JCL LAW FIRM, APC 1 Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676) Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884) 2 Andrea Amaya Silva (State Bar #348080) 3 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600 San Diego, CA 92121 4 Telephone: (619) 599-8292 Facsimile: (619) 599-8291 5 ilapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com mdelatorre@icl-lawfirm.com 6 aamaya@icl-lawfirm.com 7 ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC 8 Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924) 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600 9 San Diego, CA 92121 Telephone: (619) 255-9047 10 Facsimile: (858) 404-9203 11 shani@zakaylaw.com 12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs MARTIN MARISCAL, DANIEL GARCIA, and RAFAEL ROJAS 13 [Additional counsel on next page] 14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 15 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN 16 Case No: STK-CV-UOE-2022-7290 MARTIN MARISCAL, DANIEL GARCIA, 17 RAFAEL ROJAS. JOSE HERNANDEZ. Related with: STK-CV-UOE-2022-9998; AND LUIS VAZQUEZ individuals, on behalf STK-CV-UOE-2022-8450; and 18 of themselves and on behalf of all persons STK-CV-UOE-2022-8790 19 similarly situated, ORDER **GRANTING** PROPUSED 20 Plaintiffs, PLAINTIFFS' MOTION **FOR** PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ٧. 21 ACTION AND **PAGA ACTION** JANCO INDUSTRIES, INC., a California SETTLEMENT 22 corporation; TERRY ALEXANDER, AUG 0 6 2024 23 individual; ANDREW ALEXANDER, Date: individual; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive, Time: 9:00 Am 24 Hon, George J. Abdallah Defendants. Judge: 25 10A Dept.: 26 27

ļ		:
1	GAINES & GAINES	
2	Daniel Gaines, Esq. Alex Katofsky, Esq.	1
	4550 East Thousand Oaks Blvd, Suite 100	1
3	Westlake Village, CA 91362 T: (866) 400-4450	
4	daniel@gaineslawfirm.com alex@gaineslawfirm.com	
5		1
6	Attorneys for PLAINTIFF JOSE HERNANDEZ	
7	DREW LEWIS, PC Drew Lewis, Esq.	
8	2999 Douglas Blvd, Suite 180	
9	Roseville, CA 95661 T: (833) 600-7400	
10	drew@drewlewis.law	1
11	Attorneys for PLAINTIFF LUIS VAZQUEZ	
12		
13		
14		
15	' 	· !
16		
17		
18		1
19		1
20		
21		1
22		ı
23		
24		! !
25		
26		i I
27		
28		
	DOODOCEDI ODDED CD ANTINC DI AINTIEES MOTION EOD DUCTIMINADY	ADDDOUGH OF CLASS

ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

- 1. The Court preliminarily approves the Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims ("Settlement Agreement" or "Agreement"), a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "1". This is based on the Court's determination that the Settlement Agreement is within the range of possible final approval, pursuant to the provisions of Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and California Rules of Court, rule 3.769.
- 2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Agreement.
- 3. Subject to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Gross Settlement Amount that Defendants shall pay is Two Million Dollars and Zero Cents (\$2,000,000.00). It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount and terms are fair, adequate, and reasonable as to all Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to certification, liability, and damages issues. It further appears that investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court that settlement at this time will avoid substantial additional costs by all Parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the litigation. It further appears that the Settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and

 non-collusive arms-length negotiations.

- 4. The Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement appears to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery that is being granted as part of the Settlement and preliminarily finds that the monetary settlement awards made available to the Class Members are fair, adequate, and reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to certification, liability, and damages issues.
- 5. Plaintiffs seek a Class Counsel Award in the amount of up-to 35% of the Total Settlement Amount, currently estimated at Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$700,000.00), plus reimbursement of actually incurred litigation cost in an amount of up to Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Centers (\$30,000.00), and proposed Class Representative Service Award to the Class Representatives Martin Mariscal, Daniel Garcia, Rafael Rojas, and Jose Hernandez of not more than Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00) each, and a propose Class Representative Service Award to Class Representative Luis Vazquez of not more than Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000.00). While these awards appear to be within the range of reasonableness, the Court will not approve the Class Counsel Award or the Class Representative Service Award until the Final Approval Hearing.
- 6. The Court recognizes that Plaintiffs and Defendants stipulate and agree to certification of a class for settlement purposes only. This stipulation will not be deemed admissible in this, or any other proceeding should this Settlement not become final. For settlement purposes only, the Court conditionally certifies the following Class:

All non-exempt employees who are or previously were employed by Defendant Janco Industries, Inc. and performed work in California during the period beginning August 19, 2018 to January 12, 2024

7. The Court concludes that, for settlement purposes only, the Class meets the requirements for certification under section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure in that: (a) the Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the Class Members is impracticable; (b) common questions of law and fact predominate, and there is a well-defined community of interest amongst the Class Members with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c) the claims of the

Class Representative are typical of the claims of the Class Members; (d) the Class Representative will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class Members; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) Class Counsel are qualified to act as counsel for the Class Representative in his individual capacity and as the representative of the Class Members.

- 8. The Court provisionally appoints Plaintiffs Martin Mariscal, Daniel Garcia, Jose Hernandez, Rafael Rojas and Luis Vazquez as the representatives of the Class.
- 9. The Court provisionally appoints Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq., of the JCL Law Firm, APC, Shani Zakay, Esq. of the Zakay Law Group, APLC, Drew Lewis, Esq. of Drew Lewis, PC and Daniel Gaines, Esq. of Gaines & Faines, APLC as Class Counsel for the Class Members.
- 10. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the Proposed Class Notice ("Class Notice") attached to the Agreement as Exhibit "A". The Court finds that the notice appears to fully and accurately inform the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees of all material elements of the proposed Settlement, including the right of any Class Member to be excluded from the Class by submitting a written request for exclusion, and of each Class Member's right and opportunity to object to the Settlement. The Court further finds that the distribution of the notices substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Agreement and this Order meets the requirements of due process, is the most reasonable notice under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court orders the mailing of the notices by first class mail, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.
- 11. The Court hereby appoints Apex Class Action LLC, as Settlement Administrator. Within fifteen (15) calendar days after the Preliminary Approval Date, Defendant shall confirm with the Settlement Administrator the Class Data, including information regarding Class Members that Defendant will in good faith compile from its records, including each Class Member's full name; last known mailing address; Social Security Number; and start dates and end dates of employment. No later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after receiving the Class Data from Defendant, the Settlement Administrator shall mail copies of the Notice Packet to all Class Members via regular First-Class U.S. Mail.

12. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure for exclusion from the Settlement. Any Class Member may individually choose to opt out of and be excluded from the Settlement as provided in the Notice by following the instructions for requesting exclusion from the Settlement of the Released Class Claims that are set forth in the Notice. All requests for exclusion must be postmarked or received by the Response Deadline which is forty-five (45) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator mails the Notice Packets to Class Members or, in the case of re-mailed Notice, not more than fifteen (15) days from the original Response Deadline. Any such person who chooses to opt out of and be excluded from the Settlement will not be entitled to an Individual Settlement Payment under the Settlement and will not be bound by the Settlement, or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. Class Members who have not requested exclusion shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Agreement, and Judgment.

- 13. Any Class Member who has not opted out may appear at the final approval hearing and may object or express the Class Member's views regarding the Settlement and may present evidence and file briefs or other papers that may be proper and relevant to the issues to be heard and determined by the Court as provided in the Notice. Class Members will have forty-five (45) calendar days from the date the Settlement Administrator mails the Class Notice to postmark their written objections to the Settlement Administrator.
- 14. A final approval hearing shall be held before this Court on 12-4.24 at 100 at 100
 - 15. In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the

Agreement, or the Settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, canceled, or fails to become effective for any reason, this Settlement Agreement shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated, and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement. In such an event, the Court's orders regarding the Settlement, including this Preliminary Approval Order, shall not be used or referred to in litigation for any purpose. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to alter the terms of the Settlement Agreement with respect to the effect of the Settlement Agreement if it is not approved.

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

Dated: Cluza. 6, 2024

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Gearge alledallah

EXHIBIT 1

ļ		;			
1	JCL LAW FIRM, APC				
2	Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)				
	Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)				
3	Monnett De La Torre (State Bar # 272884) 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600				
4	San Diego, CA 92121				
5	Telephone: (619) 599-8292				
5	Facsimile: (619) 599-8291 jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com				
6	scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com				
7	mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com				
8	ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC				
0	Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)				
9	5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600	i i			
10	San Diego, CA 92121 Telephone: (619) 255-9047	:			
11	Facsimile: (858) 404-9203				
	shani@zakaylaw.com				
12	Attornava for Blaintiffa Martin Mariagal, Daniel C	Saucia and Dafael Daice			
13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Martin Mariscal, Daniel C	rarcia, and Karaei Rojas			
14	[Additional Counsel listed on following page]	·			
	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
15	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN				
16	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTI OF SAN JOAQUIN			
17	MARTIN MARISCAL, DANIEL GARCIA,	Case No.: STR-CV-UOE-2022-7290			
	JOSE HERNANDEZ, RAFAEL ROJAS, and	[Action Filed August 19, 2022]			
18	LUIS VAZQUEZ, individuals, on behalf of themselves, and on behalf of all persons				
19	similarly situated,	STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT OF CLASS AND PAGA ACTION CLAIMS			
20	DI : .100	AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS			
21	Plaintiffs, v.				
21		1			
22	JANCO INDUSTRIES, INC., a California				
23	corporation; TERRY ALEXANDER, an individual; ANDREW ALEXANDER, an				
24	individual; and DOES 1 through 50, Inclusive,				
	Defendants.				
25	Detendants.				
26					
27					
28	CTIDUR ATTION OF COUNTY DAYS OF CO.	ATT PAGA ACTION AND PET TAGE			
	STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT OF CLASS A	ND PAGA ACTION AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS			

		; ;	
		1	
1	GAINES & GAINES, APLC	,	
2	Daniel F. Gaines (State Bar #251488) Alex P. Katofsky (State Bar #202754)		
3	4550 East Thousand Oaks Blvd., Suite 100 Westlake Village, CA 91362		
4	Telephone: (818) 703-8985	' 	
5	Facsimile: (818) 703-8984 <u>daniel@gaineslawfirm.com</u>	ı	
6	alex@gaineslawfirm.com	; ;	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff Jose Hernandez		
8	DREW LEWIS, P.C.		
9	Drew Lewis (State Bar #309288) 2999 Douglas Blvd., Suite 180	,	
10	Roseville, CA 95661 Telephone: (650) 665-9000	 	
11	drew@drewlewis.law		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff Luis Vazquez		
13		, ,	
14			
15		, 	
16			
17		·	
18			
19		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
20		,	
21		'	
22		; 	
23			
24			
25			
26	1	ı	
27	STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION AND RELEASE C	F CLAIMS	
28			

Ш

Ш

|

This Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims is entered into by and between Plaintiffs MARTIN MARISCAL, DANIEL GARCIA, JOSE HERNANDEZ, RAFAEL ROJAS, and LUIS VAZQUEZ (hereinafter "Plaintiff" and/or "Plaintiffs"), individuals, on behalf of the Settlement Class, and in their representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees, and Defendants JANCO INDUSTRIES, INC. ("Defendant Janco"), TERRY ALEXANDER, and ANDREW ALEXANDER (hereinafter "Defendant" and/or "Defendants"):

I. <u>DEFINITIONS</u>

- A. "Actions" shall mean the putative class action lawsuits designated Mariscal, et al. v. Janco Industries, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STR-CV-UOE-2022-7290, filed August 19, 2022, Hernandez, et al. v. Janco Industries, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2022-8790, filed September 30, 2022, and Vazquez, et al. v. Janco Industries, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2022-9998, filed October 31, 2022.
- B. "Claims Administration Expenses" shall mean the amount paid to the Claims Administrator from the Gross Settlement Amount for administering the Settlement pursuant to this Agreement currently estimated not to exceed \$13,000.00.
- C. "Agreement" or "Settlement Agreement" means this Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action and Release of Claims.
- D. "Attorneys' Expenses" means the award of expenses that the Court authorizes to be paid to Class Counsel for the expenses they have incurred of up to \$30,000.00.
- E. "Attorneys' Fees" means the award of fees that the Court authorizes to be paid to Class Counsel for the services they have rendered to Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class in the Action not to exceed 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount, currently estimated to be \$700,000.00. Attorneys' Fees will be divided between Class Counsel

26 ||

N.

