Trucking Company, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00001601-CU-OE-CTL; Kove v. Old Republic Title, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09477437; Krellcom v. Medley Communications, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00050245-CU-OE-CTL; Ladd v. Extreme Recovery, LP, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC11-02790; Langille v. EMC, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0168; Lawson v. Marquee Staffing, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00103717-CU-OE-CTL; Lazar v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv-273289; Lemmons v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00125488; Levine v. Groeniger, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09476193; Linder v. OCWEN (In re Ocwen Federal Bank FSB Servicing Litig.) U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. 07cv501, U.S. District Court, Northern Dist. Illinois, Case No. MDL 1604; Litton v. Diebold, Incorporated, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV524776; Lohn v. Sodexo, Inc. & SDH Services West, LLC, U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 2:15-CV-05409; Lopez v. K-Mart, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. BC351983; Louie / Stringer v. Kaiser, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-0795; Lucero v. Sears, U.S. District Court Southern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-01620-AJB; Lucero v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00075933-CU-OE-CTL; Magallanes v. TSA Stores, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-15-cv-283586; Magana v. El Pollo Loco, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00613901-CU-OE-CXC; Maitland v. Marriott, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. SACV 10-00374; Mann v. NEC Electronics America, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 109CV132089; Martinez v. Hydro-Scape Products, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00029157-CU-OE-CTL; Mathies v. Union Bank - Class Certification Granted, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-10-498077; McDermott v. Catalina Restaurant Group Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00574113-CU-OE-CXC; McPhail v. First Command, United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No.05CV0179 IEG (JMA); Medina v. Universal Protection Service, LP, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. BC572848; Meierdiercks v. 8x8, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 110CV162413; Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court Eastern District of California, Case No. 16-1133 JGB (Kkx); Meyer v. Thinktank Learning, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-15-cv-282698; Morales v. Wells Fargo Insurance Services USA, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:13-cv-03867-EDL; Morse v. Marie Callender Pie Shop, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 09-cv-1305; Moynihan v. Escalante Golf, Inc. & Troon Golf, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00083250-CU-OE-CTL; Muntz v. Lowe's HIW, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC880932; Najarian v. Macy's West Stores, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00418401; Nelson v. Avon Products, Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court for The Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02276-BLF; Nguyen v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Orange County

Superior Court, Case No. 05 CC 00116; Ochoa v. Eisai, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 3:11-cv-01349; Ogans v. Nationwide Credit, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00121054; Ohayon v. Hertz, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-1662; Olvera v. El Pollo Loco, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00707367-CU-OE-CXC; Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 14-cv-02113-MCE; Ortega v. Prime Healthcare Paradise Valley, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00011240-CU-OE-CTL; Patel v. Nike Retail Services, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-04781-RS; Patelski v. The Boeing Company, United States District Court, Southern District of New York; transferred to United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri; Pearlman v. Bank of America, San Diego Superior Court; Perry v. AT&T, U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 11-cv 01488; Picus v. Wal-Mart Stores, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:07-CV-00682; Pittard v. Salus Homecare, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08 cv 1398; Port v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2007-00067538; Postema v. Lawyers Title Ins. Corp., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00418901; Pratt v. Verizon, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00430447; Proctor v. Ameriquest. Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 06CC00108; Ramirez v. Estenson Logistics, LLC, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2015-00803197-CU-OE-CXC; Ray v. Lawyers Title, Fidelity National, Commonwealth Land Title, Chicago Title, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00359306; Renazco v. Unisys Technical Services, L.L.C., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-539667; Reynolds v. Marlboro/Philip Morris U.S.A., United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 08-55114, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 05 CV 1876 JAH; Rezec v. Sony, San Diego Superior Court; Rix v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-2063; Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Summary Judgment *Sua Sponte* Granted for Plaintiff, *Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Inc.*, 870 F. Supp. 2d 856 (C.D. Cal. 2012); Ritchie v. Mauran Ambulance Services, Inc., Los Angeles County, Case No. BC491206; Rivers v. Veolia Transportation Services, Class Certification Granted, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV 255350; Roeh v. JK Hill, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00089046; Rodriguez v. Protransport-1, LLC, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-522733; Romero v. Central Payment Co., LLC, Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV 1106277; Salas v. Evolution Hospitality, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00083240-CU-OE-CTL; Salem v. Alliance Human Services, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. CIVRS1401129; Sanchez v. Beena Beauty Holding, Inc. d/b/a Planet Beauty, Los Angeles County Superior Court, BC566065; Santone v. AT&T – Settled United States District Court, Southern District of Alabama; Santos v. Sleep Train (Sleep Train Wage and Hour Cases), Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00214586, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4553; Saravia v. O.C. Communciations, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00180734; Sawyer v. Vivint, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Case No. 1:14-cv-08959; Sayaman v. Baxter Healthcare, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 10-1040; Schuler v. Ecolab, Inc., U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:10-cv-02255; Schulz v. Qualxserv, LLC / Worldwide Techservices - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0017; Serrato v. Sociedad Textil Lonia, Corp., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101195-CU-OE-CTL; Shrivastara v. Fry's Electronics, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 111cv192189; Sierra v. Oakley Sales Corp., Orange County Superior Court, U.S. District Court Central District of California; U.S. Court of Appeals 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit; Sirota v. Swing-N-Slide, Wisconsin District Court, County of Rock Wisconsin, Case No. 95CV726J; Small v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00099011-CU-OE-CTL; Smith v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No.

