

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK
DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (SBN 068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (SBN 205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (SBN 248066)

Christine T. LeVu (SBN 288271)

Andrew G. Ronan (SBN 312316)

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858) 551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

WILLIE MARQUEZ and ANDY MIKHAEL

[Additional counsel listed on following page]

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

**WILLIE MARQUEZ and ANDY
MIKHAEL**, on behalf of themselves and
on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**ACCURATE DELIVERY SYSTEMS,
INC.**, a California Corporation; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB2125337

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Jessica Morgan,
Dept. S-26]*

**DECLARATION OF KYLE NORDREHAUG IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT AND AWARD OF ATTORNEYS'
FEES, COSTS, SERVICE AWARDS**

[Filed and served concurrently with Notice of Motion
and Motion for Final Approval of Class Action
Settlement]

Date: November 30, 2023

Time: 9:00 a.m.

[Hearing set by Order dated July 13, 2023]

Dept: S-26

Judge: Hon. Jessica Morgan

Complaint Filed: August 31, 2020

LIDMAN LAW, APC

Scott M. Lidman (SBN 199433)
slidman@lidmanlaw.com
Elizabeth Nguyen(SBN 238571)
enguyen@lidmanlaw.com
Milan Moore, Esq. (SBN 308095)
mmoore@lidmanlaw.com
2155 Campus Drive, Ste 150
El Segundo, CA 90245
Tel: 424-322-4772
Fax: 424-322-4775

Attorneys for Plaintiff,
JULIO GARCIA

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
phaines@haineslawgroup.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, CA 90245
Tel: (424) 292-2350
Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiff,
JULIO GARCIA

1 **DECLARATION OF KYLE NORDREHAUG IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL**
2 **APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENT AND AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES,**
3 **COSTS, SERVICE AWARDS**

4 I, Kyle Nordrehaug, declare:

5 1. I am a partner of the law firm of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
6 ("BNBD"), counsel for Plaintiffs Willie Marquez, Andy Mikhael, and Julio Garcia. As such, I am
7 fully familiar with the facts, pleadings and history of this matter. The following facts are within my
8 own personal knowledge, and if called as a witness, I could testify competently to the matters stated
9 herein.

10 2. This declaration is being submitted in support of the Motion for Final Approval of
11 Class Settlement by Plaintiffs Willie Marquez, Andy Mikhael, and Julio Garcia ("Plaintiffs"). The
12 settlement reached between Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all members of the Class, on the
13 one hand, and Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc, on the other hand, is set forth in the
14 Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release ("Settlement Agreement"), a true and
15 correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit #1.

16 Experience of BNBD

17 3. Over the course of the litigation, my firm has worked actively on this matter. The firm
18 credentials are reflected in the BNBD Resume, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as
19 Exhibit #2. Some of the major cases our firm has undertaken are also set forth therein. BNBD has
20 represented hundreds of thousands of employees in hundreds of legal matters, including PAGA
21 lawsuits and hundreds of employment class actions. BNBD's practice is devoted almost entirely to the
22 prosecution of wage and hour class action and PAGA action matters. The attorneys at BNBD have
23 been appointed lead counsel in hundreds of contested motions for class certification including many
24 consolidated wage and hour matters. The attorneys at my firm have extensive experience in cases
25 involving labor code violations and overtime claims. BNBD has litigated similar overtime cases
26 against other employers on behalf of employees, including cases against Wal-Mart, Cigna, Health Net,
27 Securitas, Okta, See's Candies, Walt Disney Resorts, El Pollo Loco, Panda Express, Universal
28 Protection, Mattress Firm, Total Renal, Liberty Mutual, Union Bank, Apple, Coventry Health Care,

1 Qualxserv, Union Bank, Marriott, Kaiser / Permanente, Walgreens, and California State Automobile
2 Association. My firm has been approved as class counsel by state and federal courts in California in
3 contested class certification motions, including approvals in this Court. It is this level of experience
4 which enabled the firm to undertake the instant matter and to successfully combat the resources of the
5 defendants and their capable and experienced counsel. On account of the concerted and dedicated
6 effort this case demanded in order to properly handle and prosecute, BNBD was precluded from taking
7 other cases, and in fact, had to turn away other potential fee generating cases.