"Funding Date" shall mean the date by which Defendants must pay each installment of the Gross Settlement Amount to the Claims Administrator in accord with the terms of this Agreement. Janco, Terry Alexander, and Andrew Alexander will each be jointly and severally liable for the entire Gross Settlement Amount, which includes payment for all claims, payment of the Claims Administration Expenses, Attorneys' Fees, Attorneys' Expenses, Service Awards, and PAGA Payment, and in addition to the Gross Settlement amount, Defendants shall include the employer share of the payroll taxes which will be advised by the Claims Administrator. The Gross Settlement Amount shall be paid to the Claims Administrator in three (3) installments. The first installment of \$666,666.66 shall be made within fourteen (14) days of the Effective Date ("First Installment"). The second installment of \$666,666.66 shall be made within six months of the First Installment ("Second Installment"). The third and final installment of \$666,666.67 shall be made within six months of the Second Installment. Each payment shall include a proportionate share of employer payroll taxes due.

O. "Gross Settlement Amount" means Two Million Dollars and Zero Cents (\$2,000,000.00) that Defendants must pay into the Qualified Settlement Fund (QSF) in connection with this Settlement, inclusive of the sum of Claims Administration Expenses, Attorneys' Fees, Attorneys' Expenses, Service Awards, and the PAGA Payment and *exclusive* of the employer's share of payroll tax, if any, triggered by any payment under this Settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount shall be all-in with no reversion to Defendants. The employer's share of payroll taxes for net wages shall not be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, and shall remain the sole responsibility of Defendants.

- Y. "PAGA Payment" shall mean One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) to be allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 25% of the payment going to the PAGA Group Members ("PAGA Group Payment") and 75% of the payment going to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA Payment"). The amount of the PAGA Payment is subject to Court approval pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(l). Any reallocation of the Gross Settlement Amount to increase the PAGA Payment will not constitute grounds by either party to void this Agreement, so long as the Gross Settlement Amount remains the same.
- Z. "Parties" means Plaintiffs and Defendants, collectively, and "Party" shall mean either Plaintiffs or Defendants, individually.
- AA. "Payment Ratio" means the respective Workweeks for each Class Member divided by the sum total Workweeks for all Class Members.
- BB. "Plaintiff" and/or "Plaintiffs" shall mean Martin Mariscal, Daniel Garcia, Rafael Rojas, Jose Hernandez, and Luis Vazquez.
- CC. "QSF" means the Qualified Settlement Fund established, designated, and maintained by the Claims Administrator to fund the Gross Settlement Amount.
- DD. "Released Class Claims" shall mean all class claims alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged in the Operative Complaint in the Action, or reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged in the Operative Complaint, which occurred during the Class Period, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and class claims outside of the Class Period.
- EE. "Released PAGA Claims" means all PAGA claims alleged in the Operative Complaint and Plaintiffs' PAGA notices to the LWDA, or reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged in the Operative Complaint and Plaintiffs' PAGA

notices to the LWDA, which occurred during the PAGA Period, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

- FF. "Released Parties" shall mean the named Defendants, together with their officers, directors, employees, members, member managers, owners, affiliates and agents. The Parties intend that the Released Parties shall be defined as broad as legally permissible.
- GG. "Response Deadline" means the date forty-five (45) calendar days after the Claims

 Administrator mails Notice Packets to Class Members and the last date on which

 Class Members may submit requests for exclusion or objections to the Settlement.
- HH. "Service Awards" means awards in the amount of \$15,000.00 each or in an amount that the Court authorizes to be paid to Class Representatives Martin Mariscal, Daniel Garcia, Rafael Rojas, and Jose Hernandez, and an award in the amount of \$30,000.00 or in an amount the Court authorizes to be paid to Class Representative Luis Vazquez. The Service Awards are in addition to the Individual Settlement Payments and the individual PAGA Group Payments, in recognition of the Plaintiffs' efforts and risks in assisting with the prosecution of the Action.
- II. "Settlement" means the disposition of the Actions pursuant to this Agreement.
- JJ. "Claims Administrator" means Apex Class Action Settlement Administration, 18

 Technology Drive, Ste. 164, Irvine, CA 92618; Tel: 1-800-355-0700; Fax: (949)878
 3536. The Claims Administrator establishes, designates and maintains, as a QSF under Internal Revenue Code section 468B and Treasury Regulation section 1.468B
 1, into which the amount of the Gross Settlement Amount is deposited for the purpose of resolving the claims of Settlement Class Members. The Claims Administrator shall maintain the funds until distribution in an account(s) segregated from the assets of

- On August 16, 2022, Plaintiff Hernandez sent a letter, by online submission to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants outlining the facts and theories underlying
- On September 30, 2022, Plaintiff Hernandez initiated his Action by filing a class
- On October 28, 2022, Plaintiff Vazquez sent a letter, by online submission to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants outlining the facts and theories underlying
- On October 31, 2022, Plaintiff Vazquez initiated his Action by filing a class action
- On March 30, 2023, the Court ordered all matters consolidated. Currently, all matters are consolidated and reside with the Honorable George Abdallah Jr., Department 10A
- The Class Representatives believe they have claims based on alleged violations of the California Labor Code, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and that class certification is appropriate because the prerequisites for class certification can be satisfied in the Action, and this action is manageable as a PAGA representative
- Defendants deny any liability or wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims alleged in the Action, disputes any wages, damages and penalties claimed by the Class Representative are owed, and further contends that, for any purpose other than settlement, the Action is not appropriate for class or representative action treatment. Defendants contend, among other things, that at all times it complied with the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders.
- The Class Representatives are represented by Class Counsel. Class Counsel investigated the facts relevant to the Action, including conducting an independent

investigation as to the allegations, reviewing documents and information exchanged through informal discovery, and reviewing documents and information provided by Defendants pursuant to informal requests for information to prepare for mediation. Defendants produced for the purpose of settlement negotiations certain employment data concerning the Settlement Class, which Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed with the assistance of an expert. Based on their own independent investigation and evaluation, Class Counsel is of the opinion that the Settlement with Defendants is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interest of the Settlement Class considering all known facts and circumstances, including the risks of significant delay, defenses asserted by Defendants, uncertainties regarding class certification, and numerous potential appellate issues. Although it denies any liability, Defendants agree to this Settlement solely to avoid the inconveniences and cost of further litigation. The Parties and their counsel have agreed to settle the claims on the terms set forth in this Agreement.

- K. On October 11, 2023, the Parties participated in mediation presided over by Steve Rottman, Esq., an experienced mediator of wage and hour class and PAGA actions.

 The mediation concluded with a settlement, which was subsequently memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding.
- L. This Agreement replaces and supersedes the Memorandum of Understanding and any other agreements, understandings, or representations between the Parties. 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 Defendants that the claims in the Action of Plaintiff or the Class Members have merit or that Defendants bear any liability to Plaintiff or the Class on those claims or any other claims, or as an admission by Plaintiff that Defendants' defenses in the Action have merit.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

M.

The Parties believe that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Settlement was arrived at through arm's-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors. The Parties recognize the uncertainty, risk, expense, and delay attendant to continuing the Action through trial and any appeal. Accordingly, the Parties desire to settle, compromise and discharge all disputes and claims arising from or relating to the Action fully, finally, and forever. N.

The Parties agree to certification of the Class for purposes of this Settlement only. If for any reason the settlement does not become effective. Defendants reserve the right to contest certification of any class for any reason and reserves all available defenses to the claims in the Action.

Based on these Recitals that are a part of this Agreement, the Parties agree as follows:

III. TERMS OF AGREEMENT

- A. Settlement Consideration and Settlement Payments by Defendants.
 - 1. Settlement Consideration. In full and complete settlement of the Action, and in exchange for the releases set forth below, Defendant Janco will pay the sum of the Individual Settlement Payments, the Service Awards, the Attorneys' Fees and Attorneys' Expenses, PAGA Payments, and the Claims Administration Expenses, as specified in this Agreement, equal to the Gross Settlement Amount of Two Million Thousand Dollars (\$2,000,000.00). The Parties agree that this is a non-reversionary Settlement and that no portion of the Gross Settlement Amount shall revert to Defendants. Other than Defendant Janco's share of employer payroll taxes and as provided in Section III.A.2 below, Defendant Janco shall not be required to pay more than the Gross Settlement Amount.
 - 2. Class Size. Defendants represent that the Settlement Class was comprised of 893 individuals who collectively worked approximately 61,357 workweeks

STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS

("Projected Workweeks") during the Class Period. No later than fifteen (15) days after execution of this Settlement Agreement, Defendant Janco will provide the Claims Administrator with the Class Data in order to ensure the Claims Administrator has sufficient time to prepare the foregoing declaration prior to the filing of the motion for Preliminary Approval. If the Projected Workweeks increase by more than 10% of the estimated stated herein, the Gross Settlement Amount shall increase proportionally for the number of workweeks over 110% of the 61,357 Projected Workweeks (67,493). For example, if the total workweeks in the Class Period are 115% of 61,357, the Gross Settlement Amount shall increase by 5%. The Claims Administrator will provide a declaration under penalty of perjury confirming the number of applicable Class Members, PAGA Group Members, PAGA Pay Periods, and workweeks they worked during the applicable Class Period one week prior to Plaintiffs' deadline to file their motion for preliminary approval of the settlement.

3. Settlement Payment. Defendants Janco, Terry Alexander, and Andrew Alexander will each be jointly and severally liable for the entire Gross Settlement Amount and shall deposit the Gross Settlement Amount into the QSF, through the Claims Administrator in three (3) installments. The first installment of \$666,666.66 shall be made within fourteen (14) days of the Effective Date ("First Installment"). The second installment of \$666,666.66 shall be made six months of the First Installment ("Second Installment"). The third and final installment of \$666,666.67 shall be made within six months of the second installment. Any interest accrued will be added to the NSA and distributed to the Settlement Class Members except that if final approval is reversed on appeal, then Defendants are entitled to prompt return of the

D.

principal and all interest accrued.

