Electronically Received 09/08/2026 11:38 AM

STAN S. MALLISON (Bar No. 184191)
StanM@TheMMLawFirm.com
HECTOR R. MARTINEZ (Bar No. 206336)
HectorM@TheMMLawFirm.com
CODY A. BOLCE (Bar No. 322725)
CBolce@TheMMLawFirm.com
MALLISON & MARTINEZ
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 730
Oakland, California 94549
Telephone: 510-832-9999
Facsimile: 510-832-1101

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Alameda
09/09/2026
Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court
By: _____ Deputy
P. Greene

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ISIDRO MIRANDA, on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals,

Plaintiff,

v.

M & M AUTOMOTIVE GROUP INC., MIKE MURPHY, and DOES 1-20,

Defendants.

CARLOS CORTEZ OCEGUERA, on behalf of himself, other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California,

Plaintiff,

v.

M & M AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, INC. (dba Volkswagen of Oakland); and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. RG14714460

SECOND AMENDED ~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER AND JUDGMENT GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT SETTLEMENT

Date: June 15, 2026
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Location: Dept. 19

Reservation ID: 864239041287
Case No. HG21086853

SECOND AMENDED [~~PROPOSED~~] ORDER AND JUDGMENT

The Court, having read and considered all papers filed in connection with Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement, including all arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing, hereby **ORDERS, ADJUDGES, AND DECREES AS FOLLOWS**:

Plaintiffs' Motion is **GRANTED** in full. The parties' settlement agreement, entitled "Settlement Agreement and Release of Private Attorneys General Act Claims," ("Settlement") attached to the Declaration of Stan Mallison is hereby **APPROVED** as follows:

1. The Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' request to consolidate Case Nos. RG14714460 and Case No. HG21086853. The cases shall be completely consolidated under Case No. RG14714460. The Consolidated Complaint attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is deemed filed as of the date this Order and Judgment is signed and shall be the operative complaint in the consolidated action. This Order shall constitute Final Judgment in the consolidated case;
2. The Court **GRANTS** the requests for a Representative Service Award of $10,000 to Plaintiffs Isidro Miranda and Carlos Cortez Oceguera respectively ($20,000 total). The Court finds the requested Representative Service Awards reasonable considering Plaintiffs service as Representative Plaintiffs and the risks they undertook in initiating and prosecuting this lawsuit.
3. The Court **GRANTS** the request for an award of $715,000 in attorneys' fees to Mallison & Martinez. The Court finds this amount fair and reasonable considering the result achieved and the work performed by Plaintiffs' counsel in prosecuting this lawsuit;
4. The Court **GRANTS** the request for an award of $192,500 in attorneys' fees to Zakay Law Group, APLC. The Court finds this amount fair and reasonable considering the result achieved and the work performed by Plaintiffs' counsel in prosecuting this lawsuit;

5. The Court **GRANTS** the request for an award of $192,500 in attorneys' fees to JCL Law Firm, APC. The Court finds this amount fair and reasonable considering the result achieved and the work performed by Plaintiffs' counsel in prosecuting this lawsuit;

6. Of those total attorney fee awards, the following amounts shall be payable as of the date the judgment is entered: $640,000 Mallison & Martinez, $170,000 to Zakay Law Group APLC, and $170,000 to JCL Law Firm APC. The remaining amounts of the attorney fee awards shall be retained by the settlement administrator pending the compliance hearing described below.

7. The Court **GRANTS** the request for reimbursement of Plaintiffs' litigation costs in the amount of $24,383.91 to Mallison & Martinez. The Court finds these costs were reasonably incurred during this litigation and necessary in achieving the result provided under the Settlement;

8. The Court **GRANTS** the request for reimbursement of Plaintiffs' litigation costs in the amount of $3,074.68 to Zakay Law Group, APLC. The Court finds these costs were reasonably incurred during this litigation and necessary in achieving the result provided under the Settlement;

9. The Court **GRANTS** the request for reimbursement of Plaintiffs' litigation costs in the amount of $2,463.09 to JCL Law Firm, APC. The Court finds these costs were reasonably incurred during this litigation and necessary in achieving the result provided under the Settlement;

10. The Court **GRANTS** the request for $3,340 to the Settlement Administrator, Rust Consulting, as its reasonable fees and costs in administering the Settlement;