08-cv-02353; Smith v. Fedex Ground Package system, Inc., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG14734322; Sones v. World Savings / Wachovia; U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 3:08-cv-04811; Spradlin v. Trump, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:08-cv-01428; Steele v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 07-5743; Steffan v. Fry's Electronics, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-13-CV-254011; Steroid Hormone Product Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, JCCP4363; Strauss v. Bayer Corporation, United States District Court, District of Minnesota; Sustersic v. International Paper Co., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00331538; Sutton v. Seasons Hospice & Palliative Care of California, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC590870; Swartout v. First Alarm Security & Patrol, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-231989; Talamantez v. The Wellpoint Companies, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 12-cv-08058; Tan v. California State Automobile Assn. - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. 07cv1011, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00231219; Tauber v. Alaska Airlines, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court; Thai v. Staff Assistance, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC567943; Thomas v. Stanford Health Care d/b/a Stanford University Medical Center, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv-273362; Thomas-Byass v. Michael Kors Stores (California), Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 5:15-cv-00369-JGB; Trujillo v. LivHome, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00100372, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4570; Tull v. Stewart Title, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-CV-1095; Turner v. C.R. England, U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 5:14-cv-02207-PSG; Turner v. Ampac Fine Chemicals, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00176993; Valadez v. Schering-Plough, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 10-CV-2595; Van Gorp v. Ameriquest Mortgage/Deutsche Bank, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV05-907 CJC (Anx); Varela v. The Walking Company, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC562520; Veloz v. Ross Dress For Less, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC485949; Vogel v. Price-Simms, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 114CV261268; Vrab v. DNC Parks & Resorts at Tenaya, Inc., Mariposa County Superior Court, Case No. 0010225; Vultaggio-Kish v. Golden State Lumber, Inc., San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV 51661; Wadhwa v. Escrow Plus, Los Angeles Superior Court; Waldhart v. Mastec North America, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1419318; Walker v. Brink's Global Services USA, Inc. & Brinks Incorporated, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC564369; Walsh v. Apple, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 08-04918; Weinman v. Midbar Condo Development (Las Vegas One), U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:08-cv-00684; Weltman v. Ortho Mattress - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-0840, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00327802; West v. Jerome's Furniture Warehouse, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2013-00147707-CU-OE-GDS; Wheat v. Jerome's Furniture Warehouse, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00094419-CU-OE-CTL; Wietzke v. Costar Realty, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 09-cv-2743; Williams v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 3:09-cv-01669; Wilson v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 8:14-cv-1021-FMO; Winston v. Lemoire Transportation, Inc., Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C-15-00897; Wise v. Cubic, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-2315; Witman v. Level 3 Communications, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00091649-CU-OE-CTL; Yam v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 10-cv-05225-SBA; Zurlo v. Mission Linen, U.S. District Court, Central District, Case No. 08cv1326; Baxt v. Scor U.S., Delaware Court of Chancery; Bronson v. Blech Securities - Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York; Castro & Cardwell v. B & H Education, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC456198;

Dibella v. Olympic Financial, U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota; Doyle v. Lorna Jane USA, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC526837; Estrella v. B-Per Electronic, Inc. & My Wireless, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00048951-CU-OE-CTL; Ferrari v. Read-Rite, U. S. District Court, Northern District of California; Forever 21 Wage and Hour Cases - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, JCC Proceeding No. 4745; Hart v. United States Tobacco Co., Los Angeles Superior Court; In re Bank of America Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litigation, U.S. District Court, District of Kansas, Case No. MDL 2138; In re Walgreen Co. Wage and Hour Litigation, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 11-cv-07664; Jackson v. Fresh & Easy Neighborhood Market Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497964; U.S. Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware Case No. 13-12569 (KJC); Jordan/Ramos v. DMV -Sacramento County Superior Court; Kensington Capital v. Oakley, U. S. District Court, Southern District of California; Kensington Capital v. Vesta, U. S. District Court, Northern District of Alabama; Lopez v. Tire centers, LLC, U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:13-cv-05444-JCS; Miller v. Western Athletic Clubs, LLC, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-228670; Moffett v. WIS International, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00099909-CU-OE-CTL; Perez v. Urban Outfitters, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02628-JSW; Ridgewood Capital Management v. Gensia, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, #CV-92-1500H; Sandoval v. Redfin Corporation, U.S. District Court Northern District, Case No. 3:14-cv-04444-SC; Shurman v. Scimed, State of Minnesota District Court, Fourth District, #94-17640; Sioson v. AMP Holding, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00663825; Slatton v. G.E. Capital Mortgage Services, Camden County Superior Court, New Jersey, #CAML0256198; Somkin v. Molten Metal, U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, #9710325PBS; Sparks v AT&T, Illinois District Court - Madison County; Sullivan v. Lyon Management Group, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00649432-CU-BT-CXC; Herencia v. Alexander's Steakhouse, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550551; Reinhardt v. Beverly Fabrics, Inc. – Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-257217; DeBettencourt v. Interstate realty Management Company – San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2015-0011942; Torres v. Bhandal Bros, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV01555; Rodriguez v. El Toro Medical Investors Limited Partnership – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00059-JLS-KES; Velez v. Timec Specialty Services, Inc. & Transfield Services– Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC614318; Henry v. Central Freight Lines, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00280-JAM-EFB; Taylor v. TIC – The Industrial Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00186-VAP(SPX); Harvey v. Sears, Roebuck And Co. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00207556; Tapia v. Panda Express, LLC et al. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, JCCP No. 4919; Severson v. Lowe's HIW, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-00189508; Bendon v. DTG Operations, Inc. - U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00861-FMO-AGR; Talavera v. ACS Dataline, LP – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC617159; McHenry v. Prologix Distribution Services (West), LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC608948; Stone v. Prologistics Distribution, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, JCCP No 4881; Easton v. Handy Technologies, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00004419-CU-OE-CTL; Singh v. Total Renal Care, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550847; Conners v. Rag Traders Melrose, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC591413; Saporito v. Space Explorations Technologies Corporation, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC554258; Calhoun v. Celadon Trucking Services, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-01351-PSG-FFM; Conners v. Mission Valley Kilt, LLC - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00036888-CU-OE-CTL; Shibley v. New Prime, Inc. - U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 17-CV-00321-DOC; Lawrenz v. Blacktalon Enterprises, Inc. - Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-258205; Jamison v. Fitness 19 CA 121, LLC - Solano County