- 4. <u>Defendants' Share of Payroll Taxes</u>. Defendants' share of employer side payroll taxes is in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount and shall be paid together with the Gross Settlement Amount on each Funding Date.
- B. Release by Settlement Class Members. As of the Effective Date, subject to Defendants' full payment of the Gross Settlement Amount, and in exchange for the consideration set forth in this Agreement, Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members release the Released Parties from the Released Class Claims for the Class Period.
- C. Release by the PAGA Class Members. As of the Effective Date, subject to Defendants' full payment of the Gross Settlement Amount, and in exchange for the consideration set forth in this Agreement, the Plaintiffs, the LWDA and the State of California release the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims for the PAGA Period. As a result of this release, the PAGA Class Members shall be precluded from bringing claims against Defendants for the Released PAGA Claims.
 - General Release by Plaintiffs. As of the Effective Date, subject to Defendants' full payment of the Gross Settlement Amount, and for the consideration set forth in this Agreement, Plaintiffs waive, release, acquit and forever discharge the Released Parties from any and all claims, whether known or unknown, which exist or may exist on either Plaintiffs' behalf as of the date of this Agreement, including but not limited to any and all tort claims, contract claims, wage claims, wrongful termination claims, disability claims, benefit claims, public policy claims, retaliation claims, statutory claims, personal injury claims, emotional distress claims, invasion of privacy claims, defamation claims, fraud claims, quantum meruit claims, and any and all claims arising under any federal, state or other governmental statute, law, regulation or ordinance, including, but not limited to claims for violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the California Labor Code, the Wage Orders of California's Industrial Welfare

Commission, other state wage and hour laws, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, the California Family Rights Act, the Family Medical Leave Act, California's Whistleblower Protection Act, California Business & Professions Code Section 17200 et seq., and any and all claims arising under any federal, state or other governmental statute, law, regulation or ordinance. Plaintiffs also waive and relinquish any and all claims, rights or benefits that they may have under California Civil Code § 1542, which provides as follows:

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.

Thus, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1542, and to implement a full and complete release and discharge of the Released Parties, Plaintiffs expressly acknowledge this Settlement Agreement is intended to include in its effect, without limitation, all claims Plaintiffs do not know or suspect to exist in Plaintiffs' favor at the time of signing this Settlement Agreement, and that this Settlement Agreement contemplates the extinguishment of any such claims. Plaintiffs warrant that each of them has read this Settlement Agreement, including this waiver of California Civil Code section 1542, and that Plaintiffs have consulted with or had the opportunity to consult with counsel of Plaintiffs' choosing about this Settlement Agreement and

specifically about the waiver of section 1542, and that Plaintiffs understand this Settlement Agreement and the section 1542 waiver, and so Plaintiffs freely and knowingly enter into this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiffs further acknowledge that Plaintiffs later may discover facts different from or in addition to those Plaintiffs now know or believe to be true regarding the matters released or described in this Settlement Agreement, and even so Plaintiffs agree that the releases and agreements contained in this Settlement Agreement shall remain effective in all respects notwithstanding any later discovery of any different or additional facts. Plaintiffs expressly assume any and all risk of any mistake in connection with the true facts involved in the matters, disputes, or controversies released or described in this Settlement Agreement or with regard to any facts now unknown to Plaintiffs relating thereto.

Representations as to No Other Claims: Neither Plaintiffs nor Class Counsel are currently aware, as of the date this Agreement is fully executed, (a) unalleged claims in addition to, or different from, those which are finally and forever settled and released against the Released Parties by this Agreement or this settlement, and (b) unalleged facts or legal theories upon which any claims or causes of action could be brought against any Released Parties, except such facts and theories specifically alleged in the operative Complaint in this Action. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will further represent that, other than this Action, they have no current intention of asserting any other claims against any of the Released Parties in any judicial or administrative forum as of the execution of the Settlement Agreement. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will further represent that, as of the signing of the Settlement Agreement, they do not currently know of or represent any persons who have expressed any interest in pursuing litigation or seeking any recovery against any Released Parties. This includes all Plaintiffs and any claims they may have or had, including any individual claims, which

will be released in the settlement agreement and herein via Cal. Civ. Code section 1542 waiver. The Parties acknowledge, understand and agree that the representations described in this paragraph are essential to this Agreement or this settlement and that this Agreement would not have been entered into were it not for these representations.

- E. <u>Conditions Precedent</u>: This Settlement will become final and effective only upon the occurrence of all of the following events:
 - 1. The Court enters an order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement;
 - 2. The Court enters an order granting final approval of the Settlement and a Final Judgment;
 - 3. If an objector appears at the final approval hearing, the time for appeal of the Final Judgment and Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement expires; or, if an appeal is timely filed, there is a final resolution of any appeal from the Judgment and Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement; and
 - 4. Defendants fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount and comply with all payment provisions herein.
- F. <u>Nullification of Settlement Agreement</u>. If this Settlement Agreement is not preliminarily or finally approved by the Court, fails to become effective, or is reversed, withdrawn or modified by the Court, or in any way prevents or prohibits Defendants from obtaining a complete resolution of the Released Class Claims, or if Defendants fail to fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount:
 - 1. This Settlement Agreement shall be void *ab initio* and of no force or effect, and shall not be admissible in any judicial, administrative or arbitral proceeding for any purpose or with respect to any issue, substantive or procedural;

- The conditional class certification (obtained for any purpose) shall be void ab initio and of no force or effect, and shall not be admissible in any judicial, administrative or arbitral proceeding for any purpose or with respect to any issue, substantive or procedural;
- 3. None of the Parties to this Settlement will be deemed to have waived any claims, objections, defenses, or arguments in the Action, including with respect to the issue of class certification; and
- 4. If Defendants fail to fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, Defendants shall bear the sole responsibility for any cost to issue or reissue any curative notice to the Settlement Class Members and all Claims Administration Expenses incurred to the date of nullification.
- G. Certification of the Settlement Class. The Parties stipulate to conditional class certification of the Class for the Class Period for purposes of settlement only. In the event that this Settlement is not approved by the Court, fails to become effective, or is reversed, withdrawn or modified by the Court, or in any way prevents or prohibits Defendants from obtaining a complete resolution of the Released Class Claims, the conditional class certification (obtained for any purpose) shall be void *ab initio* and of no force or effect, and shall not be admissible in any judicial, administrative or arbitral proceeding for any purpose or with respect to any issue, substantive or procedural.
- H. Tax Liability. The Parties make no representations as to the tax treatment or legal effect of the payments called for, and Class Members and/or PAGA Group Members are not relying on any statement or representation by the Parties in this regard. Class Members and/or PAGA Group Members understand and agree that they will be responsible for the payment of any taxes and penalties assessed on the Individual Settlement Payments and/or PAGA Group Members' individual shares of the PAGA Group Payment described and will be solely responsible for any penalties or other

obligations resulting from their personal tax reporting of Individual Settlement Payments and/or PAGA Group Members' individual shares of the PAGA Group Payment.

- I. Circular 230 Disclaimer. Each Party to this Agreement (for purposes of this section, the "acknowledging party" and each Party to this Agreement other than the acknowledging party, an "other party") acknowledges and agrees that: (1) no provision of this Agreement, and no written communication or disclosure between or among the Parties or their attorneys and other advisers, is or was intended to be, nor shall any such communication or disclosure constitute or be construed or be relied upon as, tax advice within the meaning of United States Treasury Department circular 230 (31 CFR part 10, as amended); (2) the acknowledging party (a) has relied exclusively upon his, her or its own, independent legal and tax counsel for advice (including tax advice) in connection with this Agreement, (b) has not entered into this Agreement based upon the recommendation of any other Party or any attorney or advisor to any other Party, and (c) is not entitled to rely upon any communication or disclosure by any attorney or adviser to any other party to avoid any tax penalty that may be imposed on the acknowledging party, and (3) no attorney or adviser to any other Party has imposed any limitation that protects the confidentiality of any such attorney's or adviser's tax strategies (regardless of whether such limitation is legally binding) upon disclosure by the acknowledging party of the tax treatment or tax structure of any transaction, including any transaction contemplated by this Agreement.
- J. <u>Preliminary Approval Motion</u>. Class Counsel shall draft and file the motion for preliminary approval within thirty (30) calendar days of execution of this Agreement, or within the statutory timeframe as determined by the Court's setting of the preliminary approval hearing, which shall include this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiffs will provide Defendants with a draft of the Motion at least five business days

22

23

24

25

26

4

7

8

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

prior to the filing of the Motion to give Defendants an opportunity to propose changes or additions to the Motion.

K. Claims Administrator. The Claims Administrator shall be responsible for; establishing and administering the QSF; calculating, processing and mailing payments to the Class Representatives, Class Counsel, LWDA, PAGA Group Members, and Class Members; printing and mailing the Notice Packets to the Class Members as directed by the Court; receiving and reporting the objections and requests for exclusion; calculating, deducting and remitting all legally required taxes from Individual Settlement Payments and distributing tax forms for the Wage Portion, the Penalties Portion and the Interest Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments and/or PAGA Group Members' individual shares of the PAGA Group Payment; processing and mailing tax payments to the appropriate state and federal taxing authorities; providing declaration(s) as necessary in support of preliminary and/or final approval of this Settlement; and other tasks as the Parties mutually agree or the Court orders the Claims Administrator to perform. The Claims Administrator shall keep the Parties timely apprised of the performance of all Claims Administrator responsibilities by among other things, sending a weekly status report to the Parties' counsel stating the date of the mailing, the of number of Elections Not to Participate in Settlement it receives (including the numbers of valid and deficient), and number of objections received.

L. Notice Procedure.

- 1. Class Data. No later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the Preliminary
 Approval Date, Defendant Janco shall confirm with the Claims Administrator
 the Class Data for purposes of preparing and mailing Notice Packets to the
 Class Members.
- 2. Notice Packets.

a)

The Notice Packet shall contain the Notice of Class Action Settlement in a form substantially similar to the form attached as Exhibit A. The Notice of Class Action Settlement shall inform Class Members and PAGA Group Members that they need not do anything in order to receive an Individual Settlement Payment and/or PAGA Group Members' individual shares of the PAGA Group Payment and to keep the Claims Administrator apprised of their current mailing address, to which the Individual Settlement Payments and/or PAGA Group Members' individual shares of the PAGA Group Payment will be mailed following each Funding Date. The Notice of Class Action Settlement shall set forth the release to be given by all members of the Class who do not request to be excluded from the Settlement Class and/or PAGA Group Members in exchange for an Individual Settlement Payment and/or PAGA Group Members' individual shares of the PAGA Group Payment, the number of Workweeks worked by each Class Member during the Class Period and PAGA Period, if any, and the estimated amount of their Individual Settlement Payment if they do not request to be excluded from the Settlement and each PAGA Group Members' share of the PAGA Group Payment, if any. The Claims Administrator shall use the Class Data to determine Class Members' Workweeks and PAGA Workweeks. The Notice will also advise the PAGA Group Members that they will release the Released PAGA Claims and will receive their share of the PAGA Group Payment regardless of whether they request to be excluded from the Settlement.

26

- b) The Notice Packet's mailing envelope shall include the following language: "IMPORTANT LEGAL DOCUMENT- YOU MAY BE ENTITLED TO PARTICIPATE IN A CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT; A PROMPT REPLY TO CORRECT YOUR ADDRESS IS REQUIRED AS EXPLAINED IN THE ENCLOSED NOTICE."
- Administrator will perform a search based on the National Change of Address
 Database to update and correct any known or identifiable address changes.