11. The Court **ORDERS** that 75% of the remaining net Settlement amount, in the amount of $1,760,053.74 be awarded to the LWDA, and the remaining 25%, in the amount of $586,684.58, be awarded to the allegedly aggrieved employees, as their respective shares of PAGA penalties, pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act;

12. To the extent there ultimately remain any unclaimed funds represented by uncashed Settlement checks, the Court hereby **APPROVES** Legal Aid at Work as an appropriate *cy pres* beneficiary and directs the Settlement Administrator to forward any unclaimed Settlement funds to this organization;

13. By means of this Order, the Court hereby enters final judgment as to Defendants in this action, pursuant to Code 577 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, operating as a full release and discharge of claims encompassed by the parties' Settlement; and

14. The Court retains jurisdiction to consider all further issues arising out of or in connection with the Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.

Dated: 09/09/2026

By: Joscelyn C. Jones

Hon. Joscelyn Jones
Judge of the Superior Court
Joscelyn Jones / Judge

Exhibit 1

STAN S. MALLISON (Bar No. 184191)
StanM@TheMMLawFirm.com
HECTOR R. MARTINEZ (Bar No. 206336)
HectorM@TheMMLawFirm.com
CODY A. BOLCE (Bar No. 322725)
CBolce@TheMMLawFirm.com
MALLISON & MARTINEZ
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 730
Oakland, California 94549
Telephone: 510-832-9999
Facsimile: 510-832-1101

Attorneys for Plaintiff Isidro Miranda and the State of California Pursuant to the Private Attorney General Act

[*Additional Counsel listed on next page*]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ISIDRO MIRANDA, Plaintiff, vs. M&M AUTOMOTIVE GROUP INC, MIKE MURPHY and DOES 1-20 Defendants.	Case No. RG14714460 **CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT FOR PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE §§ 2698 *ET SEQ.*** Case No. HG21086853
CARLOS CORTEZ OCEGUERA, on behalf of himself, other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, Plaintiff, v. M&M AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, INC. (dba Volkswagen of Oakland); and DOES 1-50, Inclusive, Defendants.	

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
shani@zakaylaw.com
Eden Zakay (State Bar #339536)
eden@zakaylaw.com
Jennifer Gerstenzang (State Bar #279810)
jenny@zakaylaw.com
Nicole Noursamadi (State Bar #357246)
nicole@zakaylaw.com
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com
3110 Camino Del Rio S, Suite 308
San Diego, CA 92108
Telephone: (619) 255-9047

JCL LAW FIRM, APC
Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292

Attorneys for Plaintiff Carlos Cortez Oceguera and the State of California
Pursuant to the Private Attorney General Act

CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Isidro Miranda ("Miranda") and Carlos Cortez Oceguera ("Oceguera") (collectively "Plaintiffs") bring this action against M&M Automotive Group Inc. ("M&M"), Mike Murphy ("Murphy"), and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive (collectively "Defendants"), on behalf of the State of California and the general public under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"). Plaintiffs assert the allegations that follow based on personal knowledge and on information and belief, which is based upon the investigation of counsel. The allegations below made on information and belief are likely to have evidentiary support after further opportunity for discovery and investigation.

I. NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Plaintiffs bring this action as private attorneys general representing the claims of the State of California under PAGA (Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*).

2. This action seeks relief pursuant to the PAGA. As set forth in the case of *Arias v. Superior Court*, 2009 WL 1838973 (Cal. June 29, 2009), an aggrieved employee seeking civil penalties on behalf of current and former employees does so as a "proxy" for the State of California and, thus, need not satisfy class certification requirements. As such, Plaintiffs' PAGA cause of action on behalf of Defendants' workforce is not subject to class certification. After satisfying administrative requirements under Labor Code § 2699.3, PAGA empowers an aggrieved employee to seek penalties on behalf of himself or herself, the State and current or former employees that are otherwise recoverable only by the Labor Commissioner. Plaintiffs have complied with Labor Code § 2699.3 and are entitled thus to assert a PAGA claim.