Superior Court, Case No. FCS046697; Brooks v. Archer Trucking, Inc. – Mendocino County Superior Court, Case No. SCUK-CVG-16-67106; Montgomery v. New Prime, Inc. - San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1611884; Mills v. Core-Mark International, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, case No. 37-2016-00009669-CU-OE-CTL; Lopez v. Networked Insurance Agents, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00843587-CU-OE-CXC; Yberri v. Agent Provocateur, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC620413; Woodard v. BKD Twenty-One Management Company, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00009682-CU-OE-CTL; Gallagher v. H.H. Restaurant, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00031247-CU-OE-CTL; San Nicolas v. West Covina Corporate Fitness, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC16304; Summerlin v. Maplebear Inc., d/b/a Instacart – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 603030; Padilla v. Sutter West Bay Hospitals – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV538977; Quagliariello v. Victory Entertainment, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC620273; Mohammad v. Tee It Up LLC – Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C16-01188; Pucilowski v. Esurance Insurance Services, Inc. – Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0038790; Arias v. Alamitos Enterprises, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00865183-CU-OE-CXC; Orzano v. Hazelwood Enterprises, Inc. - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00029231-CU-OE-CTL; Tejero v. Firstmed Ambulance Services, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00885355-CU-OE-CXC; Artis v. T-W Transport, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00013010-CU-OE-CTL; Searles v. Navajo Express, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1613846; Lara v. Commercial Protective Service, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC648921; Picos v. Culinart of California, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4892; Samaniego v. A&I Transport, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV01894; Bailey v. Romanoff Floor Covering, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-00685-TLN-CMK; Aguirre v. Bitech, Inc.– Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-002022; Phillips v. DI Overnight LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00016800-CU-OE-CTL; Jacob v. Pride Transport, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV1337; Bennett v. Heartland Express, Inc. of Iowa – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00015056-CU-OE-CTL; Stapf v. Mercer Health & Benefits Administration LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC643007; Armstrong v. Ruan Transport Corporation – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1605897; Geiger v. Floyd’s 99-California LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00874943-CU-OE-CXC; Mondrian v. Trius Trucking, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 16CECG01501; Johnson v. Fedex Office and Print Services, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG17856291; Rios v. Pacific Western Bank - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00038083; Sanders v. Old Dominion Freight Lines, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00030725-CU-OE-CTL; Taylor v. Gardner Trucking, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1614280; Couture v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, case No. 16-CV-02202-VC; Bertuol v. AHMC Anaheim Regional Medical Center LP – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00899024-CO-OE-CXC; Espinoza v. Prime Communications of California, LLC – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 16CIV01563; Archuletta v. Tidy Services, Inc. – Orange County Superior court, Case No. 30-2016-008611892-CU-OE-CXC; Puccini v. Earthbound Farm, LLC – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV308643; Vikram v. First Student Management, LLC – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-04656-KAW; Blair v. Ashley Distribution Services, LTD. – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 17-CV-01427-JAK-SP; Richardson v. Service Staffing, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00899039-CU-OE-CXC; Coffin v. Certified Freight Logistics, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00036523-CU-OE-CTL; Encarnacion v. S.A.S. Services Group, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00026726-CU-OE-CTL; Vasquez v. Golden State Overnight Delivery Service, Inc. – Alameda County Superior

Court, Case No. RG17862924; Karr v. Tristar Managed Care, Inc. – Contra Costa Superior Court, case No. MSC17-00650; Gouveia v. Central Cal Transportation – San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2017-0001765; Miranda v. Genex Services, LLC – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-01438-JD; Spears v. Health Net of California, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00210560; Martinez v. Geil Enterprises, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG01879; McComack v. Marriott Ownership Resorts, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 17CV1663 BEN WVG; Velasco v. Lemonade Restaurant Group, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC672235; Smith v. Personnel Services, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-03594-SK; Gabriel v. Kuni SDA, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-000251191-CU-OE-CTL; Miller v. Mattress Firm, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV313148; Provost v. Yourmechanic, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00024056-CU-OE-CTL; Zirpolo v. UAG Stevens Creek II, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV313457; Salazar v. Aids Healthcare Foundation – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00033482-CU-OE-CTL; Knipe v. Amazon.com, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00029426-CU-OE-CTL; Erwin v. Caremeridian, LLC – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG03048; Davis v. Cox Communications California, LLC – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00989-BAS-BLM; Lara v. RMI International, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC597695; Harper v. C.R. England, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Utah Central Division, Case No. 16-CV-00906-DB; Mrazik v. C.H. Robinson Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 12-CV-02067-CAS-PLA; Horn v. Rise Medical Staffing, LLC – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:17-cv-01967-MCE-KJN; Pasallo v. GSG Protective Services CA Inc. – San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00037611-CU-OE-CTL; Smith v. Pacific Personnel Services, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-cv-03594-SK; Terrado v. Accredited Debt Relief, LLC – San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00014181-CU-OE-CTL; Escobedo v. Pacific Western Bank – Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC682686; Wade v. Automobile Club of Southern California – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00960268-CU-OE-CXC; Montano v. American Automobile Association of Northern California – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. CIVMSC18-01539; Perez v. Summit Interconnect, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00995403-CU-OE-CXC; Wolleson v. Gosch Imports, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC170356; Banuelos v. Ortho Mattress, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01161304-CU-OE-CXC; Castellanos v. Miller Automotive Group, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC699211; Tressler v. Spoonful Management, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC71940; Delph v. Employee Retention Services, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00007885; Romero v. May Trucking Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 5:17-cv-02166-JGB-SHK; Miranda v. Genex Services, LLC – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1700779; Moore v. Zirx Transportation Services, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566655; Sottile v. Motion Recruitment Partners – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV321677; Shahbazian v. Fast Auto Loans, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:18-cv-03076-ODW-KS; Salazar v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC702468; Conti v. L’Oreal USA S/D, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Fresno, Case No. 1:19-CV-00769-LJO-SKO; Mercado v. Security Industry Specialists, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV320059; Vikili v. Dignity Health – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-569456; Bagby v. Swissport SA, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC691058; Henry v. Motion Entertainment Group, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC18565643; Dandoy v. West Coast Convenience, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20051121; Lanuza v. AccentCare, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-565521; Thomas v. Easy Driving School, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case