 No later than twenty-one (21) calendar days receipt of the Class Data the
 Claims Administrator shall mail copies of the Notice Packet to all Class
 Members via regular First-Class U.S. Mail and electronic mail. The Claims
 Administrator shall exercise its best judgment to determine the current mailing
 address for each Class Member. The address identified by the Claims
 Administrator as the current mailing address shall be presumed to be the best
 mailing address for each Class Member.
- 4. <u>Undeliverable Notices</u>. Any Notice Packets returned to the Claims Administrator as non-delivered on or before the Response Deadline shall be re-mailed to any forwarding address provided. If no forwarding address is provided, the Claims Administrator shall promptly attempt to determine a correct address by lawful use of skip-tracing, or other search using the name, address and/or Social Security number of the Class Member involved, and shall then perform a re-mailing, if another mailing address is identified by the Claims Administrator. In addition, if any Notice Packets, which are addressed to Class Members who are currently employed by Defendant Janco, are returned to the Claims Administrator as non-delivered and no forwarding

address is provided, the Claims Administrator shall notify Defendants. Defendants will request that the currently employed Class Member provide a corrected address and transmit to the Claims Administrator any corrected address provided by the Class Member. Class Members who received a remailed Notice Packet shall have their Response Deadline extended fifteen (15) days from the original Response Deadline.

- bisputes Regarding Individual Settlement Payments. Class Members will have the opportunity, should they disagree with Defendant Janco's records regarding the start and end dates of employment, to provide documentation and/or an explanation to show contrary dates. If there is a dispute, the Claims Administrator will consult with the Parties to determine whether an adjustment is warranted. The Claims Administrator shall determine the eligibility for, and the amounts of, any Individual Settlement Payments under the terms of this Agreement. The Claims Administrator's determination of the eligibility for and amount of any Individual Settlement Payment shall be binding upon the Class Member and the Parties.
- by the Claims Administrator concerning the administration of the Settlement will be presented to the mediator for resolution. Before any such involvement of the mediator, counsel for the Parties will confer in good faith to resolve the disputes without the necessity of involving the mediator.
- 7. Exclusions. The Notice of Class Action Settlement contained in the Notice Packet shall state that Class Members who wish to exclude themselves from the Settlement must submit a written request for exclusion to the Claims Administrator by the Response Deadline. The written request for exclusion (1) must contain the name, address, and the last four digits of the Social

Security number of the person requesting exclusion; (2) must be signed by the Class Member; (3) must be postmarked or fax stamped by the Response Deadline and returned to the Claims Administrator at the specified address or fax telephone number; and (4) contain a typewritten or handwritten notice stating in substance that he or she wishes to be excluded from the settlement of the class action lawsuit entitled Mariscal, et al. v. Janco Industries, Inc., currently pending in Superior Court of San Joaquin, Case No. STR-CV-UOE-2022-7290. The request for exclusion will not be valid if it is not timely submitted, if it is not signed by the Class Member, or if it does not contain the name and address and last four digits of the Social Security number of the Class Member. The date of the postmark on the mailing envelope or fax stamp on the request for exclusion shall be the exclusive means used to determine whether the request for exclusion was timely submitted. Any Class Member who submits a timely request for exclusion shall be excluded from the Settlement Class will not be entitled to an Individual Settlement Payment and will not be otherwise bound by the terms of the Settlement or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. However, any Class Member that submits a timely request for exclusion that is also a member of the PAGA Group Members will still receive his/her pro rata share of the PAGA Settlement, as specified below, and in consideration, will be bound by the Release by the PAGA Group Members as set forth herein. Settlement Class Members who fail to submit a valid and timely request for exclusion on or before the Response Deadline shall be bound by all terms of the Settlement and any final judgment entered in this Action if the Settlement is approved by the Court. No later than ten (10) calendar days after the Response Deadline, the Claims Administrator shall provide counsel for the Parties with a final list

26

26

27

28

of the Class Members who have timely submitted timely requests for exclusion. At no time shall any of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise encourage members of the Class to submit requests for exclusion from the Settlement.

8. Objections. The Notice of Class Action Settlement contained in the Notice Packet shall state that Class Members who wish to object to the Settlement may submit to the Claims Administrator a written statement of objection ("Notice of Objection") by the Response Deadline. The postmark date of mailing shall be deemed the exclusive means for determining that a Notice of Objection was served timely. The Notice of Objection, if in writing, must be signed by the Settlement Class Member and state: (1) the case name and number; (2) the name of the Settlement Class Member; (3) the address of the Settlement Class Member; (4) the last four digits of the Settlement Class Member's Social Security number; (5) the basis for the objection; and (6) if Settlement Class Member intends to appear at the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing. Class Members who fail to make objections in writing in the manner specified above may still make their objections orally at the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing with the Court's permission. Settlement Class Members will have a right to appear at the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing to have their objections heard by the Court regardless of whether they submitted a written objection. At no time shall any of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise encourage Class Members to file or serve written objections to the Settlement or appeal from the Order and Final Judgment. Class Members who submit a written request for exclusion may not object to the Settlement. Class Members may not object to the PAGA Settlement.

27

- M. Funding and Allocation of the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendants are required to pay the Gross Settlement Amount plus the employer's share of payroll taxes as mandated by law within the time specified hereinabove on each Funding Date.
 - Calculation of Individual Settlement Payments. Individual Settlement 1. Payments shall be paid from the Net Settlement Amount and shall be paid pursuant to the formula set forth herein. Using the Class Data, the Claims Administrator shall add up the total number of Workweeks for all Class Members. The respective Workweeks for each Class Member will be divided by the total Workweeks for all Class Members, resulting in the Payment Ratio for each Class Member. Each Class Member's Payment Ratio will then be multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to calculate each Class Member's estimated Individual Settlement Payment. Each Individual Settlement Payment will be reduced by any legally mandated employee tax withholdings (e.g., employee payroll taxes, etc.). Individual Settlement Payments for Class Members who submit valid and timely requests for exclusion will be redistributed to Settlement Class Members who do not submit valid and timely requests for exclusion on a pro rata basis based on their respective Payment Ratios.
 - Calculation of Individual Payments to the PAGA Group Members. Using the Class Data, the Claims Administrator shall add up the total number of PAGA Pay Periods for all PAGA Group Members during the PAGA Period. The respective PAGA Pay Periods for each PAGA Group Member will be divided by the total PAGA Pay Periods for all PAGA Group Members, resulting in the "PAGA Payment Ratio" for each PAGA Group Member. Each PAGA Group Members's PAGA Payment Ratio will then be multiplied by the PAGA

Group Payment to calculate each PAGA Group Members's estimated share of the PAGA Group Payment.

- 3. Allocation of Individual Settlement Payments. For tax purposes, Individual Settlement Payments shall be allocated and treated as 20% wages ("Wage Portion") and 80% penalties and pre-judgment interest ("Penalties and Interest Portion"). The Wage Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments shall be reported on IRS Form W-2 and the Penalties and Interest Portion and Interest Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments shall be reported on IRS Form 1099 issued by the Settlement Agreement.
- 4. <u>Allocation of PAGA Group Payments</u>. For tax purposes, PAGA Group Payments shall be allocated and treated as 100% penalties and shall be reported on IRS Form 1099.
- 5. No Credit Toward Benefit Plans. The Individual Settlement Payments and individual shares of the PAGA Payment made to Settlement Class Members and/or PAGA Group Members under this Settlement Agreement, as well as any other payments made pursuant to this Settlement Agreement, will not be utilized to calculate any additional benefits under any benefit plans to which any Class Members may be eligible, including, but not limited to profit-sharing plans, bonus plans, 401(k) plans, stock purchase plans, vacation plans, sick leave plans, PTO plans, and any other benefit plan. Rather, it is the Parties' intention that this Settlement Agreement will not affect any rights, contributions, or amounts to which any Class Members may be entitled under any benefit plans.
- 6. All monies received by Settlement Class Members under the Settlement which are attributable to wages shall constitute income to such Settlement Class Members solely in the year in which such monies are actually received by the

8.

Settlement Class Members. It is the intent of the Parties that Individual Settlement Payments and individual shares of the PAGA Payment provided for in this Settlement agreement are the sole payments to be made by Defendants to Settlement Class Members and/or PAGA Group Members in connection with this Settlement Agreement, with the exception of Plaintiffs, and that the Settlement Class Members and/or PAGA Group Members are not entitled to any new or additional compensation or benefits as a result of having received the Individual Settlement Payments and/or their shares of the PAGA Group Payment.

- 7. Mailing. Proportionate Individual Settlement Payments and PAGA Group Payments shall be mailed by regular First-Class U.S. Mail to Settlement Class Members' and/or PAGA Group Members' last known mailing address no later than thirty (30) days after each Funding Date.
 - Expiration. Any checks issued to Settlement Class Members and PAGA Group Members shall remain valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) days from the date of their issuance. If a Settlement Class Member and/or PAGA Group Member does not cash his or her settlement check within 90 days, the Claims Administrator will send a letter to such persons, advising that the check will expire after the 180th day, and invite that Settlement Class Member and/or PAGA Group Member to request reissuance in the event the check was destroyed, lost or misplaced. In the event an Individual Settlement Payment and/or PAGA Group Members' individual share of the PAGA Payment check has not been cashed within one hundred and eighty (180) days, all funds represented by such uncashed checks, plus any interest accrued thereon, shall be paid to the Community Law Project, a Cy Pres, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 384.

9.

Service Awards. In addition to the Individual Settlement Payments as Settlement Class Members and their individual shares of the PAGA Group Payment, Plaintiffs will apply to the Court for an award of not more than \$15,000.00 as Service Awards for Plaintiffs Martin Mariscal, Daniel Garcia, Rafael Rojas and Jose Hernandez, and for an award of not more than \$30,000.00 as the Service Award for Plaintiff Luis Vazquez. Defendants will not oppose Service Awards of not more than \$15,000.00 for Plaintiffs Martin Mariscal, Daniel Garcia, Rafael Rojas, and Jose Hernandez, and a Service Award of not more than \$30,000.00 for Plaintiff Luis Vazquez. The Claims Administrator shall pay proportionate shares of the Service Awards, either in the amount stated herein if approved by the Court or some other amount as approved by the Court, to Plaintiffs from the Gross Settlement Amount no later than thirty (30) days after each Funding Date. Any portion of the requested Service Award that is not awarded to the Class Representatives shall be part of the Net Settlement Amount and shall be distributed to Settlement Class Members as provided in this Agreement. The Claims Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099 — MISC to Plaintiffs for their Service Awards. Plaintiffs shall be solely and legally responsible to pay any and all applicable taxes on their Service Awards and shall hold harmless the Released Parties from any claim or liability for taxes, penalties, or interest arising as a result of the Service Awards. Approval of this Settlement shall not be conditioned on Court approval of the requested amount of the Service Awards. If the Court reduces or does not approve the requested Service Awards, Plaintiffs shall not have the right to revoke the Settlement, and it will remain binding.