3. Defendants' violations revolve around their failure to pay all wages when due; failure to pay employees minimum and overtime wages; failure to comply with rest and meal period requirements; and failure to comply with the record-keeping, wage statement and payment deadline provisions of California law. As a result of these violations, Defendants have violated provisions of California labor laws and the California unfair competition law, and are liable to the

State of California, Plaintiffs and current and former employees for civil penalties, pursuant to PAGA.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This case is subject to the jurisdiction of this court pursuant to the California Labor Code, California Business and Professions Code, and California Code of Civil Procedure. Defendants are entities, partnerships, businesses or persons that were headquartered in California during the relevant time period. Defendants conduct business in Alameda County, California.

5. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain their principal California offices in Alameda County, California. In addition, venue in Alameda County is proper because Defendants have their address in Alameda, operate retail locations in Alameda, and many of the alleged violations arose in Alameda.

6. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, Defendants were required to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees 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, Defendants required Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees to work without paying them for all the time they were under Defendants' control. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiffs to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be Plaintiff's off-duty meal break. Plaintiffs were often interrupted by work assignments during their breaks. Indeed, there were many days where Plaintiffs did not even receive a partial lunch. As a result, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees, from time to time, forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. Defendants' uniform policy and practice not to pay Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

7. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees were also from time-to-time unable to take off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for meal periods. Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees 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 and Aggrieved Employees with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which these employees were required by Defendant to work ten (10) hours of work. Plaintiffs and the other Aggrieved Employees therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with Defendants' strict corporate policy and practice.

8. During the PAGA Period, from time to time, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, 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, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. When they did have an opportunity to take their rest breaks, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to remain on the premises and subject to Defendants' control. If they were to leave Defendants' premises, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to clock out. Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees were also not provided with one-hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, and in compliance with Defendants' policy, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees were periodically denied their proper rest periods by Defendants and Defendants' managers.

9. In addition, because Defendants implemented a commission pay plan for some of the Aggrieved Employees, Defendants failed to compensate the Aggrieved Employees for their rest periods as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code at their regular rate of pay. Defendants did not have a policy or practice which paid for off-duty rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other Aggrieved Employees at their regular rate. As a result, Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with all the legally required paid rest periods is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

10. From time to time, when Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees missed meal

and rest breaks, or when they worked during what was supposed to be their meal breaks, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct time and overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the correct penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Aside from the violations listed above in this paragraph, Defendants failed to issue to Plaintiffs an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq*. As a result, from time-to-time Defendants provided Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

11. Additionally, from time-to-time Defendants issued Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees inaccurate wage statements that failed to show, among other things, 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 instance, for the pay period between February 24, 2020 and March 1, 2020, Oceguera received remuneration from Defendants described as "OT DT Premium" in the gross amount of $20.36. Defendants violated California Labor Code Section 226 by failing to list the applicable hourly rate and the corresponding number of hours worked at the applicable hourly rate for this line item of remuneration described as "OT DT Premium". Specifically, as to Plaintiffs, they were from time-to-time unable to 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 Defendants to work ten (10) hours of work. Plaintiffs therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with Defendants' strict corporate policy and practice. Defendants also provided

Plaintiffs with paystubs that failed to accurately display the information required by Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a). To date, Defendants have not fully paid Plaintiffs all wages still owed to them or any penalty wages owed to them under Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

III. PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

12. Miranda is a California resident. During the PAGA period, Miranda was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee at Defendants' facilities. Miranda was hired pursuant to written and implied contracts of employment impliedly or explicitly promising to pay in conformance with California wage and hour requirements. The text of any written terms of contract are contained within Defendants' records. Miranda and Aggrieved Employees were required by Defendants to provide their own tools and therefore were required to be paid twice the California minimum wage or $16.00 for all hours worked after 2008. This minimum wage increased to $18.00 in July of 2014 and $20 in January 2016. Miranda worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period as defined below. Miranda was employed by Defendants to work in Defendants' automobile repair facilities in California as an automobile mechanic or technician. As a result of Defendants' violations described herein, Miranda has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property. As such, he is an aggrieved employee.

13. On February 19, 2014, Miranda gave written notice by certified mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. The statutory waiting period for Miranda to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, Miranda may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all Aggrieved Employees as herein defined.