8 4. Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP was responsible for handling the
9 briefing and argument that resulted in the landmark ruling of *Sakkab v. Luxottica Retail N. Am., Inc.*,
10 803 F.3d 425 (9th Cir. 2015). There, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP overcame
11 opposition by Littler Mendelson and amici Curiae briefs submitted by Mayer Brown LLP to persuade
12 the Ninth Circuit of the importance of the substantive rights of the State of California under the
13 California Private Attorney General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"). BNBD took the lead on this case where
14 the ruling was the reaffirmation of the PAGA statute and the *Iskanian* rule. BNBD also has recently
15 engaged in noted appellate work on the subject of class actions in the California Court of Appeals
16 resulting in the opinions handed down in *Securitas Sec. Services USA, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 234 Cal.
17 App. 4th 1109, 184 Cal. Rptr. 3d 568 (2015) (class or representative action waiver in an employment-
18 related arbitration agreement was unenforceable); *Altman v. Solarcity Corp.*, No. D067582, 2016 Cal.
19 App. Unpub. LEXIS 3536 (Ct. App. May 13, 2016) (same). In 2015, Blumenthal Nordrehaug
20 Bhowmik De Blouw LLP received an award from the Daily Journal for Top Appellate Reversal, and I
21 received an award from the Daily Journal as Top Labor & Employment Attorney in 2016.

22 5. District Judge Irma Gonzales in a consolidated class action representing hundreds of
23 armed forces officers held that Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP was "qualified
24 counsel with extensive experience in class action litigation." *McPhail v. First Command Fin.*
25 *Planning, Inc.*, 247 F.R.D. 598, 611 (S.D. Cal. 2007). Examples of other contested actions where
26 class certification was granted Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP and was appointed
27 lead class counsel in wage and hour class actions in Federal Court include *Schulz v. Qualxserv, LLC*,
28 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58561 (S.D. Cal. 2012); *Dobrosky v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., LLC*, No.

1 EDCV 13-0646 JGB (SPx), 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106345 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2014); *Culley v.*
2 *Lincare Inc.*, No. 2:15-cv-00081-MCE-CMK, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105704 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 10,
3 2016); *Nelson v. Avon Prods.*, No. 13-cv-02276-BLF, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51104 (N.D. Cal. Apr.
4 17, 2015); *Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works*, U.S.D.C. Case No. 14-cv-02113-MCE, 2016 U.S. Dist.
5 LEXIS 158115 (E.D. Cal. February 17, 2017); *Metrow v. Liberty Mutual*, U.S.D.C. Case No. EDCV
6 16-1133 JGB (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2017). Some examples of heavily contested State Court wage and
7 hour class actions where class certification was obtained and BNBD was appointed lead class counsel
8 include *El Pollo Loco Wage and Hour Cases*, Orange County Superior Court, JCCP Case No. 4957
9 (July 30, 2018); *Torrento v. Lucile Packard Children's Hospital*, Santa Clara County Superior Court
10 Case No. 2016-1-CV-291035 (July 17, 2018); *Salem v. Alliance*, San Bernardino Superior Court, Case
11 No. CIVRS1401129 (March 8, 2016); *Rivers v. Veolia*, Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV
12 255350 (March 9, 2016); *Mathies v. Union Bank*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-10-
13 498077 (Sept. 11, 2013); *Jefferson v. Bottling Co, LLC*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-
14 2009-00180102-CU-OE-CXC (Sept. 7, 2010); *Rangel v. Balboa Ambulance Co.*, 37-2008-00095700-
15 CU-BT-CTL (Fe. 11, 2010); *Tan v. CSAA*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-
16 00231219 (Nov. 23, 2009).

17
18 Background:

19 6. On May 28, 2021, Plaintiffs Willie Marquez sent a letter to the California Labor &
20 Workforce Development Agency exhausting their administrative remedies before filing a civil claim
21 under the PAGA against Defendant. The LWDA took no action in response to that letter.

22 7. On August 18, 2021, Plaintiff Julio Garcia filed a class action Complaint against
23 Defendant in Los Angeles County Superior Court, in the matter entitled *Julio Garcia v. Accurate*
24 *Delivery Systems, Inc., a California corporation; and Does 1 through 100, inclusive*, Case No.
25 21STCV30557. On January 27, 2022, pursuant to a request by Plaintiff Julio Garcia, the Los Angeles
26 County Superior Court dismissed his action without prejudice. On August 18, 2021, Plaintiffs Julio
27 Garcia sent a letter to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency exhausting his
28

1 administrative remedies before filing a civil claim under the PAGA against Defendant. The LWDA
2 took no action in response to that letter.