No. 37-2018-00047639-CU-OE-CTL; Erickson v. Erickson – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC18-00307; Martin v. Menzies Aviation (USA) Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566072; Mortimer v. Healthsouth Bakersfield Rehabilitation Hospital, LLC – Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-102761; Alcaraz v. Red Lion Hotels Corporation – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-570310; Calhoun v. Total Transportation and Distribution, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00058681-CU-OE-CTL; Rataul v. Overton Security Services, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG18891882; Beltran v. Compass Bank – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00024475-CU-OE-CTL; Kirshner v. Touchstone Golf, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00028865-CU-OE-CTL; Pizarro v. The Home Depot, Inc. – U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia-Atlanta Division; Hatanaka v. Restore Rehabilitation, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00034780-CU-OE-CTL; Faria v. Carriage Funeral Holdings, Inc. – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC18-00606; Ontiveros v. Baker Concrete Construction, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV328679; Morales v. Redlands Automotive Services, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1807525; Ramirez v. Carefusion Resources, LLC – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California; Amster v. Starbucks Corporation – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1922016; Kutzman v. Derrel’s Mini Storage, Inc. – U.S. District, Eastern District of California, Case No. 1:18-cv-00755-AWI-JLT; Marks v. Universal Propulsion Company, Inc. – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS051608; Martinez v. Geil Enterprises, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG01480; Teniente v. Cirrus Asset Management, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV16302; Blackshear v. California Fine Wine & Spirits LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2018-00245842; Warnick v. Golden Gate America West LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC714176; Bennett v. Dnata Aviation USA, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566911; George v. PF Stockton Fitness LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00261113-CU-OE-GDS; Oshana v. Farmers and Merchants Bank of Central California – Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-19-003427; Vasquez v. Packaging Corporation of America, – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:19-cv-01935-PSG-PLA; Palomino v. Zara USA Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00992682-CU-OE-CXC; Simmons v. Joe & The Juice LA, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court; Pacia v. CIM Group, L.P. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC709666; Flores v. Plastic Express – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC71971; Madera v. William Warren Properties, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01055704-CU-OE-CXC; Hernandez v. Quality Custom Distribution – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-01010611-CU-OE-CXC; Arango v. Schlumberger Technology Corporation – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01056839-CU-OE-CXC; Dandoy v. West Coast Convenience, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20051121; Ramirez v. J E H Enterprises, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-19-574691; Sullen v. First Service Residential California, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-19-575131; Valentino v. East Bay Tire Co. – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS053067; Murphy v. Rockler Retail Group, Inc. – Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00251220; Shahbazian v. Onewest Bank – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV23722; Bruemmer v. Tempur Retail Stores LLC – Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV1803646; Antonios v. Interface Rehab, Inc. – Orange County Superior, Case No. 30-2019-01067547-CU-OE-CXC; Tavallodi v. DC Auto, Inc. – San Bernardino, Case No. CIVDS1833598; Miranda v. The Lloyd Pest Control Co. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00052510-CU-OE-CTL; Soenardi v. Magnussen Imports, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV340003; Thai v. Team Industrial Services, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV21953; Castillo v. A.J. Kirkwood & Associates, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV04435; Moss v. Jabil Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20050536; Billosillo, Jr. v. Crown Energy Services, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court,

Case No. 37-2018-00058254-CU-OE-CTL; Tarkington v. Freetime, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00011473-CU-OE-CTL; McIntyre v. J.J.R. Enterprises, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00251220; Bucur v. Pharmaca Integrative Pharmacy, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00009409-CU-OE-CTL; Batin v. McGee Air Services, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV347733; Terry v. McGee Air Services, Inc. – King County Superior Court of Washington, Case No. 19-2-3321-5 KNT; Weiss v. Niznik Behavioral Health Resources, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00039441-CU-OE-CTL; Cavada v. Inter-Continental Hotels Group, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:19-cv-01675-GPC-AHG; Lesevic v. Spectraforce Technologies, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 5:19-cv-03126-LHK; Mutchler v. Circle K Stores, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00016331-CU-OE-CTL, Azima v. CSI Medical Group, – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV345450; Porras v. Baypointe Enterprises, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV31015; Mitchell v. Mack Trucking, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1928334; Watts v. T.R.L. Systems, Incorporated – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01102457-CU-OE-CXC; Price v. DMSD Restaurants Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00024062-CU-OE-CTL; Jacobs v. Nortek Security & Control LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-0019735-CU-OE-CTL; Gonzalez v. Hub International Midwest – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1900463; Cisneros v. Bluepearl California, Inc. – San Mateo Superior Court, Case No. 19-CIV-05707; Garcia v. Gallagher Basset Services – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2004140; Callow v. Adventist Health System/West – Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0043607; Dominguez v. Kimco Facility Services, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV37592; Searles v. Robert Heath Trucking, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCY30808; Rangel v. Pioneer Hi-Bred international, Inc. – Yolo County Superior Court, Case No. CV-19-1797; Ivon v. Sinclair Television of California, Humboldt County Superior Court, Case No. DR190699; Williams v. Henkels & McCoy, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2003888; Cano v. Larry Green Chrysler Jeep Dodge, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. BLC1900184; Lopez v. Cepheid – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV358827; Hernandez v. Quick Dispense, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV29405; Lopez v. Lacoste USA, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1914626; Duhe v. Hospital Couriers Nevada, LLC – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC19-01377; Law v. Sequoia Equities, Incorporated – Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C19-01925; Dvorak v. Rockwell Collins, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00064397-CU-OE-CTL; Noguera v. Metal Container Corporation – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2003235; Leon v. Miller Event Management, Inc. – San Luis Obispo Superior Court, Case No. 19CV-0435; Leon v. Miller Event Management, Inc. – San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV-0435, Camacho-Bias v. Serve U Brands Inc. – Butte County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV00603; La Pietra v. Entertainment Partners Services, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV39529; Celis v. Theatre Box - San Diego, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. \_\_\_\_; Ignacio v. Laboratory Corporation of America – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:19-cv-06079-AB-RAO; Kovnas v. Cahill Contractors LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19037852; Hersh v. Mrs. Gooch’s Natural Food – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV10444; Miller v. The Permanente Medical Group – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19045904; Vasquez v. Autoalert, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01114549-CU-OE-CXC; Cavanaugh v. Morton Golf, LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00270176; Coley v. Monroe Operations, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20063188; Ramirez v. Sierra Aluminum Company – U.S. District Court, California Central District Court, Case No. 5:20-cv-00417-JGB-KK; Marrero v. Stat Med, P.C. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG19043214; Enriquez v. Solari Enterprises, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV11129; Craig v.