14. Oceguera is a California resident. During the PAGA period, Oceguera was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee at Defendants' facilities. Oceguera was hired

pursuant to written and implied contracts of employment impliedly or explicitly promising to pay in conformance with California wage and hour requirements. The text of any written terms of contract are contained within Defendants' records. Oceguera and Aggrieved Employees were required by Defendants to provide their own tools and therefore were required to be paid twice the California minimum wage or $16.00 for all hours worked after 2008. This minimum wage increased to $18.00 in July of 2014 and $20 in January 2016. Oceguera worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period as defined below. Oceguera was employed by Defendants to work in Defendants' automobile repair facilities in California as an automobile mechanic or technician. As a result of Defendants' violations described herein, Oceguera has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property. As such, he is an aggrieved employee.

15. On November 4, 2020, Oceguera gave written notice by certified mail to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. The statutory waiting period for Oceguera to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, Oceguera may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all Aggrieved Employees as herein defined.

B. Defendants

16. Defendant M&M (dba Volkswagen of Oakland) is a California Corporation and at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California. Defendant M&M owns and operates a car dealership in Oakland, California.

17. In addition to his liability as an employer, agent or alter ego, Plaintiffs allege Murphy is liable under PAGA and Labor Code §§ 558 and 18 as a "person" who violated or caused to be violated the Labor Code and Wage Orders listed in this complaint, by exercising control over and involvement in the creation and/or implementation of the wage and hour practices and policies that are the subject matter of this complaint.

18. On information and belief, Defendant Murphy is the owner and/or alter ego of

M&M, and president of its operations and caused the violations at issue in this complaint.

19. Defendants' violations as described in this complaint were knowing, intentional, deliberate and willful.

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

20. This is a non-class representative action pursuant to the PAGA. From at least February 19, 2013 to June 1, 2022, Defendants maintained and enforced against their non-exempt employees the following unlawful practices and policies, in violation of California wage and hour laws:

a. failure to pay Aggrieved Employees, including Plaintiffs, all minimum wages due for all hours worked, as required under the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders;

b. failure to pay Aggrieved Employees, including Plaintiffs, all overtime wages due pursuant to the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders;

c. failure to provide paid rest periods or to pay Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees additional pay for missed rest periods, in violation of California law;

d. failure to provide Aggrieved Employees, including Plaintiffs, with accurate itemized wage statements as required by California law; and

e. failure to pay Aggrieved Employees, including Plaintiffs, statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203 and other California law upon termination or resignation.

21. On information and belief, Defendants were on notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants' violations alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

22. Defendants have made it difficult to account with precision for the unlawfully

withheld wages due Defendants' non-exempt employees, including Plaintiffs, during all relevant times herein, because Defendants did not implement and preserve a record-keeping method that calculated all hours worked so as to record correct wages.

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* and 558)
Plaintiffs against all Defendants

23. Plaintiffs incorporate all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

24. Plaintiffs bring this representative claim for themselves, the State of California and all other current and former employees of Defendants as a non-class claim, as expressly authorized by PAGA.

25. This PAGA cause of action is brought against Defendants pursuant to provisions of the Labor Code including § 558, which imposes liability on "persons" (defined by Labor Code § 18 as "… any person, association, organization, partnership, business trust, limited liability company, or corporation.") who violate the Labor Code or IWC regulations or cause these to be violated, and which provides for recovery of penalties.

26. Plaintiffs have complied with the PAGA's administrative requirements.

27. Plaintiffs are aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(a). They bring this cause on behalf of themselves, the State of California and other aggrieved employees – i.e., current or former employees affected by the Labor Code violations alleged in this complaint.

28. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), Plaintiffs seek civil penalties as provided under applicable Labor Code sections for violations alleged herein.

29. To the extent that any violation of statute or regulation alleged herein does not carry a penalty, Plaintiffs seek civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f), which provides:

> For all provisions of this code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, there is established a civil penalty for a violation of these provisions, as follows: . . . (2) If, at the time of the alleged violation, the person employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is 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.

30. The penalties sought by Plaintiffs are to be distributed as mandated in Labor Code § 2699(i) – 75% to the State and the remaining to workers.

31. Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs, the State and other current or former employees as a result of the violations alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiffs are also entitled to an award of attorneys' fees and costs for bringing this claim as set forth below.

