

1 JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
2 Douglas Han (SBN 232858)
3 ghan@justicelawcorp.com
4 Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh (SBN 272164)
5 statavos@justicelawcorp.com
6 Jason Rothman (SBN 304961)
7 jrothman@justicelawcorp.com
8 751 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Suite 101
9 Pasadena, California 91103
10 Telephone: (818) 230-7502
11 Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Neil Fraser and Cody Lamont,
13 on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
12/15/2022

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: M. Mata Deputy

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

NEIL FRASER and CODY LAMONT,
individually, and on behalf of other members
of the general public similarly situated;

Plaintiffs,

v.

VALLEY POWER SYSTEMS, INC., a
California corporation, VALLEY POWER
SYSTEMS NORTH, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 20STCV00279

CLASS ACTION

Assigned for All Purposes To:
Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl
Dept.: 12

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF
THE CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Date: December 15, 2022
Time: 11:30 a.m.
Place: Department 12

Complaint Filed: January 6, 2020
First Amended: March 26, 2021
Trial Date: None Set

On December 15, 2022 Plaintiffs Neil Fraser and Cody Lamonts (collectively “Plaintiffs”) Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses, and Incentive Award came before the Court, in Department SS-12, for hearing pursuant to the Order of this Court, dated July 26, 2022 (“Preliminary Approval Order”), on the application of Plaintiffs and the Certified Class for approval of the Settlement set forth in the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement (the “Stipulation”). Full and adequate notice having been given to the Class as required in the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order, and the Court having considered all papers filed and proceedings held herein and otherwise being fully informed in the premises and good cause appearing therefore,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation, and all capitalized terms used, but not defined herein, shall have the same meanings as in the Stipulation.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action and over all parties to the Action, including all Class Members.

3. The Motion for final approval is granted. The Court approves the settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate. The Court makes the following awards and approves the following payments:

payments: \$666,666.00

a. ~~\$700,000.00~~ in attorneys' fees and \$31,779.25 in costs to Class Counsel;
\$15,000.00

b. ~~\$20,000.00~~ as a combined service award to the Class Representatives
\$7500.00
(\$10,000.00 to Class Representative Neil Fraser and \$10,000.00 to Class Representative Cody
Lamont);

c. \$16,000.00 in costs to the claims administrator CPT Group, Inc.;

d. \$100,000.00 for the PAGA claim (\$25,000.00 to be paid to the participating Class Members and \$75,000.00 to be paid to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency); and

4. In accordance with the Settlement and the terms set forth in this order, this Order shall not be deemed a judgment in favor of class members or any them and shall not constitute an obligation for direct compensation of any one or any number of the Class Members, but rather it

1 simply approves and undertakes to monitor the execution of the settlement between the Parties.
2 Except for the payment due under the Stipulation, the parties are each to bear their own costs and
3 attorneys' fees. The Court approves the Stipulation and Defendants VALLEY POWER SYSTEMS,
4 INC., a California corporation, VALLEY POWER SYSTEMS NORTH, INC., a California
5 corporation (collectively "Defendants") and the Released Parties are discharged from all Released
6 Claims in accordance with the terms of the Stipulation.

7 5. In this wage and hour class action lawsuit, Plaintiffs sued Defendants for a variety of
8 Labor Code violations. The operative complaint alleges that Defendants failed to pay minimum
9 wages and overtime, failed to provide meal periods and rest breaks, failed to provide accurate wage
10 statements, failed to pay final wages when due, failure to reimburse all necessary business
11 expenditures, committed unfair business practices under California's Unfair Competition Law
12 ("UCL"), and violated the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), all in violation of
13 California law.

14 6. Defendants made and makes no admission of liability and none shall be inferred
15 from the Stipulation or entry of judgment. Neither this order nor the Stipulation shall be used or
16 submitted into evidence in any proceeding or action, except for the sole purpose of enforcing the
17 terms hereof.

18 7. In California, the notice to class members must have "a reasonable chance of
19 reaching a substantial percentage of the class members." *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001)
20 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 251. Importantly, however, the plaintiff need not demonstrate that each
21 member of the class received notice. As long as the notice had a "reasonable chance" of reaching a
22 substantial percentage of class members, it should be found effective.