Hometown Heart – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-582454; Lopez v. HyOLang Electric California, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00012543-CU-OE-CTL; Heuklom v. Clara Medical Group, P.C. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-585918; Dominguez v. Lifesafer of Northern California – Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV002586; Kiseleva v. Totalmed Staffing Inc. – U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Case No. 5:19-cv-06480; Vires v. Sweetgreen, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV365918; Kim v. Wireless Vision, LLC – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2000074; Senoren v. Air Canada Corporation – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV13942; Clark v. Quest Diagnostics Incorporated – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2018707; Green v. Shipt, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV01001; Respass v. The Scion Group LLC – Sacramento County Superior County, Case No. 34-2020-00285265; Jackson v. Decathlon USA LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG2003024; Avacena v. FTG Aerospace Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV28767; Perez v. Butler America, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV20218; Christensen v. Carter’s Retail, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01138792-CU-OE-CXC; Astudillo v. Torrance Health Association, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV18424; Hansen v. Holiday AI Management Sub LLC – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. CIVMSC20-00779; Almahdi v. Vitamin Shoppe Industries Inc – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV365150; Krisinda v. Loyal Source Government Services LLC – U.S. District Court, California Southern District, Case No. 3:20-cv-879-LAB-NLS; Ettedgui v. WB Studio Enterprises Inc – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:20-CV-08053-MCS (MAAx); Fernandez v. Nuvision Federal Credit Union – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01161691-CU-OE-CJC; Aviles v. UPS Supply Chain Solutions, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2000727; Alcocer v. DSV Solutions, LLC – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2010345; Wilson v. Wholesome Harvest Baking, LLC – U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Case No. 4:20-cv-05186-YGR; Gregory v. Verio Healthcare, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV37254; Rose v. Impact Group, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01141107-CU-OE-CXC; Monasterio v. Citibank, N.A. – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 20-CIV-03650; Martinez-Lopez v. Medamerica, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00034393-CU-OE-CTL; Cox v. PRB Management, LLC – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS055514; Nash v. K. Hovnanian Companies, LLC – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2003319; Kyler v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00015828-CU-OE-CTL; Roberts v. Solantic Corporation – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV41117; Price v. Mistras Group, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV22485; Macias v. ABM Electrical & Lighting Solutions, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00024997-CU-OE-CTL; Basu-Kesselman v. Garuda Labs, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-585229; Armstrong v. Prometric LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV29967; Ashlock v. Advantis Medical Staffing, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00022305-CU-OE-CTL; Wilson v. WXI Global Solutions, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV25007; Gandhale v. Select Rehabilitation, LLC – Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV002240; Starvoice v. G4S Secure Solutions (USA) Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00029421-CU-OE-CTL; Mbise v. Axlehire, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20067350; Points v. C&J Services, Inc. – Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-20-102483; Marshall v. PHI Air Medical, LLC – Lassen County Superior Court, Case No. 62973; Jauregui v. Cyctec Engineered Materials, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01164932-CU-OE-CXC

**EXHIBIT #3**

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: [www.bamlawca.com](http://www.bamlawca.com)

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:  
[Nick@bamlawca.com](mailto:Nick@bamlawca.com)

WRITERS EXT:  
1004

October 31, 2022  
CA2788

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
Online Filing

**Feghali Foods**  
**Certified Mail #1030189**  
**MAROON FEGHALI**  
**7613 PACKSADDLE CT**  
**BAKERSFIELD, CA 93309**

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Feghali Foods in California, including any employees staffed with Feghali Foods by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of October 31, 2021 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Isaac Rodriguez (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Feghali Foods (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from July of 2021 to February 2022. Plaintiff was then re-hired in April of 2022 and let go again on October 5, 2022. He was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right

to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5<sup>th</sup> 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.



**EXHIBIT #4**

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK**  
2 **DE BLOUW LLP**

3 Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

4 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

5 Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

6 2255 Calle Clara

7 La Jolla, CA 92037

8 Telephone: (858)551-1223

9 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

10 Website: [www.bamlawca.com](http://www.bamlawca.com)

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

12 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

13 **COUNTY OF KERN**

14 **ISAAC RODRIGUEZ, MARIA ALVAREZ,**  
15 **CECILIO GUZMAN VIVEROS, KATE**  
16 **LOPEZ and GILBERTO SERRATOR**  
17 **MORENO, individuals, on behalf of**  
18 **themselves and on behalf of all persons**  
19 **similarly situated,**

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 **FEGHALI FOODS, a Corporation; and**  
23 **DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,**

24 Defendants.

25 **CASE NO.: BCV-23-100142**

26 **DECLARATION OF SEAN HARTRANFT**  
27 **IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR**  
28 **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS**  
**ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Hearing Date: May 30, 2024

Hearing Time: 8:30 a.m.

Judge: Hon. T. Mark Smith

Dept: T-2

Date Filed: January 17, 2023

Trial Date: Not set

1  
2 **DECLARATION OF SEAN HARTRANFT**

3 I, Sean Hartranft, declare as follows:

4 1. I am the Chief Executive Officer of Apex Class Action LLC., a class action settlement  
5 administration company headquartered in Irvine, California. I have personal knowledge of the facts  
6 outlined in this declaration and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto.

7 2. Apex Class Action’s team has been directly involved with class action administration for  
8 a combined 65 years and has successfully managed numerous class action cases during that time. Our team  
9 comprises experienced professionals with extensive knowledge of class action settlement administration.  
10 In addition, Apex Class Action has the necessary technology and infrastructure to efficiently manage large-  
11 scale class action cases. We utilize state-of-the-art software and systems to ensure that all aspects of the  
12 administration process are executed accurately and efficiently.

13 3. The legal practitioners or parties involved do not possess any form of ownership stake or  
14 affiliation with Apex Class Action.

15 4. Apex Class Action has extensive expertise in the dissemination of class action notices and  
16 administration of class action settlements. Our range of services includes first-class mail via the United  
17 States Postal Service, a bilingual toll-free call center, interactive & static website development and support,  
18 enterprise database management, response processing, and Qualified Settlement Fund (QSF) distribution  
19 for class actions of various sizes. We uphold the highest level of confidentiality in all our operations, and  
20 any class data and communication received by us will be treated with the utmost confidentiality and will  
21 not be disclosed to any unauthorized party. Attached is our current CV as **Exhibit A**, highlighting our  
22 primary competencies in class action administration.

23 5. Apex Class Action ensures that Client and Class Member Information is only used for the  
24 purposes specified in the relevant agreements or court orders governing the provision of its legal services.  
25 To safeguard class member information, Apex Class Action has implemented a comprehensive process to  
26 identify, assess, and mitigate risks in all areas of its operations, regularly evaluating the effectiveness of  
27 its security measures. Access to class member information is limited to employees, agents, or  
28 subcontractors who require it to perform their duties, and Apex Class Action conducts background checks

1 on all personnel with access to sensitive personal information, to ensure they do not pose a threat to the  
2 security of client or class member information. To guarantee the security of the settlement administration  
3 process, Apex Class Action maintains Professional Liability and Cyber Liability Insurance coverage, as  
4 required by legal standards and best practices in the legal profession.