10. <u>Attorneys' Fees and Attorneys' Expenses</u>. Defendant understands Class Counsel will file a motion for or Attorneys' Fees not to exceed 35% of the

25

26

Gross Settlement Amount currently estimated to be \$700,000.00 and Attorneys' Expenses not to exceed Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000.00). Any awarded Attorneys' Fees and Attorneys' Expenses shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Any portion of the requested Attorneys' Fees and/or Attorneys' Expenses that are not awarded to Class Counsel shall be part of the Net Settlement Amount and shall be distributed to Settlement Class Members as provided in this Agreement. The Claims Administrator shall allocate and pay a proportionate share of the Attorneys' Fees and Attorneys' Expenses to Class Counsel from the Gross Settlement Amount no later than thirty (30) days after each Funding Date. Class Counsel shall be solely and legally responsible to pay all applicable taxes on the payment made pursuant to this paragraph. The Claims Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099 — MISC to Class Counsel for the payments made pursuant to this paragraph. In the event that the Court reduces or does not approve the requested Attorneys' Fees, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall not have the right to revoke the Settlement, or to appeal such order, and the Settlement will remain binding.

11. PAGA Payment. One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) shall be allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount for settlement of claims for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA Payment"). The Claims Administrator shall pay a proportionate share of the LWDA Payment, comprised of seventy-five percent (75%) of the PAGA Payment (\$75,000.00), to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency no later than thirty (30) days after each Funding Date. The PAGA Group Payment, comprised of twenty-five percent (25%) of the PAGA Payment (\$25,000.00), will be distributed to the PAGA Group Members as described in this Agreement. For purposes of distributing the PAGA Group

Payment, each PAGA Group Member shall receive their pro-rata share of the PAGA Group Payment using the PAGA Payment Ratio as defined above.

- 12. <u>Claims Administration Expenses</u>. The Claims Administrator shall be paid for the costs of administration of the Settlement from the Gross Settlement Amount. The estimate of the Claims Administration Expenses is \$13,000.00. The Claims Administrator shall be paid a proportionate share of the Claims Administration Expenses no later than thirty (30) days after each Funding Date.
- N. Final Approval Motion. Class Counsel and Plaintiffs shall use best efforts to file with the Court a Motion for Order Granting Final Approval and Entering Judgment, within twenty (20) days following the expiration of the Response Deadline, which motion shall request final approval of the Settlement and a determination of the amounts payable for the Service Awards, the Attorneys' Fees and Attorneys' Expenses, the PAGA Payment, and the Claims Administration Expenses. Plaintiffs will provide Defendants with a draft of the Motion at least five business days prior to the filing of the Motion to give Defendants an opportunity to propose changes or additions to the Motion.
 - Declaration by Claims Administrator. No later than seven (7) days after the Response Deadline, the Claims Administrator shall submit a declaration in support of Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of this Settlement detailing the number of Notice Packets mailed and re-mailed to Class Members, the number of undeliverable Notice Packets, the number of timely requests for exclusion, the full names of those Class Members who requested exclusion from the Settlement, the number of objections received, the amount of the average, highest, and lowest Individual Settlement Payments, the amount of the average, highest, and lowest PAGA Group Payments, the Claims

Administration Expenses, and any other information as the Parties mutually agree or the Court orders the Claims Administrator to provide.

- 2. <u>Final Approval Order and Judgment</u>. Class Counsel shall present an Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement to the Court for its approval, and Judgment thereon, at the time Class Counsel files the Motion for Final Approval.
- N. Review of Motions for Preliminary and Final Approval. Class Counsel will provide an opportunity for Counsel for Defendants to review the Motions for Preliminary and Final Approval, including the Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, and Judgment before filing with the Court, as stated above. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts to affect the Court's approval of the Motions for Preliminary and Final Approval of the Settlement, and entry of Judgment.
- O. <u>Cooperation</u>. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts to implement the Settlement.
- P. <u>Interim Stay of Proceedings</u>. The Parties agree to stay all proceedings in the Action, except such proceedings necessary to implement and complete the Settlement, pending the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing to be conducted by the Court.
- Q. <u>Amendment or Modification</u>. This Agreement may be amended or modified only by a written instrument signed by counsel for all Parties or their successors-in-interest.
- R. Entire Agreement. This Agreement and any attached Exhibit constitute the entire Agreement among these Parties, and no oral or written representations, warranties or inducements have been made to any Party concerning this Agreement or its Exhibits other than the representations, warranties and covenants contained and memorialized in this Agreement and its Exhibit.

- S. Authorization to Enter into Settlement Agreement. Counsel for all Parties warrant and represent they are expressly authorized by the Parties whom they represent to negotiate this Agreement and 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 required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The persons signing this Agreement on behalf of Defendants represents and warrants that he/she is authorized to sign this Agreement on behalf of Defendants. Plaintiffs represent and warrant that they are authorized to sign this Agreement and that they have not assigned any claim, or part of a claim, covered by this Settlement to a third-party.
- Т. No Public Comment: The Parties and their counsel agree that they will not issue any press releases, initiate any contact with the press, respond to any press inquiry, or have any communication with the press about the fact, amount or terms of the Settlement Agreement. Class Counsel further agrees not to use the Settlement Agreement or any of its terms for any marketing or promotional purposes. Further, Class Counsel will not include, reference, or use the Settlement Agreement for any marketing or promotional purposes, either before or after the Motion for Preliminary Approval is filed. Except a may be necessary to enforce the provisions of this Agreement, or otherwise prohibited by law, including California Code of Civil Procedure section 1001-1002, and Cal. Gov. Code §§ 12900 et seq., Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall not directly or indirectly disclose the facts, Gross Settlement Amount, or terms of this individual, class and representative settlement to the public or to anyone. Nothing herein will restrict Class Counsel from including publicly available information regarding this settlement in future judicial submissions regarding Class Counsel's qualifications and experience for adequacy as attorneys for a putative class or representative group to justify an award of attorney fees. Nothing shall prevent the

21

22

23

24

25

- communication by Class Counsel or any parties to respond to specific questions received from the Settlement Class Members regarding the terms of the Agreement.
- U. <u>Binding on Successors and Assigns</u>. This Agreement shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors or assigns of the Parties, as previously defined.
- V. <u>California Law Governs</u>. All terms of this Agreement and the Exhibit and any disputes shall be governed by and interpreted according to the laws of the State of California.
- W. <u>Counterparts</u>. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts. All executed counterparts and each of them shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument provided that counsel for the Parties to this Agreement shall exchange among themselves copies or originals of the signed counterparts.
- X. This Settlement Is Fair, Adequate and Reasonable. The Parties believe this Settlement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of this Action and have arrived at this Settlement after extensive arms-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors, present and potential.
- Y. Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court. The Parties agree that the Court shall retain continuing jurisdiction over this case under CCP Section 664.6 to ensure the continuing implementation of the provisions of this settlement and that the time within which to bring this action to trial under CCP Section 583.310 shall be extended from the date of signing this agreement by all parties until the entry of the final approval order and judgement or if not entered the date this agreement shall no longer be of any force or effect
- Z. <u>Invalidity of Any Provision</u>. Before declaring any provision of this Agreement invalid, the Court shall first attempt to construe the provisions valid to the fullest extent possible consistent with applicable precedents so as to define all provisions of this Agreement valid and enforceable.

Waiver of Certain Appeals. The Parties agree to waive appeals and to stipulate to class

 DocuSign Envelope			;
			ı
1	DATED.	 	
2	DATED:Lui	s Vazquez	
3			
4	IS SO AGREED, FORM AND CONTENT, BY DI	EFENDANT:	
5	DATED:	\	
6		NCO INDUSTRIES, INC.	
7	l1	erry Alexander; Andrew Alexendar	
8		nted Name	
9	$\frac{C}{Tit}$	EO/CFO; Vice President	
10 11	DATED:March 26, 2024 [12:23 PM PDT	terry alexander	
12	Ter	rry Alexander CEO/CFO Docustigned by:	
13	DATED: March 26, 2024 10:14 AM EDT	drew Mexander drew APEXAMMET Vice President	
14	An	drew Alexander Vice Fresident	
15	IT IS SO AGREED AS TO FORM BY COUNS	SEL:	
16		1	
17	DATED: JC	L LAW FIRM, A.P.C.	,
18	Ву		_ ,
19		torneys for Plaintiff and the Settleme	nt Class
20	Me	embers	
21	DATED: ZA	KAY LAW GROUP, APLC	
22	By	:	
23		torneys for Plaintiff and the Settleme	ent Class
24		embers	
25			
26		35	
27	STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT OF C	LASS ACTION AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS	
28			

:
:
_
,
: Class
01405
<u>'</u>
Class
-

,		1
i	DATED: 3/20/2024	GAINES & GAINES, APLC
2	- 100 1000 1	1
3		By:
4.		Attorneys for Praintiff and the Settlement Class Members
5		
6	DATED: 04/01/2024	DREW LEWIS, PC
7		By: Dun Line
8		Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class
9		Members
10	DATED: 4-2-2024	GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP
11		By: Blather Dains
12		Roger M. Mansukhani, Esq. Bimali Walgampaya, Esq.
13		Heather T. Daiza, Esq.
14		Attorney for Defendants
15		,
16		1
17		!
18		1
20		i !
21		
22		<u> </u>
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	STIDI II ATION OF CETTI ELAPATA	36 OF CLASS ACTION AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS
28	OTH GEATION OF SETTEMBNIT	OF CLASS ACTION AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS
l		

EXHIBIT A

NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL HEARING DATE

(Mariscal, et al. v. Janco Industries, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court Case No. STR-CV-UOE-2022-7290)

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

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT:		
Do Nothing and Receive a Payment	To receive a cash payment from the Settlement, you do not have to do anything.	
	Your estimated Individual Settlement Payment is: \$<<>>. See the explanation below.	
	After final approval by the Court, the payment will be mailed to you at the same address as this notice. If your address has changed, please notify the Claims Administrator as explained below. In exchange for the settlement payment, you will release claims against the Defendants as detailed below.	
Exclude Yourself	If you wish to exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must send a written request for exclusion to the Claims Administrator as provided below. If you request exclusion, you will receive no money from the Settlement . Even if you exclude yourself, you will still be a PAGA Group Member subject to the PAGA settlement.	
	Instructions are set forth below.	
Object	You may object by writing to the Court about why you believe the settlement should not be approved or by appearing in court.	
u Homorou	Directions are provided below.	

1. Why did I get this Notice?

A proposed class action settlement (the "Settlement") of this lawsuit pending in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of San Joaquin (the "Court") has been reached between Plaintiff Martin Mariscal, Plaintiff Daniel Garcia, Plaintiff Jose Hernandez, Plaintiff Rafael Rojas, and Plaintiff Luis Vazquez ("Plaintiffs") and Defendant Janco Industries, Inc., Defendant Terry Alexander, and Defendant Andrew Alexander ("Defendants"). The Court has granted preliminary approval of the Settlement. You may be entitled to receive money from this Settlement.

You have received this Class Notice because you have been identified as a member of the Class, which is defined as:

All non-exempt employees who are or previously were employed by Janco and performed work in California during the period between August 19, 2018 to January 12, 2024 ("Class Period").

This Class Notice explains the lawsuit, the Settlement, and your legal rights. It is important that you read this Notice carefully as your rights may be affected by the Settlement.