3 8. On August 31, 2021, Plaintiff Willie Marquez filed a representative PAGA action
4 against Defendant, entitled *Willie Marquez. v. Accurate Delivery Services, Inc.*, in the San Bernardino
5 County Superior Court (Case No. CIVSB 2125174), before Hon. David Cohn of Dept. S-26. In June
6 2022, pursuant to a request by Plaintiff Willie Marquez, the San Bernardino County Superior Court
7 dismissed his action without prejudice.

8 9. On August 31, 2021, Plaintiffs Willie Marquez and Ahdy Mikhael filed a class action
9 against Defendant, entitled *Willie Marquez, et al. v. Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc.*, in the San
10 Bernardino County Superior Court (Case No. CIVSB 2125337), before Hon. David Cohn of Dept. S-
11 26 (hereinafter, the “Action”)

12 10. On January 11, 2022, a First Amended Complaint was filed in the Action on behalf of
13 Plaintiffs alleging the following claims: (1) all claims for unfair business practices that could have
14 been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above; (2) failure to
15 pay all minimum wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper
16 rounding, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (3) failure to pay
17 all overtime wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding,
18 miscalculating the regular rate of pay, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the
19 commission pay plan; (4) failure to provide meal periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant meal
20 periods, and failure to record meal periods; (5) failure to authorize and permit rest periods, pay
21 premium wages for non-compliant rest periods, or the failure to separately pay premiums for rest
22 periods under the commission pay plan; (6) failure to issue accurate, itemized wage statements (7)
23 failure to timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment; (8) failure to reimburse necessary
24 business expenses; and (9) violations of the California Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of
25 2004 (“PAGA”) seeking civil penalties premised on the facts, claims, causes of action and legal
26 theories described above.

27 11. After agreeing to participate in early mediation, Accurate Delivery informally produced
28 documents and information relevant to the claims alleged in advance of mediation, including without

1 limitation timekeeping and payroll data for the putative class. Additionally, Accurate Delivery
2 produced information and data points needed for a fruitful mediation, including without limitation, the
3 number of employees, workweeks at issue, pay periods at issue, meal and rest period policies and
4 procedures, and payroll policies. After a review and analysis of the documents and information
5 produced by Accurate Delivery, Class Counsel drew on their extensive experience in similar cases to
6 assess the strengths and weaknesses of Plaintiffs' case. This discovery allowed the parties to assess the
7 merits and value of Plaintiffs' claims and Accurate Delivery's defenses thereto, if a settlement could
8 not be reached.

9 12. On March 7, 2023, a mediation was held with Lynn Frank, a well-respected wage and
10 hour class action mediator. During mediation, the parties vigorously debated their opposing legal
11 positions, the likelihood of certification of Plaintiffs' claims, and the legal basis for the claims and
12 defenses. Ultimately, the parties agreed in principle on a class-wide resolution. In the weeks that
13 followed, the parties finalized the terms of settlement and executed the Settlement Agreement.

14 13. The Class Representatives have vigorously prosecuted this case, and Defendant
15 has vigorously contested it. The Parties engaged in sufficient investigation and informal
16 discovery to assess the relative merits of the claims of the Class and of Defendant's defenses to
17 them. Defendant has denied all of Plaintiffs' allegations in their entirety and any liability or
18 wrongdoing of any kind.

19
20 The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable and Adequate:

21 14. As a result of the mediation, the parties agreed to settle this matter for a Gross
22 Settlement Amount of \$900,000 (Settlement Agreement at ¶ 4).). Based on their own respective
23 independent investigations and evaluations, and after taking into account the sharply disputed factual
24 and legal issues involved in this matter, the risks attending further prosecution of the case, and the
25 monetary benefits received under the Settlement, Class Counsel is of the opinion that the settlement
26 for the consideration and on the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable and
27 adequate and is in the best interests of the Class Members.

1 15. As explained in the motion for preliminary approval, accounting for the risks of continued
2 litigation and impediments to discovery, Plaintiffs determined that a settlement amounting to \$900,000 was fair
3 and reasonable, and accounts for reasonable percentage of the estimated realistic recovery and courts have
4 routinely approved settlements that provided a similar discounted range of the maximum potential recovery.

5 16. Fairness of the Settlement is demonstrated by the uncertainty and risks to
6 Plaintiffs involved both in not prevailing on one or more of the causes of action or theories
7 alleged in the operative Complaint and in non-certification, and if successful, Defendant disputes
8 the ability of Plaintiffs to certify a class in this case. Defendant also argued it maintained lawful
9 written policies that were provided to the class members. Yet, despite the defenses proffered by
10 Defendant, the proposed Settlement commits Defendant to pay each Class Member a portion of
11 the Net Settlement Amount. The amount to be paid to the Class is fair, adequate and reasonable
12 given the significant risk to Plaintiffs and the Class in continuing with the litigation and not
13 prevailing on their claims at class certification or at trial or not being paid anything even if trial
14 was successful.