5 6. Apex Class Action disbursement process involves (i) obtaining a Federal Employer  
6 Identification Number (FEIN) from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) under the name of the settlement  
7 case; (ii) establishing a QSF to manage the distribution of settlement funds; (iii) conducting preliminary  
8 and final calculations to determine the individual settlement amounts, including attorneys' fees, costs,  
9 enhancement awards, and any other court-approved designees; (iv) calculating and reporting state and  
10 federal taxes as applicable; (v) and disseminating approved settlement funds and tax forms via First-Class  
11 USPS mail.

12 7. The administration fees for Apex Class Action's management of this settlement will not  
13 exceed \$18,400.00, as specified in **Exhibit B**. This document presents a comprehensive plan detailing the  
14 specific administration services that will be provided.

15  
16 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is  
17 true and correct. Executed this 30<sup>th</sup> day of April 2024, in Irvine, California.

18  
19   
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Sean Hartranft

# **EXHIBIT A**



## CASE TYPES

---

- Consumer
- Data Breach
- Mass Tort Disbursement
- Wage & Hour
- Private Attorneys  
General Act (PAGA)
- Belaire West
- Class Certification
- Fair Labor Standards  
Act (FLSA)
- Telephone Consumer  
Protection Act (TCPA)
- Employee Retirement  
Income Security Act  
(ERISA)
- Product Liability

## SUMMARY

---

Apex Class Action brings together a seasoned team of professionals adept at navigating the intricate landscape of legal processes and settlement administration. Armed with extensive expertise, we offer a comprehensive understanding of the nuances inherent in settlement procedures. Our organization excels in communication and organization, leveraging cutting-edge technology to streamline project management and adhere to rigorous timelines with precision and efficiency.

From initial pre-settlement consultation to the final stages of disbursement and tax reporting, our technology platform and stringent data security protocols revolve around integration, automation, and observability. This ensures swift and precise payment for class members, bolstering efficiency and accuracy throughout the process.

## PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION

---

Our complimentary preliminary consultation serves as the cornerstone for establishing a comprehensive framework. This framework ensures that all stakeholders grasp the project's scope, timeline, and budget parameters effectively. Following the alignment of objectives and expectations between plaintiff and defense counsel, our team diligently explores additional avenues to identify potential class members. We go the extra mile by offering detailed interactive banner ad campaigns and print media options, maximizing outreach and engagement to achieve optimal results.

## CASE MANAGEMENT

---

At Apex Class Action, our expert Case Managers and Data Managers take charge of overseeing all aspects of the settlement administration process. Their role is pivotal in ensuring strict adherence to court orders, settlement agreements, and industry benchmarks. Working hand in hand with both plaintiff and defense counsel, we meticulously manage every aspect of the settlement administration process.

Our comprehensive mailing and notification services commence with meticulous data scrubbing and the establishment of a class database, guaranteeing the accuracy of contact information. Subsequently, the database undergoes validation using the USPS National Change of Address (NCOA) database to ensure precision and reliability. Additionally, we provide court-certified translation services covering over 65 languages, facilitating effective communication across diverse demographics. In instances where mail is returned as undeliverable, we undertake skip tracing to obtain updated addresses for class members, ensuring that all notices reach their intended recipients without delay.



To ensure transparency throughout the entire process, a steady cadence of reports, as defined during the preliminary consultation, is generated throughout the administration process for both the plaintiff and defense counsel.

Our capability to provide cost-effective pricing is rooted in our adept utilization of cutting-edge technology, a team of highly skilled professionals, and an optimized process. Should the courts approve the utilization of modern electronic notification methods like email and banner ads, we ensure both certainty and cost-effectiveness. Through electronic disbursement, we offer a highly efficient strategy wherein settlement awards are directly delivered to class members, mitigating potential drawbacks associated with traditional mail delivery and enhancing overall efficiency.

## **TAX COMPLIANCE & CASE RESOLUTION**

---

Apex leverages its proprietary technology to efficiently manage all necessary state and federal tax reporting requirements. This includes establishing a Settlement Federal Tax Identification Number (FIEN) with the IRS and Qualified Settlement Fund (QSF) EDD accounts where applicable. We handle taxes associated with settlements involving multiple state tax filings, as well as manage all payroll tax filings such as Form 940, 941, and state filings. Additionally, our services encompass the preparation of information returns (Forms W-2, 1099, and 1042-S) for reportable payments and the preparation of the annual Federal income tax return (Form 1120-SF). Moreover, we provide comprehensive management of qualified settlement funds (QSF), ensuring that all accounts are FDIC-insured bank accounts. Our full suite of comprehensive tax management services includes:

- Prepare and fill all applicable returns (Forms W-2, 1099, and 1042-S)
- FID-Insured QSF Bank Accounts
- IRS Federal Tax Identification Number
- Prepare And File 1120-SF Tax Returns with Quarterly Tax Obligations
- Payroll tax filings, including Form 940, 941, and state filings
- State and Federal Tax Reporting
- QSF Audit Reports

## **CONTACT**

---

**Address**  
18 Technology Dr. Ste. 164  
Irvine, CA 92618

**Email**  
[Info@apexclassaction.com](mailto:Info@apexclassaction.com)

**Phone**  
1.800.355.0700

# **EXHIBIT B**





**Quotation Request:**

Jeffrey Herman  
 Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw  
 jeff@bamlawca.com  
 858.551.1223

**Case Name:**

Date:  
 RFP Number:

**Feghali Foods**

Wednesday, March 27, 2024  
 12230043

**Prepared By:**

Sean Hartranft  
 Apex Class Action LLC  
 Sean@apexclassaction.com  
 949.878.3676

Settlement Specifications	
Estimated Class Size:	1,835
Certified Language Translation:	No
Static Settlement Website	No
Percentage of Undeliverable Mail	20%

Professional Services	Fee Calculation	Rate(s)	Quantity	Estimated Cost
-----------------------	-----------------	---------	----------	----------------