2. What is this class action lawsuit about?

In this lawsuit, which was consolidated on March 30, 2023, Plaintiffs claim that Defendants (1) failed to pay all wages due; (2) failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, or compensation in lieu thereof; (3) failed to reimburse for all business-related expenses; (4) failed to issue accurately itemized wage statements; (5) failed to timely pay all wages due at the separation of employment; (6) violated California's Unfair Competition laws; and (7) that these violations entitle Plaintiffs to recovery civil penalties on behalf of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"). Currently, this matter resides with the Honorable George Abdallah Jr., Department 10 of the Stockton Courthouse.

Defendants deny any liability or wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims alleged in the Action, disputes any wages, damages and penalties claimed by the Class Representatives are owed, and further contends that, for any purpose other than settlement, the Action is not appropriate for class or representative action treatment. Defendants contend, among other things, that at all times it complied with the California Labor Code, the California Business & Professions Code, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders.

On October 11, 2023, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation with Steve Rottman, an experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. The mediation concluded with a settlement, which was subsequently memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding. The Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement on MONTH XX, 202X. At that time, the Court also preliminarily approved the Plaintiffs to serve as the Class Representatives, and the law firms of JCL Law Firm, APC, Zakay Law Group, APC, Gaines & Gaines, APLC, and Drew Lewis, PC to serve as Class Counsel.

3. What are the terms of the Settlement?

Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant has agreed to pay an amount of Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000.00) (the "Gross Settlement Amount") to fund the settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount includes the payment of all Individual Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members, PAGA Group Members, Attorneys' Fees, Attorneys' Expenses, Claims Administration Expenses, the PAGA Payment, and the Service Awards to the Plaintiffs.

After the Judgment becomes Final, Defendants will pay the Gross Settlement Amount by depositing the money with the Claims Administrator in three installments, commencing 14 days after the Final Judgment, and completed a year after Final Judgment. "Final" means the date the Judgment is no longer subject to appeal, or if an appeal is filed, the date the appeal process is completed, and the Judgment is affirmed.

Amounts to be Paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. The Settlement provides for certain payments to be made from the Gross Settlement Amount, which will be subject to final Court approval, and which will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount before settlement payments are made to Class Members, as follows:

- <u>Claims Administration Expenses</u>. The amount paid to the Claims Administrator from the Gross Settlement Amount for administering the Settlement currently estimated not to exceed Thirteen Thousand Dollars (\$13,000.00) for expenses, including expenses of sending this Notice, processing opt outs, and distributing settlement payments.
- <u>Attorneys' Fees and Attorneys' Expenses</u>. An award of Attorneys' Fees that the Court authorizes to be paid to Class Counsel for the services they rendered to Plaintiff and the Settlement Class in the Action,

not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, currently estimated to be Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000.00), and an award Attorneys' Expenses that the Court authorizes to be paid to Class Counsel for the expenses they have incurred up to Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000.00) for all expenses incurred as documented in Class Counsel's billing records, both subject to Court approval. Class Counsel have 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 have been paying all litigation costs and expenses.

- Service Awards. Service Awards in the amount of Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00) to Plaintiffs
 Mariscal, Garcia, Rojas, and Hernandez and in the amount of Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000.00) to
 Plaintiff Vazquez, 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.
- PAGA Payment. A payment of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) to be allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount, relating to Plaintiffs' claim under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), with 25% of the payment (\$25,000.00) going to the PAGA Group Members ("PAGA Group Payment") and 75% of the payment (\$75,000.00) going to the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") ("LWDA Payment")
- Calculation of Payments to Settlement Class Members. After all the above payments of the court-approved Attorneys' Fees, Attorneys' Expenses, the Service Awards, the PAGA Payment, and the Claims Administration Expenses are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the remaining portion, called the "Net Settlement Amount," shall be distributed to class members who do not request exclusion ("Settlement Class Members"). The Individual Settlement Payment for each Settlement Class Member will be calculated by dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of workweeks for all Settlement Class Members that occurred during the Class Period and multiplying the result by each individual Settlement Class Member's workweeks that occurred during the Class Period. A "workweek" is defined as any seven (7) consecutive days beginning on Sunday and ending on Saturday, in which a Class Member is employed and received any form of compensation from Defendants.
- Calculation of PAGA Group Payments to PAGA Group Members. The PAGA Group Payment shall be distributed to the PAGA Group Members irrespective of whether they exclude themselves or opt-out. The PAGA Group Payment will be divided by the total number of pay periods worked by all PAGA Group Members during the PAGA Period, and then taking that number and multiplying it by the number of pay periods worked by each respective PAGA Group Member during the PAGA Period. "PAGA Group Members" means all non-exempt employees who are or previously were employed by Defendant and performed work in California during the PAGA Period. The PAGA Period means the period between July 13, 2021, to January 12, 2024.

If the Settlement is approved by the Court, you will automatically be mailed a check for your Individual Settlement 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 Claims Administrator to inform them of your correct address to ensure you receive your payment.

Tax Matters. Twenty percent (20%) of each Individual Settlement Payment is allocated to wages. Taxes are withheld from this amount, and each Settlement Class Member will be issued an Internal Revenue Service Form W-2 for such payment. Eighty percent (80%) of each Individual Settlement Payment is allocated to interest, penalties and other non-wage payments, and no taxes will be withheld, and each Settlement Class Member will be issued an Internal Revenue Service Form 1099 for such payment. In addition, no taxes will be withheld from the PAGA Payment paid to PAGA Group Members, and each PAGA Group Member will be issued an Internal Revenue Service Form 1099 for such payment. Neither Class Counsel nor Defendants' counsel intend anything contained in this Settlement to constitute advice regarding taxes or taxability. You may wish to consult a tax advisor concerning the tax consequences of the payments received under the Settlement.

No Credit Toward Benefit Plans. The Individual Settlement Payments and PAGA Group Payments made to Settlement Class Members and/or PAGA Group Members under this Settlement Agreement, as well as any other payments made pursuant to this Settlement Agreement, will not be utilized to calculate any additional benefits under any benefit plans to which any Class Members may be eligible, including, but not limited to profit-sharing plans, bonus plans, 401(k) plans, stock purchase plans, vacation plans, sick leave plans, PTO plans, and any other benefit plan. Rather, it is the Parties' intention that this Settlement Agreement will not affect any rights, contributions, or amounts to which any Class Members may be entitled under any benefit plans.

<u>Conditions of Settlement</u>. This Settlement is conditioned upon the Court entering an order granting final approval of the Settlement and entering judgment.

4. What Do I Release Under the Settlement?

Released Class Claims. As of the Effective Date, subject to Defendants' full payment of the Gross Settlement Amount, and in exchange for the consideration set forth in this Agreement, Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members release the named Defendants, together with their officers, directors, employees, members, member managers, owners, affiliates and agents (the "Released Parties") from the all class claims alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged in the Operative Complaint in the Action which occurred during the Class Period, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and class claims outside of the Class Period (the "Released Class Claims").

Released PAGA Claims. As of Effective Date, subject to Defendants' full payment of the Gross Settlement Amount, and in exchange for the consideration set forth in this Agreement, the Plaintiffs, the LWDA and the State of California release the Released Parties from all PAGA claims alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, in the Operative Complaint and Plaintiffs' PAGA notices to the LWDA which occurred during the PAGA Period, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period (the "PAGA Released Claims"). As a result of this release, the PAGA Class Members shall be precluded from bringing claims against Defendants for the Released PAGA Claims.

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 about the legal issues resolved by this Settlement. It also means that all of the Court's orders in this Action will apply to you and legally bind you.

5. How much will my payment be?
Defendants' records reflect that you have <<>> Workweeks worked during the Class Period (August, 2018 to January 12, 2024).
Based on this information, your estimated Individual Settlement Payment is <<>>.
Defendants' records reflect that you have <<>> pay periods worked during the PAGA Period (Jul. 13, 2021 to January 12, 2024).
Based on this information, your estimated PAGA Group Payment is <<>>.
If you wish to challenge the information set forth above, then you must submit a written signed dispu

challenging the information along with supporting documents, to the Claims Administrator at the address

provided in this Notice no later thanafter the re-mailed Notice].	_ [forty-five (45) days after the Notice or fifteen (15) days
6. How can I get a payment? When will I be paid	
be mailed automatically to the same address as this No	to do anything. A check for your settlement payment will tice. If your address is incorrect or has changed, you must strator is: Apex Class Action Settlement Administration.
the Court approves the Settlement and there are no ob- months after this hearing. If there are objections or ap year, Please be patient. After entry of the Judgment,	_ to decide whether to finally approve the Settlement. If jections or appeals, payments will be mailed within a few speals, resolving them can take time, perhaps more than a the Claims Administrator will provide notice of the final f the Judgment on the Claims Administrator's website at
Group Payment will be received in three nayments a	t opt out, your Individual Settlement Payment and PAGA which are expected to take place on
7. What if I don't want to be a part of the Settlen	ient?
you opt out, you will receive NO money from the Se as provided as follows: Irrespective of whether you	may exclude yourself from the Settlement or "opt out." If ttlement, and you will not be bound by its terms, except exclude yourself from the Settlement or "opt out," you will to have released the Released PAGA Claims, and you will
for exclusion postmarked no later than Class Action LLC, 18 Technology Drive, Ste. 164, In substance that the Class Member has read the Class settlement of the class action lawsuit entitled <i>Maris</i> Superior Court of San Joaquin, Case No. STR-CV-UO	tor, by First Class Mail, a written, signed and dated request . The address for the Claims Administrator is Apex vine, CA 92618. The request for exclusion must state in Notice and that he or she wishes to be excluded from the cal, et al. v. Janco Industries, Inc., currently pending in E-2022-7290. The request for exclusion must contain your our Social Security Number for verification purposes. The person may opt out for a member of the Class.
Written requests for exclusion that are postmarked aft rejected, and those Class Members will remain bound	er, or are incomplete or unsigned will be by the Settlement and the release described above.
8. How do I tell the Court that I would like to ch	allenge the Settlement?

Any Class Member who has not opted out and believes that the Settlement should not be finally approved by the Court for any reason, may object to the proposed Settlement. Objections may be in writing and state the Class Member's name, current address, telephone number, and describe why you believe the Settlement is unfair and whether you intend to appear at the final approval hearing. All written objections or other correspondence must also state the name and number of the case, which is *Mariscal*, et al. v. Janco Industries, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court Case No. STR-CV-UOE-2022-7290. You may also object without submitting a written objection by appearing at the final approval hearing scheduled as described in Section 9 below.

To object to the Settlement, you cannot opt out. If the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by the terms of the Settlement in the same way as Class Members who do not object. Any Class Member who does not object in the manner provided in this Class Notice shall have waived any objection to the Settlement, whether by appeal or otherwise.

Written objections must be delivered or mailed to the Claims Administrator no later than . The address for the Claims Administrator is 18 Technology Drive, Suite 164, Irvine, CA 92618.