15 17. Settlement Class members' claims arise from Accurate Delivery's common,
16 uniform policies and practices that applied to Settlement Class members during the class period.
17 Specifically, Plaintiffs alleged that Accurate Delivery's common and uniform policies and
18 practices resulted in the following violations: (1) failure to pay all minimum wages owed; (2)
19 failure to pay all overtime wages owed; (3) failure to provide all legally-required meal periods;
20 (4) failure to authorize and permit all legally-required rest periods; (5) failure to reimburse
21 necessary business expenses; (6) failure to provide accurate, itemized wage statements, (7)
22 failure to timely pay all wages upon termination; (8) engagement in unfair competition; and (9)
23 liability for civil penalties under the PAGA.

24 18. Over the course of litigation, the Parties engaged in the investigation of the
25 claims, including production of documents, class data, and other information, allowing for the
26 full and complete analysis of liabilities and defenses to the claims in the Action. The
27 information for mediation obtained by Plaintiffs included: (1) time punch data showing
28 employees' meal periods and their time worked; (2) Payroll data for employees; (3) Defendant's

1 employee wage and hour policies; (5) the employment files for the Plaintiffs; and, (7) samples of
2 wage statements provided by Defendant. As such, Class Counsel received the data and
3 information for the Class, which was sufficient for Plaintiffs' expert to prepare the valuations of
4 the claims for the Class.

5 19. Here, a number of defenses asserted by Defendant present serious threats to the
6 claims of the Plaintiffs and the other Class Members. Defendant asserted that Defendant's
7 practices complied with all applicable Labor laws. Defendant argued that all work time was
8 properly paid for and that the work time recording practices were lawful. Defendant contend that
9 its meal and rest period policies fully complied with California law and that Defendant's
10 timekeeping system recorded meal periods, paid for missed meal periods, and was not required
11 to record rest periods. Defendant established that it paid significant premiums for any alleged
12 meal or rest period violation. As to expenses reimbursement, Defendant contended that it did not
13 fail to provide reimbursement for necessary business expenses and that claimed expenses were
14 voluntary and convenient and therefore not required reimbursement. Defendant also argued that
15 it provided all required equipment to employees in order for them to perform their required job
16 duties. Defendant could argue that the Supreme Court decision in *Brinker v. Superior Court*, 53
17 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012), weakened Plaintiffs' claims, on liability, value, and class certifiability as to
18 the meal and rest period claims. Defendant also argues that based on its facially lawful practices,
19 they acted in good faith and without willfulness, which if accepted would negate the claims for
20 waiting time penalties and/or inaccurate wage statements. If successful, Defendant's defenses
21 could eliminate or substantially reduce any recovery to the Class. While Plaintiffs believe that
22 these defenses could be overcome, Defendant maintains these defenses have merit and therefore
23 present a serious risk to recovery by the Class.

24 20. There was also a significant risk that, if the Actions were not settled, Plaintiffs
25 would be unable to obtain class certification and thereby not recover on behalf of any employees
26 other than themselves. Defendant argued that the individual experience of each putative class
27 member varied with respect to the claims. Defendant could also contest class certification by
28 arguing injury and good faith were case by case determinations that precluded class certification.

1 Plaintiffs are aware of other cases where class certification of similar claims was denied. *See*
2 *e.g. Cacho v. Eurostar, Inc.*, 43 Cal. App. 5th 885 (2019) (denying certification of rest break
3 claims). Finally, even if class certification was successful, as demonstrated by the California
4 Supreme Court decision in *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.*, 59 Cal. 4th 1 (2014), there are
5 significant hurdles to overcome for a class wide recovery even where the class has been certified.
6 While other cases have approved class certification in wage and hour claims, class certification
7 in this action would have been hotly disputed and was by no means a foregone conclusion.