23 8. CPT Group, Inc. is providing settlement administration services for this settlement.
24 (Declaration of Irvin Garcia In Support of Final Approval Motion, ¶¶ 1-2.) On October 10, 2022,
25 CPT received the class information from Defendants. (*Id.* at ¶ 4.) The list contained 498 individuals
26 class members. (*Id.* at ¶ 4.) CPT conducted a search of the NCOA to update addresses
27 and, on October 27, 2022, mailed notice to all class members. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 5-7.) CPT forwarded notice

1 packets returned with forwarding addresses and performed skip searches on all other returned mail.
2 (*Id.* at ¶¶ 8-9.) Ultimately, one (1) notice packet was undeliverable. (*Id.* at ¶ 9.) CPT received no
3 objections and only one (Charles Maikish) request for exclusion. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 11-13, Exhibit B.) Based
4 on the foregoing, the Court finds that the notice provided to class members conforms to due process
5 requirements.

6 9. It is the duty of the Court, before finally approving the settlement, to conduct an
7 inquiry in the fairness of the proposed settlement. California Practice Guide, Civil Procedure Before
8 Trial, The Rutter Group, ¶14:139.12 (2012). The trial court has broad discretion in determining
9 whether the settlement is fair. In exercising that discretion, it normally considers the following
10 factors: strength of the plaintiff's case; the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further
11 litigation; the risk of maintaining class action status through trial; amount offered in settlement;
12 extent of discovery completed and stage of the proceedings; experience and views of counsel;
13 presence of a governmental participant; and reaction of the class members to the proposed class
14 settlement. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801; *In Re Microsoft I-V Cases*
15 (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 706, 723. This list is not exclusive and the Court is free to balance and
16 weigh the factors depending on the circumstances of the case. *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*
17 (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 244-245.

18 10. The proponent bears the burden of proof to show the settlement is fair, adequate and
19 reasonable. *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135,
20 1165-1166; *Wershba, supra*, 91 Cal.App.4th at 245. There is a presumption that a proposed
21 settlement is fair and reasonable when it is the result of arms'-length negotiations. 2 Herbert
22 Newburg & Albert Conte, *Newburg on Class Actions* §11.41 at 11-88 (3d ed. 1992); *Manual for*
23 *Complex Litigation* (Third) §30.42.

24 11. At the time of preliminary approval, Class Counsel's claim that Defendants failed to
25 pay minimum wage/overtime claim were valued in terms of maximum exposure at (1) \$908,891.00
26 due to pre-shift, post shift, and unrecorded on call hours worked, and (2) \$137,646.00 due to regular
27 rate issues pertaining to non-discretionary bonuses and sick time pay calculations (Han Declaration
28

re: Preliminary Approval, at ¶ 33.) Meal break violations were valued, in terms of a maximum exposure, at \$1,777,073.00, and rest breaks respectively at \$4,045,755.00 when assuming a 60% violation rate. (Id. at ¶¶ 39-40.) The paystub violations were valued at \$1,216,000.00. (Id. at ¶ 43.) The claim for failure to pay final wages valued at \$2,192,242.00. (Id. at ¶ 46.) The claim under Labor Code § 2699 *et seq.* was valued at \$3,746,600.00 (Id. at ¶ 50.)

12. Had this case not settled, there would have been additional risks and expenses associated with continuing to litigate. Procedural hurdles (e.g., motion practice and appeals) are also likely to prolong the litigation as well as any recovery by the class members.

13. There is always a risk of decertification. *Weinstat v. Dentsply Intern., Inc.* (2010) 180 Cal.App.4th 1213, 1226 (“Our Supreme Court has recognized that trial courts should retain some flexibility in conducting class actions, which means, under suitable circumstances, entertaining successive motions on certification if the court subsequently discovers that the propriety of a class action is not appropriate.”)

14. As part of the Court’s analysis of this factor, the Court should take into consideration the admonition in *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133. In *Kullar*, objectors to a class settlement argued the trial court erred in finding the terms of the settlement to be fair, reasonable, and adequate without any evidence of the amount to which class members would be entitled if they prevailed in the litigation, and without any basis to evaluate the reasonableness of the agreed recovery. The Court of Appeal agreed with the objectors that the trial court bore the ultimate responsibility to ensure the reasonableness of the settlement terms. Although many factors had to be considered in making that determination, and a trial court was not required to decide the ultimate merits of class members’ claims before approving a proposed settlement, an informed evaluation could not be made without an understanding of the amount in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the litigation.

///

///

///

1 15. Defendants have agreed to settle for the non-reversionary amount of \$2,000,000.00¹
2 all in, with no additional sums being due from Defendants for damages, costs, attorneys' fees,
3 contributions, reimbursements or for any other reason. According to the claims administrator's
4 calculations, the average settlement payment will be \$2,307.23 per Class Member, with the highest
5 Settlement Share estimated to be \$6,177.79 (Garcia Declaration, ¶ 14.)