Data Analytics and Standardization				
Import and Standardize Data*	Per Hour	\$125.00	4	\$500.00
Data Analyst	Per Hour	\$150.00	4	\$600.00
*Data provided must be in a workable format. Apex can standardize provided data at an additional cost of \$150/hr.				
			Sub Total:	\$1,100.00

Mailing of Class Notice				
Form Set Up	Per Hour	\$120.00	1	\$120.00
Print & Mail Class Notice	Per Piece	\$1.25	1,835	\$2,293.75
USPS First Class Postage	Per Piece	\$0.63	1,835	\$1,156.05
Remail Undeliverable Mail (Skip-Trace)	Per Piece	\$1.75	367	\$642.25
Receive and Process Undeliverable Mail	Per Hour	\$75.00	2	\$150.00
Process Class Member Correspondence via mail, e-mail & fax	Per Piece	\$75.00	4	\$300.00
NCOA Address Update (USPS)	Static Rate	\$345.65	1	\$345.65
			Sub Total:	\$5,007.70

Project Management				
Project Management	Per Hour	\$150.00	4	\$600.00
Project Coordinator	Per Hour	\$90.00	3	\$270.00
Data Analyst and Reporting	Per Hour	\$140.00	2	\$280.00
			Sub Total:	\$1,150.00



Professional Services	Fee Calculation	Rate(s)	Quantity	Estimated Cost
-----------------------	-----------------	---------	----------	----------------

Toll-Free Contact Center, Website & Reporting				
Bilingual Toll-Free Contact Center	Static Rate	\$320.00	1	\$320.00
Settlement Status Reports	Static Rate	\$750.00	1	Waived
Sub Total:				\$320.00

Distribution & Settlement Fund Management				
Settlement Calculations (Preliminary and Final)	Per Hour	\$120.00	5	\$600.00
Account Management and Reconciliation	Per Hour	\$140.00	5	\$700.00
Print & Mail Distribution Settlement Check (W-2/1099)	Per Piece	\$1.25	1,835	\$2,293.75
USPS First Class Postage	Per Piece	\$0.63	1,835	\$1,156.05
Remail Distribution to Updated Address (Skip Trace)	Per Piece	\$2.00	184	\$367.00
Reminder Postcard, USPS Postcard Postage	Per Piece	\$1.00	551	\$550.50
Reminder Notice via Social Media Platforms and E-mail	Static Rate	\$350.00	1	\$350.00
Individual Income Tax Preparation & Reporting	Per Hour	\$100.00	14	\$1,400.00
QSF Income Tax Reporting (per calendar year)	Per Year	\$1,250.00	1	\$1,250.00
Unclaimed Funds: State Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund	Static Rate	\$500.00	1	\$500.00
Sub Total:				\$9,167.30

Post Distribution Reconciliation				
Bank Account Reconciliation	Per Hour	\$135.00	5	\$675.00
Project Management Reconciliation	Per Hour	\$100.00	5	\$500.00
Declarations	Per Hour	\$120.00	4	\$480.00
Sub Total:				\$1,655.00

**WILL NOT EXCEED: \$18,400.00**

Thank you for your business!



## Terms & Conditions

The following Terms and Conditions govern the provision of all services to be provided by Apex Class Action and its affiliates ("Apex") to the Client. These terms and conditions are binding and shall apply to all services provided by Apex in relation to any related services or products.

1. **Services:** Apex commits to providing the Client with the administrative services detailed in the attached Proposal (the "Services").

2. **Payment Terms:** As compensation for the legal services to be provided, the Client agrees to pay Apex all fees detailed in the Proposal. The fees quoted in the Proposal (and any subsequent proposals for additional services) are estimates based on the information provided to Apex by the Client. Apex makes no representation that the estimated fees in the Proposal or any subsequent proposals for additional services shall equal the actual fees charged by Apex to the Client, which fees (including individual line items) may be greater or less than estimated. If additional services are requested on an hourly basis and are not specifically detailed in the Proposal, Apex will prepare estimates for such services subject to approval by the Client. In the performance of such additional services, Apex will charge standard hourly fees which shall apply.

3. **Incurred Expenses:** In relation to the provision of services outlined in this agreement, the Client agrees to reimburse Apex for all reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred. Such expenses may include, but are not limited to, costs associated with postage, media production or publication, banking fees, brokerage fees, messenger and delivery service expenses, travel expenses, filing fees, office supplies, meals, staff overtime expenses, and other related costs and expenses. If not otherwise specified in writing, fees for print notice and certain expenses, such as media publication and postage, must be paid immediately upon invoicing and, in certain cases, at least ten (10) days prior to the date on which such expenses will be incurred.

4. **Invoicing:** Apex shall present invoices for its fees and expenses on a monthly basis, except as provided in Section 3. The Client agrees to pay each invoice within 30 days of receipt. In case of non-payment within 90 days of the billing date, an additional service charge of 1.5% per month may apply. Apex reserves the right to increase its prices, charges, and rates annually, subject to reasonable adjustments. If any price increases exceed 10%, Apex shall give thirty (30) days' notice to the Client. In the event of any unpaid invoices beyond 120 days of the due date, Apex reserves the right to withhold services and reports until payment is received, subject to notice to the Client. It is important to note that Apex's failure to provide services and reports in such instances shall not constitute a default under this agreement.

5. **Case Duration:** The duration of these Terms and Conditions, except for the data storage obligations stated in Section 13, shall be in effect until 30 days following the completion of the Services as described in the Proposal. The parties may extend these Terms and Conditions in writing for a mutually agreed-upon period beyond this initial 30-day period.

6. **Termination of Services:** Either party may terminate the Services by providing thirty (30) days written notice to the other party. Alternatively, termination may occur immediately upon written notice for Cause, as defined below. Cause means (i) Apex's gross negligence or willful misconduct that causes serious and material harm to the Client; (ii) the Client's failure to pay Apex invoices for more than one hundred twenty (120) days from the date of the invoice; or (iii) the accrual of invoices or unpaid services where Apex reasonably believes it will not be paid. Termination of the Services shall not relieve the Client of its obligation to pay Apex for services rendered prior to the termination.