8 21. Class certification was somewhat uncertain given the numerous hurdles necessary
9 under the California Supreme Court decision in *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*.
10 Plaintiffs also considered Defendant's arguments that subsequent decisions citing and relying on
11 the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Wal-Mart v. Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338 (2011) arguably made it
12 more difficult to certify a class in this case based upon the need to demonstrate that common
13 issues are superior and could be dealt with in "one stroke" and that the "trial by formula" (*Duran*
14 *v. U.S. Bank* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 1172) could not satisfy such requirements based upon due
15 process grounds. However, Plaintiffs disagreed that the subsequent decisions citing *Walmart*,
16 applied to the facts in this case. Additionally, Plaintiffs believe the cases denying certification
17 are distinguishable and that the facts in this case are more akin to the facts in cases where
18 certification had been granted, Class Counsel recognize the risk of an adverse finding on
19 certification and considered and weighed this risk in determining to settle and compromise these
20 claims. Lastly, Plaintiffs believe the decisions in *Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Sup. Ct.*, (2004) 34
21 Cal. 4th 319, 340 and *Bell v Farmers Ins. Exchange*, (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 715 provide the
22 applicable framework for class certification trial by formula plans. See also *Duran v. Superior*
23 *Court*, 2014 Cal. LEXIS 5569 (Cal. Aug. 13, 2014).

24 22. Further, beyond the risk of an adverse ruling on the merits or certification, Class
25 Counsel considered the fact that continued litigation would likely take years and would be
26 extremely expensive given the breadth and complexity of the claims. In this case, post-trial and
27 appellate proceedings are likely to occur, which will surely drag the case far into the future even
28 with a positive trial result. When facing a distant and unsure resolution of the allegations in this

1 action, the swift, sure and substantial Settlement is all the more reasonable. Avoiding such
2 costly litigation in favor of more immediate benefits to the Class was a consideration favoring
3 settlement. Given these realities, it is highly likely that the future expense of this litigation, and
4 its likely duration if the settlement is not approved, would be significant and weigh heavily in
5 favor of approval of this settlement.

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

14 24. As a result, the Gross Settlement Amount of \$900,000 represents a reasonable
15 recovery as detailed fully at preliminary approval in the Declaration of Scott Lidman at ¶¶16-32
16 filed in support of preliminary approval. There are 104 Settlement Class Members, and the
17 highest Individual Settlement Payment to be paid is approximately \$9,992.66, the lowest
18 Individual Settlement Payment to be paid is approximately \$32.98, while the average Individual
19 Settlement Payment to be paid is approximately \$4,848.56. (Declaration of Kevin Lee at ¶¶ 12,
20 15). Class Counsel believe that this is a fair and reasonable Settlement in light of the
21 complexities of the case, the state of the law and uncertainties of class certification and litigation,
22 the policies and practices Defendant has had in place or implemented during the purported
23 liability period, and the benefit to be recovered for the Class. Given the risks inherent in
24 litigation, this settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable and is in the best interests of the
25 Settlement Class, and should be preliminarily approved.

26
27 \\
28 \\
29

1 Attorneys' Fees and Costs:

2 25. Class Counsel applies for an award of attorneys' fees in the sum of \$300,000 of the
3 Gross Settlement Amount, and litigation costs of \$21,491. The requested fee falls in the mid-range of
4 percentage class fee awards, which generally range from 20% to 50% of a common fund, and it
5 constitutes fair compensation for undertaking complex, risky, expensive, and time-consuming
6 litigation on a contingent basis and compensates Class Counsel for their efforts, as well as the result
7 achieved for the benefit of the Class. Numerous courts in California routinely approve fee requests
8 equal to or greater than one-third of the common fund. Plaintiffs' counsel have prosecuted a joint
9 prosecution agreement and agreed to split the requested fees on a 50/50 basis. In short, Class
10 Counsels' fee request of \$300,000 (one-third of the common fund) is in line with awards in similar
11 cases in California and demonstrates that Class Counsels' fee request is consistent with market rates
12 and is reasonable.

13 26. There is a substantial difference between the risk assumed by attorneys being paid by
14 the hour and attorneys working on a contingent fee basis. The attorney being paid by the hour can go
15 to the bank with his fee. The attorney working on a contingent basis can only log hours while working
16 without pay towards a result that will hopefully entitle him to a market place contingent fee taking into
17 account the risk and other factors of the undertaking. Otherwise, the contingent fee attorney receives
18 nothing. In this case, the representation by my firm and the nature of the fee was wholly contingent.
19 BNBD subjected themselves to this contingent fee market risk in this all or nothing contingent fee case
20 wherein the necessity and financial burden of private enforcement makes the requested award
21 appropriate. This case was litigated on a contingent basis with all of the risk factors inherent in such
22 an uncertain undertaking. At the time this case was brought, the result was far from certain.
23 Defendant's practices at issue here had been in place for years. Defendant's numerous defenses to the
24 merits of the case and to class certification created difficulties with proof and complex legal issues for
25 Class Counsel to overcome. Indeed, I am aware of other similar cases where the court dismissed the
26 class allegations or denied class certification. Under such contingent circumstances, courts have held
27 that a risk multiplier must be applied to the fee award.