32. Plaintiffs' PAGA claim does not require Class Certification because both the language of the PAGA and the express intent of the Legislature indicate that an aggrieved employee may act in place of the State and bring a representative action on behalf of the State and other employees without having to certify a class. Labor Code § 2699 specifically states that an aggrieved employee may bring an action on behalf of other employees, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law…" The wording of the PAGA, which authorizes an aggrieved employee to bring an action "on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees… [,]" is similar to the former wording of Business and Professions Code § 17204, which authorized a person or organization to act "for the interests of itself, its members or the general public . . . ." The Legislature has made clear that an action under the PAGA is in the nature of an enforcement action, with the aggrieved employee acting as Private Attorney General to collect penalties from employers and persons who violate labor laws. Such an action is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and penalize the defendant for past illegal conduct. Restitution is not the primary object of a PAGA action, as its purpose is not recovering damages, but civil penalties. And the PAGA does not preclude an employee from pursuing any other claim he may have available under law.

33. As such, Plaintiffs can stand in the shoes of the State of California and bring this PAGA claim for the State and other current or former employees.

34. The PAGA Period is February 19, 2013 to June 1, 2022.

35. Wherefore, Plaintiffs request penalties pursuant to the PAGA as described herein

and any other relief this Court deems proper.

VI. PRAYER

36. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as follows:

a. For such relief as the Court deems just and proper pursuant to the procedures detailed in Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq*.;

b. For all provisions of the Labor Code violated as described above except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, a civil 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;

c. For all provisions of the Labor Code violated as described above for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, civil penalties for each aggrieved employee as specifically provided by statute;

d. For attorneys' fees, interest and costs of suit; and

e. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: April 17, 2026

MALLISON & MARTINEZ

By: Cody Bolce
Stan S. Mallison
Hector R. Martinez
Cody A. Bolce
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DATED: April 17, 2026

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: _____
Shani O. Zakay
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am employed in the County of Alameda, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1939 Harrison Street, Suite 730, Oakland, California 94612.

On September 8, 2026, I served the documents described as:

- **SECOND AMENDED [PROPOSED] ORDER AND JUDGMENT GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT SETTLEMENT**

on ***Interested Parties at the following*** addresses:

John P. Boggs, Esq.
David Reese, Esq.
Alexander Curry, Esq.
Vanessa Spenik
Kathie Cherry
Fine, Boggs, & Perkins LLP
80 Stone Pine Road, Suite 210
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Telephone: 650-712-8908
Facsimile: 650-712-1712
jboggs@employerlawyers.com
dreese@employerlawyers.com
acurry@employerlawyers.com
vspenik@employerlawyers.com
kcherry@employerlawyers.com

Attorneys for Defendants
M & M AUTOMOTIVE GROUP INC.
and MIKE MURPHY

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay
Jackland K. Hom
Jennifer Gerstenzang
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
(619) 255-9047 Tel.
(858) 404-9203 Fax.
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
jenny@zakaylaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Carlos Cortez Oceguera

JCL Law Firm, APC
Jean-Claude Lapuyade
Jennifer Heming
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
(619) 599-8292 Tel.
(619)599-8291 Fax.
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
jheming@jcl-lawfirm.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Carlos Cortez Oceguera

[ ] **BY U.S. PRIORITY MAIL:** I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Oakland, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postage cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing this affidavit.

[X] **BY E-Mail:** By transmitting the foregoing document to the e-mail addresses listed above. The transmission was reported as complete and without error. The transmission was made from mmandujano@themmlawfirm.com.

[X] **STATE:** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on September 8, 2026 at Oakland, California.

Monica Mandujano

Monica Mandujano

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp FILED Superior Court of California County of Alameda 09/10/2026 Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court By: _____ Deputy P. Greene
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS: Rene C. Davidson Courthouse 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94612	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Isidro Miranda	
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: M & M Automotive Group Inc et al	
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1010.6	CASE NUMBER: RG14714460

I, the below named Executive Officer/Clerk of Court of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that on this date I served one copy of the Judgment entered herein upon each party or counsel of record in the above entitled action, by electronically serving the document(s) from my place of business, in accordance with standard court practices.

John Phillip Boggs
Fine Boggs & Perkins LLP
jboggs@employerlawyers.com

Tania Fonseca
Mallison & Martinez
enotices@themmlawfirm.com

Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court

Dated: 09/10/2026

By:

P. Greene, Deputy Clerk

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE
CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1010.6