The addresses for the Parties' counsel are as follows:

Class Counsel:

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. JCL Law Firm, APC

5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600

San Diego, CA 92121 Tel.: (619) 599-8292 Fax: (619) 599-2891

E-Mail: jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com E-Mail: shani@zakaylaw.com

Class Counsel:

Daniel Gaines, Esq. Gaines & Gaines, APLC

4550 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd.,

Suite 100

Westlake Village, CA 91362

Tel.: (818) 703-8985

Fax: (818) 703-8984

E-Mail: daniel@gaineslawfirm.com

Class Counsel:

Shani O. Zakay, Esq. Zakay Law Group, APLC

San Diego, CA 92121 Tel: (619) 599-8292 Fax: (619) 599-8291

Counsel for Defendant:

Roger M. Masukhani, Esq. Bimali Walgampaya, Esq. Heather T. Daiza, Esq.

Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP

101 W. Broadway, Suite 2000,

San Diego, CA 92101 Tel.: (619) 696-6700 Fax: (619) 696-7124

Class Counsel:

Drew Lewis, Esq. Drew Lewis, PC

2999 Douglas Blvd., Suite 180

Roseville, CA 95661 Tel: (833) 600-7400

E-Mail: drew@drewlewis.law

9. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the Settlement?

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing at 00:00 AM/PM on ____, at the San Joaquin County Superior Court, Department 10A, located at 180 E. Weber Avenue, Stockton, CA 95202 before Judge George Abdallah Jr. 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. If there are objections, the Court will consider them. The Court will listen to people who have made a timely written request to speak at the hearing or who appear at the hearing to object. This hearing may be rescheduled by the Court without further notice to you. You are not required to attend the Final Approval Hearing, although any Class Member is welcome to attend the hearing.

10. How do I get more information about the Settlement?

You may call the Claims Administrator at 1-800-355-0700 or write to *Mariscal, et al. v. Janco Industries, Inc.*, currently pending in San Joaquin County Superior Court Case No. *STR-CV-UOE-2022-7290*, Claims Administrator, c/o Apex Class Action Settlement Administration.

This notice summarizes the proposed settlement. More details are in the Settlement Agreement. You may receive a copy of the Settlement Agreement, the Final Judgment or other Settlement documents by writing to JCL Law firm, APC, 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121 or by visiting the website listed in this notice.

PLEASE DO NOT CALL THE COURT ABOUT THIS NOTICE.

IMPORTANT:

- You must inform the Claims Administrator of any change of address to ensure receipt of your settlement payment.
- Settlement checks will be null and void 180 days after issuance if not deposited or cashed. In such event, the Claims Administrator shall pay all funds from such uncashed checks to the Community Law Project, a Cy Pres, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 384. If your check is lost or misplaced, you should contact the Claims Administrator immediately to request a replacement.

EXHIBIT B

	JCL LAW FIRM, APC	· -
1	Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)	SUPERIOR COURT-STOCKTON
2	Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884)	
4	Andrea A. Amaya Silva (State Bar #348080)	2024 HAR 28 AM 14: 35
3	Kendall Garald (State Bar #351773)	
-	5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600	STEPHANE LOURER, CLERK
4	San Diego, CA 92121	
	Telephone: (619) 599-8292	[BY
5	Facsimile: (619) 599-8291	My Green Strates
6	ilapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com	
U	mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com)
7	aamaya@jcl-lawfirm.com	
	kgarald@jcl-lawfirm.com	
8		
	ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC	j
9	Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)	
10	5440 Morehouse Dr., Ste 3600	
וטו	San Diego, CA 92121	
11	Telephone: (619)255-9047	
	Facsimile: (858) 404-9203	
12	shani@zakaylaw.com	
12	_ · · · •	;
13	Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS MARTIN MARISCA	L, DANIEL GARCIA, and RAFAEL ROJAS
14	(Additional Consequence Name Dans)	
	(Additional Counsel on Next Page)	
15	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
16	SUI ERIOR COURT OF THI	I DIAIL OF CALIFORNIA
10	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTY OF SAN JOAOUIN
17		or orming and Karet
	MADTIN MADISCAL DANIEL CADOLA	Case No. STK CV HOE 2022 7200
18	MARTIN MARISCAL, DANIEL GARCIA, RAFAEL ROJAS, JOSE HERNANDEZ, AND	Related with: STK-CV-UOE-2022-7290
19	LUIS VAZQUEZ individuals, on behalf of	
לז	themselves and on behalf of all persons	STK-CV-UOE-2022-8430, and STK-CV-UOE-2022-8790
20	similarly situated,	31K-C4-00E-2022-0170
	Similarly Simaleu,	FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND PAGA
21	Plaintiffs,	ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:
~~	V.	ACTION COMITAINT FOR:
22	٧.	1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION
23	JANCO INDUSTRIES, INC., a California	OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 et
ر_	corporation; TERRY ALEXANDER, an	seq;
24	individual; ANDREW ALEXANDER, an	2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES
	individual; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,	IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§
25	individual, und DODO 1-00, Indiudito,	221, 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
26	Defendants.	3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES
40	Doromanie.	IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§
27		510 et seg;
		4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED
28		MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF
	4	·

1		CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
2		5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED
		REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF
3		CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
4		6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
5		ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN
1		VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226; 7) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE
6		EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED
7		EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF
8		CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §2802;
٥		8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
9		CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203.
10		9) FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES
		DURING EMPLOYMENT CAL. LAB.
11		CODE §§ 204 AND 210. 10) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE
12		ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR
13		CODE §§ 2698 et seq.]
1.5		
14		DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL
15		
16	GAINES & GAINES	
	Daniel Gaines, Esq. Alex Katofsky, Esq.	
17	4550 East Thousand Oaks Blvd, Suite 100	
18	Westlake Village, CA 91362	
19	T: (866) 400-4450	
17	daniel@gaineslawfirm.com alex@gaineslawfirm.com	1
20		
21	Attorneys for PLAINTIFF JOSE HERNANDEZ	
22	DREW LEWIS, PC	
23	Drew Lewis, Esq. 2999 Douglas Blvd, Suite 180	
	Roseville, CA 95661	
24	T: (833) 600-7400	1
25	drew@drewlewis.law	
26	Attorneys for PLAINTIFF LUIS VAZQUEZ	
27		ı
		•
28		1

PLAINTIFFS MARTIN MARISCAL, DANIEL GARCIA, RAFAEL ROJAS, JOSE HERNANDEZ, AND LUIS VAZQUEZ ("PLAINTIFFS"), individuals, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief, except for their own acts andknowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Defendant JANCO INDUSTRIES, INC. ("DEFENDANT JANCO INDUSTRIES") is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California.
- 2. Defendant TERRY ALEXANDER ("DEFENDANT TERRY ALEXANDER") is an individual that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California.
- 3. Defendant ANDREW ALEXANDER ("DEFENDANT ANDREW ALEXANDER") is an individual that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California.
- 4. Defendant Janco Industries, Inc., and Defendant Terry Alexander, and Defendant Andrew Alexander were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as "DEFENDANTS" and/or "DEFENDANT."
- 5. DEFENDANT provides production machining services in the State of California, including in the county of San Joaquin, where PLAINTIFFS worked.
- 6. PLAINTIFF Martin Mariscal ("PLAINTIFF Mariscal") was employed by DEFENDANT in California from February of 2022 to May of 2022 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.
- 7. PLAINTIFF Daniel Garcia ("PLAINTIFF Garcia") was employed by DEFENDANT in California from February of 2022 to May of 2022 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.

- 8. PLAINTIFF Rafael Rojas ("PLAINTIFF Rojas") was employed by DEFENDANT in California from February of 2022 to May of 2022 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.
- 9. PLAINTIFF Jose Hernandez ("PLAINTIFF Hernandez") was employed by DEFENDANT in California from July of 2020 to February of 2022 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.
- 10. PLAINTIFF Luis Vazquez ("PLAINTIFF Vazquez") was employed by DEFENDANT in California from July 2015 to 2016 and 2017 to September 2022 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.
- 11. On or about March 30, 2023, this Court ordered consolidated the following matters by the PLAINTIFFS Daniel Garcia, Rafael Rojas, Jose Hernandez, and Luis Vasquez: STK-CV-UOE-2022-7290, STK-CV-UOE-2022-9998, STK-CV-UOE-2022-8450, and STK-CV-UOE-2022-8790. The intent of this First Amended Complaint is to consolidate all of the allegations from all of the complaints into this First Amended Complaint.
- 12. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFFS who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that the Defendant named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (hereinafter collectively "DEFENDANTS" and/or "DEFENDANT") are responsible in some

2.7

manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

- 13. The agents, servants, and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting on behalf of the DEFENDANT acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.
- 14. DEFENDANT was PLAINTIFFS' employer or persons acting on behalf of PLAINTIFFS' employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558, at all relevant times.
- 15. DEFENDANT was PLAINTIFFS' employers or persons acting on behalf of PLAINTIFF's employer either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 1197.1, who paid or caused to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by California state law, and as such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee
- 16. PLAINTIFFS were employed by DEFENDANT in California from February of 2022 and 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.
- 17. PLAINTIFFS bring this Class Action on behalf of themselves and a California class, defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the

1.5

.28 //

period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

- 18. PLAINTIFFS bring this Class Action on behalf of themselves and a CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during the CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice which failed to lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice alleged herein was an unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain wages due PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.
- 19. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain wages due PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 20. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21. This has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

7 8

10 11

9

12 13

15

14

16 17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

22. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFFS worked in this County for DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conduct substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

THE CONDUCT

In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the 23. requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, including but not limited to, Wage Order 16, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally, knowingly and systematically failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked, failed to pay all wages due during employment, failed compensate PLAINTIFFS for off-the-clock work, unlawfully deducted amounts from wages, failed to compensate PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

A. Meal Period Violations

24. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically, as a result of PLAINTIFFS' demanding work requirements and DEFENDANT's understaffing, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFFS to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFFS were from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFFS did not even receive a partial lunch. More specifically, from time to time, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to work through their meal breaks in order to meet DEFENDANT's prescribed labor hours to perform all the tasks required of them by DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to perform work-related tasks. Additionally, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to perform as much work as possible and as quickly as possible in order to meet DEFENDANT's strict performance and production requirements. As a result, the PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime wages by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

25. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work requirements and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and

8

9

10 11

13 14

12

16

15

18

17

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

B. Rest Period Violations

From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and other 26. CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing. More specifically, from time to time, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to work through their rest breaks in order to meet DEFENDANT's prescribed labor hours to perform all the tasks required of them by DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to perform work-related tasks. Additionally, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to perform as much work as possible and as quickly as possible in order to meet DEFENDANT's strict performance and production requirements. Further, for the same reasons these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF

and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

C. Unlawful Rounding Violations

- an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice that resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANT's timekeeping system for PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.
- 28. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT's timekeeping system and unlawful rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' time being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT's unlawful rounding policy and practice caused PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANT's unlawful rounding policy and practice caused PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty meal break.