6 16. Class Counsel conducted an investigation that included formal and informal
7 discovery, reviewed time records, circulated a belaire west notice, reviewed Plaintiffs' documents,
8 and formed damage models based on all of these. (Han Declaration re: Preliminary Approval,
9 ("Han PA Decl.") ¶ 14-18.) The parties also mediated this case with Steve Serratore for the first
10 time and Mark Rudy during the second, both are respected and highly experienced mediator in
11 wage and hour class actions. (*Id.* at ¶ 12.) In connection with mediation and through discussions
12 with counsel for Defendant, Class Counsel also discussed all aspects of the case, including the risks
13 of litigation and the risks to both parties of proceeding with a motion for class certification as well
14 as the law relating to meal periods. (Han PA Decl., ¶ 18.)

15 17. Class Counsel has experience with wage and hour class litigation. (Han PA Decl., ¶¶
16 3-10.) He is of the opinion that this settlement is in the best interest of the class (Han Declaration re:
17 Final Approval ("Han FA Decl."), ¶ 8.) and provides substantial benefit to class members. (*Id.*)

18 18. The class reacted very positively with a 99.80% participation rate. (Garcia Decl., ¶
19 13.)

20 19. On balance, this is a fair settlement that satisfies the *Dunk* factors, such that final
21 approval is warranted.

22 20. Class Counsel requested attorneys' fees of \$700,000.00. The Court employs the
23 lodestar method in awarding fees, as opposed to a "percentage of the common fund" method. This
24 amount would reflect the actual work performed, plus a multiplier (if applicable) to recognize
25

26 ¹ Defendants have requested a payment plan accord to the following terms: The two payments shall occur on the
27 following dates: (i) January 2, 2023; and (ii) January 2, 2024. After each installment payment is received by the
28 Claim Administrator, an equal distribution will be made to all class members, attorney's fees, costs, and class
representative fees representing fifty percent of the maximum award under the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

counsel's efforts. In common fund cases, the Court may employ a percentage of the benefit method, as cross-checked against the lodestar. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l., Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503.

21. Here, fees are sought pursuant to the percentage method. The determination of what constitutes an appropriate percentage "is somewhat elastic and depends largely on the facts of a given case, but certain factors are commonly considered. Specifically, the court may address the percentage likely to have been negotiated between private parties in a similar case, percentages applied in other class actions, the quality of class counsel, and the size of the award." *In re Ikon Office Solutions, Inc., Securities Litigation* (E.D. Pa. 2000) 194 F.R.D. 166, 193.

22. These factors favor the ~~\$700,000.00~~ ^{\$666,666.00} award. As for the first factor, private contingency fee agreements are routinely 30% to 40% of the recovery. (*Id.* at 194.) As for the second factor, although the median percentage of attorney fees in class action is 25%, "most fees appear to fall in the range of nineteen to forty-five percent." (*Id.*) As for the third factor, Class Counsel has experience in class actions, including wage and hour cases. Most importantly, Class Counsel achieved good results for the class as evidenced by the class members' reaction to the settlement. As for the fourth factor, Class Counsel negotiated a \$2,000,000.00 Maximum Settlement Amount. Applying the lodestar cross-check, Class Counsel states that members of his firm have spent at least 936.50 hours on this case, with additional hours to come. (Han FA Decl., ¶ 22.) The lodestar is calculated at \$688,535.00. (*Id.*) The hourly rates appear to be reasonable for attorneys with their respective years of experience. (*Id.* at ¶ 22), and the hours spent is reasonable for this case, which has been pending for over two years. It appears that Class Counsel utilized skill in litigating this case, and by all accounts, have good reputations in the legal community; at the very least, there is no evidence before the Court to indicate that the attorneys have negative reputations in the legal community. It also appears that Class Counsel spent appreciable time on the case, which time could have been spent on other meritorious fee-generating cases. Based on the \$688,535.00 lodestar, the fee request of \$700,000.00 translates into a modest multiplier of 1.01. (*Id.*) Because the fee request is based on a reasonable percentage of the settlement fund and is supported by the lodestar calculation, and because the class was provided with notice of the fee request and did not

This amount reflects, based on a 33% contingency fee analogy, the very good results obtained for the class. The lodestar calculation does not suggest an enhancement above 33%. This was not a heavily litigated case and the lodestar hours presented appear high and somewhat duplicative in light of the requirements of the litigation.