7. **Independent Contractor:** As an independent contractor, Apex will provide services under the terms of this agreement. It is agreed that neither Apex nor any of its employees will be considered an employee of the Client. Consequently, Apex and its employees will not be eligible for any benefits provided by the Client to its employees. The Client will not make any tax deductions from the payments due to Apex for state or federal tax purposes. Apex will be solely responsible for paying all taxes and other payments due on payments received from the Client under this agreement.

8. Apex warrants that the Services outlined in the Proposal will be performed in accordance with the standards generally adhered to by professionals providing similar services. It is acknowledged that the Services may entail the likelihood of some human and machine errors, omissions, delays, and losses that may result in damage. However, Apex shall not be held liable for such errors, omissions, delays, or losses unless they are caused by its gross negligence or willful misconduct. In the event of any breach of this warranty by Apex, the Client's sole remedy will be limited to Apex's rerunning, at its expense, any inaccurate output provided that such inaccuracies occurred solely as a result of Apex's gross negligence or willful misconduct under this agreement.

9. **Limitation of Liability:** The Client acknowledges that Apex shall not be held liable for any consequential, special, or incidental damages incurred by the Client in relation to the performance of Services, whether the claim is based on breach of warranty, contract, tort (including negligence), strict liability, or any other grounds. Under no circumstances shall Apex's liability to the Client, for any Losses (including court costs and reasonable attorney's fees), arising out of or in connection with these Terms and Conditions, exceed the total amount charged or chargeable to the Client for the specific service(s) that caused the Losses.

10. **Indemnification:** The Client agrees to indemnify and hold harmless Apex from any losses, suits, actions, judgments, fines, costs, liabilities, or claims arising from any action or proceeding relating to the Services provided by Apex, regardless of whether or not it results in liability (collectively referred to as "Indemnified Claims"). However, this indemnification provision shall not apply to the extent that such Indemnified Claims are caused by Apex's willful misconduct, gross negligence, or breach of these Terms and Conditions. This provision shall survive termination of the Services.

11. **Confidentiality:** Apex will uphold strict confidentiality between Apex and the Client and applies to all non-public records, documents, systems, procedures, processes, software, and other information received by either party in connection with the performance of services under these terms. Both Apex and the Client agree to keep confidential all such non-public information, including any material marked or identified as confidential or proprietary. Any such confidential information shall not be disclosed, provided, disseminated, or otherwise made available to any third party, except as required to fulfill the parties' obligations under these terms. The parties acknowledge that in the event of any request to disclose any confidential information in connection with a legal or administrative proceeding, or otherwise to comply with a legal requirement, prompt notice of such request must be given to the other party to enable that party to seek an appropriate protective order or other remedy or to waive compliance with the relevant provisions of these terms. If the Client seeks a protective order or another remedy, Apex, at the Client's expense, will cooperate with and assist the Client in such efforts. If the Client fails to obtain a protective order or waives compliance with the relevant provisions of these terms, Apex will disclose only that portion of the confidential information that it determines it is required to disclose. This confidentiality provision shall survive termination of the services provided. Both parties acknowledge and agree that any breach of this these terms may cause irreparable harm to the non-breaching party and that injunctive relief may be necessary to prevent any actual or threatened breach. The terms set forth between the parties supersede all prior negotiations, understandings, and agreements between the parties concerning confidentiality. These terms may only be amended in writing and signed by both parties.

12. **Ownership of the programs, system data, and materials provided by Apex to the Client during the course of providing services herein shall solely belong to Apex. It is acknowledged that fees and expenses paid by the Client do not confer any rights in such property. It is also understood that the said property is made available to the Client solely for the purpose of using it during and in connection with the services provided by Apex.**

13. Upon the completion of the administration and unless retention instructions are ordered by the court, Apex will notify the client that it will destroy and/or return all confidential information and property within 90 days upon the client's written request. Alternatively, the material may be stored for one year at a monthly fee of \$1.50 per storage box for paper documents and \$0.01 per image for electronic copies over a period of three years, which compensates Apex for its electronic and hard-copy storage costs. Apex will not be liable for any damages, liability, or expenses incurred in connection with any delay in delivery of, or damage to disks, magnetic tapes, or any input data provided by the client or its representatives unless Apex has agreed in writing to assume such responsibility.

14. **COMPLETE AGREEMENT.** These Terms and Conditions, along with the attached Proposal, represent the complete agreement and understanding between the parties and override any prior agreements (whether written or oral) between Apex and the Client regarding the subject matter. Any modification to these Terms and Conditions may only be made in writing and must be signed by both Apex and the Client. The headings in this document are included for convenience only and do not alter or restrict any provisions in these Terms and Conditions. They may not be used in the interpretation of these Terms and Conditions.

15. This provision outlines the requirements for providing notice or other communication under this agreement. All such communications must be in writing and can be delivered either by personal delivery or through U.S. Mail with prepaid postage or overnight courier. Once delivered personally or sent through the mail, the notice will be considered given after five (5) days from the deposit date in the U.S. Mail. Alternatively, if sent through an overnight courier, the notice will be considered given one business day after delivery to the such courier. It's important to note that the notice must be provided to a responsible officer or principal of the Client or Apex, depending on the case.

16. **Force Majeure:** In the event of any failure or delay in performance due to circumstances beyond Apex's control, including but not limited to strikes, lockouts, fires, floods, acts of God or public enemy, riots, civil disorders, insurrections, war or war conditions, or interference by civil or military authorities, Apex shall not be held liable for any resulting loss or damage. The time for performance under this agreement shall be extended for a period equal to the duration of the disabling cause and a reasonable time thereafter. This provision shall constitute a force majeure clause and shall be construed accordingly.

17. The applicable state and federal laws shall govern the interpretation and enforcement of these Terms and Conditions. No choice of law or conflict of laws provisions shall affect this governing law provision.

18. **Severability:** This applies to all clauses and covenants contained within these Terms and Conditions. In the event that any clause or covenant is deemed invalid, illegal, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions shall remain valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permissible by law. The validity, legality, and enforceability of the remaining provisions shall in no way be affected or impaired by the invalidity, illegality, or unenforceability of any provision deemed so.

19. **Nonwaiver:** This applies to these Terms and Conditions. This means that any failure by one party to enforce a provision of these terms on one or more occasions shall not be construed as a waiver of that provision. In other words, any failure to enforce a provision does not give up the right to enforce it in the future. All provisions of these Terms and Conditions remain in full force and effect, regardless of any prior failure to enforce them.