D. Regular Rate Violation - Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums, and Sick Pay

29. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS

members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members forfeited wages due them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay rates. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS members the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

- 30. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an employee's performance.
- 31. The second component of PLAINTIFFS' and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members' compensation was DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFFS and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by DEFENDANT.
- 32. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay periods where PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or paid sick pay, and earned non-discretionary bonus, DEFENDANT failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS

members by DEFENDANT. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANT's conduct, as articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

33. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to compensate PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay. This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANT, the CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

E. Unreimbursed Business Expenses

34. DEFENDANT as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS for required business expenses incurred by the PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though

unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

35. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to use their personal cell phones, vehicles, and tools as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANT. But for the use of their own personal cell phones, vehicles, and tools, PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members could not complete their essential job duties, including but not limited to, sending and receiving work-related communications from DEFENDANT, driving to work sites., driving between work sites, and transporting equipment. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their use of their personal cell phones, vehicles, and tools. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones, vehicles, and tools, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

F. Wage Statement Violations

- 36. California Labor Code Section 226 requires an employer to furnish its employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.
- 37. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the total hours worked and all

5

9

8

11

12

13

10

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

26

28 ///

applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

- 38. In addition to the violations described above, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226.
- 39. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT's violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated or due to an unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

G. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations

40. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS performed work before and after the beginning of their shift, spending time under the DEFENDANTS' control for which they were not compensated. More specifically, from time to time, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to perform work before and after the beginning of their shifts in order to meet DEFENDANT's prescribed labor hours to perform all the tasks required of them by DEFENDANT. Additionally, since DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform as much work as possible and as quickly as possible in order to meet DEFENDANT's strict performance and production requirements, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to work off-the-clock before and after their shifts in order to meet DEFENDANT's strict requirements.

//:

- 41. As a result, the PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS necessary wages for attending for performing work at DEFENDANT's direction, request and benefit, while off-the clock. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.
- 42. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the uncompensated off-the-clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 43. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, protocols, applications, assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 44. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to document, track, or pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all wages earned and owed for all the work they performed, including pre-shift, post shift and during meal period off-the-clock work.
- 45. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.
- 46. DEFENDANTS' policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS of all minimum, regular, overtime, and double time wages owed for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over 40 hours in a workweek, and more than eight (8) hours per day, DEFENDANT's policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.
- 47. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

8

12 13

11

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

25 26

24

27 28

- 48. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control and benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.
- Specifically, as to PLAINTIFFS, PLAINTIFFS were from time to time unable to 49. take off duty meal and rest breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their rest and meal periods. PLAINTIFFS were required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFFS with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which they were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFFS with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFFS to remain on-duty and on-call, for the rest break. DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFFS to remain on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFFS therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFFS with a paystub that failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFFS for the use of their personal cell phone, personal vehicle, and personal expenses for the purchase of tools as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties for DEFENDANTS. To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFFS the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to them or any penalty wages owed to them under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversies for PLAINTIFFS individually do not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

H. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

50. PLAINTIFF brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified as non-exempt

employees ("CALIFORNIA CLASS") during the period beginning four years prior to the filing of the Complaint and ending on a date determined by the Court ("CLASS PERIOD").

- 51. PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have uniformly been deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, and illegal meal and rest period policies. Defendant further failed to reimburse for business expenses, failed to compensate for off-the-clock work, failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failed to maintain required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and expenses.
- 52. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impractical.
- 53. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANTS' conduct, including but not limited to, the off-the-clock work, unpaid mean and rest period premiums, failing to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the class are:
 - i. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant meal period policies and practices;
 - ii. Whether DEFENDANTS maintained legally compliant rest period policies and practices;
 - iii. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
 - iv. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate overtime wages;
 - v. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;

26

27

28

(Alleged By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and 63. incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

64. DEFENDANT is a "person" as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code § 17021.

65. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. (the "UCL") defines unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair competition as follows:

Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203).

- 66. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.
- 67. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were unlawful and unfair in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.
- 68. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest periods and, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal.

Bus. Code §§ 17200, et seq., and for which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

- 69. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful, unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with DEFENDANT.
- 70. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide legally required meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.
- 71. Therefore, PLAINTIFFS demand on behalf of themselves and on behalf of each CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10) hours of work.
- 72. PLAINTIFFS further demand on behalf of themselves and on behalf of each CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was not timely provided as required by law.
- 73. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.
- 74. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive, and

PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this. Complaint.

PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim 79. for DEFENDANT'S willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the

25

26

///

Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT'S failure to accurately calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

- 80. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.
- 81. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.
- 82. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages, including minimum wage compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of suit.
- 83. Defendants improperly deducted the cost of renting a truck and gas from Plaintiffs' and CALIFORNIA CLASS members' wages in violation of §§221 and 1194.
- 84. Labor Code §221 states that it is "unlawful for any employer to collect ore receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee." Defendants' practice of taking. And deducting wages from Plaintiff and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members' violates Labor Code §§221, 1194 and IWC Wage Order 16-2001, section 7.
- 85. Labor Code§§1194, 1197, 1197.1 and Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order 16 require employers to pay an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for each hour worked.
- 86. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 87. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of failing to pay all wages due as a result of unlawful deductions to the CALIFORNIA CLASS. As set forth herein, DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and intentionally deduct wages due to PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

- 88. DEFENDANT'S uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation and resulted in unlawful deductions to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.
- 89. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT inaccurately calculated the amount of time worked and/or improperly deducted certain costs from Plaintiffs' and CALIFORNIA CLASS members' wages and consequently underpaid the actual time worked and wages earned by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.
- 90. As a direct result of DEFENDANT'S unlawful wage practices as alleged herein, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.
- 91. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked than they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.
- 92. By virtue of DEFENDANT'S unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.
- 93. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are under-compensated for their time worked. DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform corporate policy, practice and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay

 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages for their time worked.

- 94. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of these employees.
- 95. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT'S conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198 and Wage Order 16)

(Alleged By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

96. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

- 97. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.
- 98. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.
- 99. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and more than forty (40) hours per workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.
- 100. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages, including minimum wage and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of suit. Cal. Lab. Code § 1198 further states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.
- 101. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked, including overtime work.
- DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked, including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.
- 103. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal

attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

- 104. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein, the PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive full compensation for overtime worked.
- 105. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were not subject to a valid collective bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFFS bring this Action on behalf of themselves and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of California.
- 106. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have been paid less for overtime worked that they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.
- 107. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay the PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194 & 1198, even though PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were required to work, and did in fact work, overtime as to which DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and witnessed by employees.
- 108. By virtue of DEFENDANT'S unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime worked by these employees, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

109. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all overtime worked. DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked.

110. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime worked and provide them with the requisite overtime compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of these employees.

111. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, including overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum and/or overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these employees would also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional, and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and Wage Order 16)

(Alleged By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

- 112. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 113. Wage order 16 and Labor Code section 512 provide that all non-exempt employees are entitled to a 30-minute, uninterrupted meal break for every 5-hour shift worked by the employee and a second meal period for shifts lasting over then (10) hours.
- 114. An employer's failure to provide an opportunity to take a meal break entitles the employee to an hour of pay for each day an employer fails to provide an opportunity to take a meal break.
- 115. At all times herein relevant, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were non-exempt employees entitled to meal breaks.
- required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS MEMBERS did not prevent these employees from being relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often not fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without

- ii. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
- iii. the number of piecerate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
 may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- v. net wages earned,
- vi. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- vii. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- viii. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- ix. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.
- 128. During the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFFS and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

\$ 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFFS and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Reimburse Employees For Required Expenses

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)

(Alleged By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all'Defendants)

- 130. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.
 - 131. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful

132. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANTS' benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to

1	using their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS.
2	Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were required by
3	DEFENDANT to use their personal cell phones to execute their essential job duties on behalf of
4	DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse
5	PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenses resulting from using
6	their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their employment
7	for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties.
8	DEFENDANT are estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of their expectation.
9	Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFFS and the members of
10	the CALIFORNIA CLASS, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and
11	the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for these expenses as an employer is required to do
12	under the laws and regulations of California.
13	133. PLAINTIFFS therefore demand reimbursement on behalf of the members of the
14	CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenditures or losses incurred in the discharge their job duties and
15	on behalf of DEFENDANT, or his/her obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with interest
16	at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.
17	EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION
18	Failure To Pay Wages When Due
19	(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203)
20	(Alleged by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)
21	134. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
22	incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
23	Complaint.
24	135. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:
25	As used in this article:
26	(d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
27	task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.

28 | ///

- (e) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the to be paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.
- 136. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that "If an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately."
 - 137. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

- 138. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFFS' or any CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' employment contract.
 - 139. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

- 140. The employment of PLAINTIFFS and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.
- 141. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of themselves and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has ended, PLAINTIFFS demand up to thirty (30) days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who terminated employment during the CLASS PERIOD and demand an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

- 150. PLAINTIFFS bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to themselves and all other current and former AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES employed by DEFENDANTS during the PAGA PERIOD.
- 151. At all relevant times, for the reasons described herein, and others, PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS within the meaning of Labor Code Section 2699(c).
- 152. Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (g) authorize an AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, like PLAINTIFF, on behalf of themselves and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code Section 2699.3
- 153. PLAINTIFFS MARISCAL and PLAINTIFF GARCIA complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code Section 2699.3. PLAINITFF ROJAS complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code Section 2699.3. By certified letter, return receipt requested, dated July 13, 2022, and August 11, 2022, PLAINTIFFS MARISCAL, GARCIA and ROJAS gave written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and to DEENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.
- LWDA with notice of DEFENDANT'S violations, the LWDA has not provided any notice by certified mail of its intent to investigate the DEFENDANT'S alleged violations as mandated by Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(A). Accordingly, pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)A, PLAINTIFF may commence and is authorized to pursue this cause of action.
- 155. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (f), PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to civil penalties for DEFENDANTS' violations of Labor Code Section 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802 and 2804 in

- a. For violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 2699(f)(2)];
- b. For violations of Labor Code Section 226(a), a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for any initial violation and one thousand dollars for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 226.3];
- c. For violations of Labor Code Sections 204, a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for any initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 210];
- d. For violations of Labor Code Sections 226.7, 510 and 512, a civil penalty in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for the initial violation and hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 558];
- e. For violations of Labor Code Section 2269(a), a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 226.3];
- f. For violations of Labor Code Sections 1194, 1197, 1198 and 1|199, a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars fifty (\$250) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section].
- g. For all provisions of the Labor Code for which civil penalty is not specifically

provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendant a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs in connection with their claims for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(g)(1).

156. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect PLAINTIFFS during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS seek penalties for those violations that affected other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. (Carrington v. Starbucks Corp. (2018) 30 Cal.App.5th 504, 519; See also Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc. (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 ["PAGA allows an "aggrieved employee"—a person affected by at least one Labor Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that employer."], Emphasis added, reh'g denied (June 13, 2018).)

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS pray for a judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:
 - a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
 - b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
 - c. An order requiring DEFENDANTS to pay all overtime wages and all sums unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and
 - d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT'S ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANTS' violations due to PLAINTIFFS and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:
 - a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
 - b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for overtime compensation and separately owed rest periods, due to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
 - c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
 - d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for

1	violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226
2	e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
3	penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
4	therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
5	3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
6	EMPLOYEES:
7	a. Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys
8	General Act of 2004
9	4. On all claims:
10	a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
11	b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
12	c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law.
13	
14	DATED: March 26, 2024
15	ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
16	By:
17	Shani O. Zakay Attorney for PLAINTIFF
18	
19	<u>DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL</u>
20	PLAINTIFFS demand a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.
21	DATED: March 26, 2024
22	ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
23	By:
24	Shani O. Zakay
25	Attorney for PLAINTIFF
26	
27	
28	