~~object, the Court awards fees in the amount requested.~~

23. Class Counsel requested costs up to \$40,000.00. (Han FA Decl., ¶ 33.) Class Counsel's actual costs, totaling \$31,779.25, consist of filing fees, mediation fees, court appearances, copying, filing and service. (*Id.*, **Exhibit H** thereto.) These costs appear reasonable and necessary to the conduct of the litigation. Further, as with the fee requests, the maximum cost request was disclosed to class members and deemed unobjectionable. For these reasons, the cost request is granted in the amount of \$31,779.25.

24. Claims administrator CPT requests administration costs of \$16,000.00. (Garcia Declaration, ¶ 15.) CPT's costs were originally \$11,000.00, but increased to \$16,000.00 when the Court requested that two payments be made to the class members as to be consistent with the installment payments. Based upon the work performed and yet to be performed, the request for administration costs of \$16,000.00 is granted.

25. The Court also approves the payment to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") in the amount of \$75,000.00 (out of \$100,000.00 as allocated to the claim under the California Private Attorneys General Act).

26. Finally, Class Counsel seeks an incentive payment of \$10,000.00 to each of the Class Representatives (\$10,000.00 to Neil Fraser and \$10,000.00 to Cody Lamont). The Court considers the following factors, among others, in determining whether to pay an incentive or enhancement award to a class representative: whether an incentive was necessary to induce the class representative to participate in the case; actions, if any, taken by the class representative to protect the interests of the class; the degree to which the class benefited from those actions; the amount of time and effort the class representative expended in pursuing the litigation; the risk to the class representative in commencing suit, both financial and otherwise; the notoriety and personal difficulties encountered by the class representative; the duration of the litigation; and the personal benefit (or lack thereof) enjoyed by the class representative as a result of the litigation. California Practice Guide, Civil Procedure Before Trial, ¶14:146.10 (The Rutter Group 2012) (citing *Clark v American Residential Services, LLC* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804; *Bell v. Farmers Ins. Exch.*

(2004) 115 Cal.App.4th 715, 726; *In re Cellphone Fee Termination Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1394; *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 412. Plaintiffs each devoted number hours to this litigation. (Neil Fraser (“Fraser Decl.”) ¶ 6; Cody Lamont Declaration (“Lamont Decl.”) ¶ 7.) They each assisted their attorneys by having multiple conferences with them and by providing documents. (*Ibid.*) Plaintiffs also helped Class Counsel prepare for mediation. (*Ibid.*) Plaintiffs freely chose to champion the rights of the class and accepted the risks associated with acting as class representatives. (Fraser/Lamont Decl.’s ¶ 7-9.)

27. The Court grants the Class Representatives an enhancement award of ~~\$10,000.00~~ ^{\$7500} to each Neil Fraser and Cody Lamont, for the following reasons: Plaintiffs spent significant time on this litigation; Plaintiffs’ actions benefitted the class; and Plaintiffs accepted the risks and notoriety that are associated with acting as a class representative.

28. All Parties, including each and all class members, are bound by this Final Approval Order and by the Stipulation. All Class Members shall be deemed to have entered into the Stipulation and the releases provided therein. Defendants shall have no obligation to pay any sums in excess of the \$2,000,000.00 settlement payment set forth in the Stipulation (save and except for the additional employer payroll taxes associated therewith). Other than as provided in the Stipulation, Defendants shall have no obligation after entry of judgment to pay any sum to any person, whether for costs, attorneys’ fees, class member reimbursement or contribution, as a result of entry of judgment.

29. The Court previously certified the Action as a class action under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 for settlement purposes only. The Class is defined as follows:

a. “Settlement Class Members:” all current and former California-based (*i.e.*, currently “residing” in California with the intent to remain in California indefinitely) hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency or labor contractor) of Defendants within the State of California.

b. “Class Period:” means the period from January 6, 2016 through May 2, 2022.

///

1 30. Excluded from the Class are those persons who validly requested exclusion in
2 accordance with the requirements set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order. The ~~one~~² individuals
3 who timely did so ^{are} ~~is~~: Charles Miakish². (Garcia Decl. ¶ 13; Exhibit B.) and Shari Benson.

4 31. The certified Class continues to meet all the requirements of California Code of
5 Civil Procedure section 382, as already found, and for the reasons set forth, in the Court's
6 Preliminary Approval Order.

7 32. Plaintiffs Neil Fraser and Cody Lamont are the Court-appointed Class
8 Representatives.

9 33. Douglas Han of the law firm JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION, is the Court-
10 appointed Class Counsel.

11 34. As set forth in the Stipulation any checks issued to Class Members will expire one
12 hundred and eighty (180) days from the date they are issued by the Claims Administrator and any
13 uncashed checks will be paid to the Controller of the State of California to be held pursuant to the
14 Unclaimed Property Law, California Civil Code §1500, *et. seq.* for the benefit of those Class
15 Members who did not cash their checks until such time as, under the law, those funds escheat to the
16 State of California.

17 35. Upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and Class Members, save and except for those
18 who timely requested exclusion, will be deemed to have released the Released Parties of and from
19 all of the Released Claims during the Class Period. These claims include without limitation: (1)
20 failure to pay minimum wages, (2) failure to pay wages and overtime, (3) meal period liability
21 under Labor Code § 226.7, (4) rest period liability under Labor Code § 226.7, (5) failure to provide
22 itemized statements, (6) failure to reimburse expenses, (7) violation of Labor Code § 226(a), (8)
23 violation of Labor Code § 203, (9) violation of Labor Code § 227.3, (10) violation of California
24 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and (11) violations of PAGA and all related
25 claims for penalties. This release covers all claims pled, or that could have been pled, based on the
26 factual allegations in the complaint or any amendments thereto. All Class Members are hereby

27 ² This [Proposed] Order will be updated when the objection deadline has passed.

1 forever barred and enjoined from commencing, prosecuting or continuing, either directly or
2 indirectly, against the Releasees, in this or any other jurisdiction or forum, any and all Released
3 Claims. “Released Claims” means all causes of action and factual or legal theories that were alleged
4 in the operative complaints or that could have been alleged against Defendants based on the facts
5 contained in the operative complaints, including all of the following claims for relief: (a) failure to
6 pay all regular wages, minimum wages and overtime wages due; (b) failure to provide proper meal
7 and rest periods, and to properly provide premium pay in lieu thereof; (c) failure to provide
8 complete, accurate or properly formatted wage statements; (d) waiting time penalties; (e) failure to
9 reimburse business expenditures, (f) unfair business practices that could have been premised on the
10 claims, causes of action or legal theories of relief described above or
11 any of the claims, causes of action or legal theories of relief pleaded in the operative complaint; (g)
12 any other claims or penalties under the California Labor Code or other wage and hour laws pleaded
13 in the Action, including but not limited to California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6,
14 201.8, 201.9, 202, 203, 204, 205.5, 218.5, 221, 226, 226(a), 226(g), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558,
15 1174(d), 1021.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802; (h) all damages, penalties,
16 interest and other amounts recoverable under said claims, causes of action or legal theories of relief,
17 and, exclusively to PAGA Members, (i) all claims under the California Labor Code Private
18 Attorneys General Act of 2004 that could have been premised on the claims, causes of action or
19 legal theories described above or any of the claims, the letter to the LWDA dated November 11,
20 2020, and causes of action or legal theories of relief pleaded in the operative complaint.

21 36. Without affecting the finality of this Order in any way, this Court hereby retains
22 continuing jurisdiction over: (a) implementation of the Stipulation and any award or distribution of
23 the Maximum Settlement Amount, including interest earned thereon; (b) disposition of the
24 Maximum Settlement Amount; (c) hearing and determining applications for attorney fees and
25 expenses in the Action; and (d) all parties hereto for the purpose of construing, enforcing, and
26 administering the Stipulation and the Settlement therein.

27 ///

36a. The Administrator shall file a final report with the court on or before August 16, 2024. The court sets a non-appearance case review for August 22, 2024.

37. There is no just reason for delay in the entry of judgment approving the Class Settlement and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



DATED: 12/15/2022

Carolyn B. Kuhl / Judge

HONORABLE CAROLYN KUHL
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

**PROOF OF SERVICE
1013A(3) CCP**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 751 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Ste. 101 Pasadena, California 91103. My electronic service address is manderson@justicelawcorp.com

On December 15, 2022, I served the foregoing document described as

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

for the following case: **Fraser, et al. v. Valley Power Systems, Inc.**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA-CM-813282-20**
20STCV00279
Los Angeles County Superior Court

on interested parties in this action by electronically submitting as follows:

State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Pursuant to California Senate Bill No. 836, I caused the documents described above to be electronically submitted by and through the procedure stated on the website of the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

[X] STATE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on December 15, 2022, at Pasadena, California.


Mariah Anderson