28 27. From March 1, 2021 to November 1, 2023, my firm has worked more than 209 hours

1 prosecuting these class claims with the attorneys' hourly fee rates for attorneys ranging from \$450 to
2 \$995, which resulted in lodestar for BNBD relating to the claims being settled in the amount of
3 \$146,000.84. In addition, there will be additional work performed to complete the settlement process.
4 Attached hereto as Exhibits #3 and 4 are true and correct copies of the BNBD billing statement for this
5 matter which sets forth the specific tasks, time and attorney for the work performed on this matter.¹
6 When combined with the lodestar incurred my co-counsel, Lidman Law, APLC and Haines Law
7 Group, APC, the total combined lodestar for Class Counsel is \$305,935.84, which reflects a lodestar
8 multiplier cross-check of 0.98, which is reasonable and well below the accepted range of multipliers.

9 28. The rates charged by my firm are in line with the prevailing rates of attorneys in the
10 local legal community for similar work and, if this were a commercial matter, these are the charges
11 that would be made and presented to the client. My firm's hourly rates are based upon the Laffey
12 Matrix with the appropriate 2% increase adjustment for Southern California. A true and correct copy
13 of the current Laffey Matrix is attached hereto as Exhibit #5. These hourly rates have been approved
14 by Court's throughout California, including the Courts in the Superior Court of California. In fact, on
15 August 1, 2018, District Judge Andre Birotte Jr. found that BNBD's "rates generally appear
16 reasonable and 'in line with those prevailing in the [relevant] community'—the Central District of
17 California". Finally, the reasonableness of BNBD's hourly rates is further confirmed by comparing
18 such rates with the rates of comparable counsel practicing complex and class litigation as detailed in
19 the National Law Journal Billing Survey. See e.g. *Zest IP Holdings, LLC v. Implant Direct MFG.,*
20 *LLC*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 167563 (S.D. Cal. 2014) (finding in 2014 that "Mayer Brown's \$775
21 average billing rate for partners" and "Mayer Brown's \$543 average associate billing rate" are
22 reasonable rates when compared within 21 other firms practicing in the Southern District of
23 California.) This survey is useful to show that BNBD's rates are in line with the comparable rates of
24 the defense counsel that opposes these types of class claims. In another historical example, several
25 years ago Paul Hastings charged between \$900 and \$750 for partners and \$755 and \$335 for
26

27 ¹ The Blumenthal Firm switched billing systems in June 2022, so Exhibit #3 contains the lodestar
28 billing from January 2020 to June 2022, and Exhibit #4 contains the lodestar billing for June
2022 to November 1, 2023.

1 associates. Thus, the rates charged by BNBD for comparable work are less than these examples and
2 are therefore undoubtedly reasonable.

3 29. The reasonableness of the requested award is also established by reference to similar
4 awards in other wage and hour cases. The following are examples of similar recent fee awards. On
5 January 31, 2020, in *El Pollo Loco Wage and Hour Cases* (Orange County Superior Court Case No.
6 JCCP 4957) Judge William Claster awarded Class Counsel a one-third award in a wage and hour class
7 settlement. On February 11, 2020, in *Singh v. Total Renal Care* (San Francisco Superior Court Case
8 No. CGC-16-550847) Judge Ethan Schulman awarded Class Counsel a one-third award in a wage and
9 hour class settlement. On June 2, 2021, in *Pacia v. CIM Group, L.P.* (Los Angeles Superior Court
10 Case No. BC709666), Judge Amy D. Hogue awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage
11 and hour class settlement. On November 8, 2021, in *Securitas Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles
12 Superior Court Case No. JCCP4837) Judge David Cunningham awarded a one-third fee award in a
13 wage and hour class settlement. On November 17, 2021, in *Leon v. Sierra Aluminum Company* (San
14 Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS2010856) Judge David Cohn awarded a one-third fee
15 award in a wage and hour class settlement. On March 17, 2022, in *See's Candies Wage and Hour*
16 *Cases* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. JCCP5004) Judge Maren Nelson awarded a one-third fee
17 award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On April 12, 2022, in *O'Donnell v. Okta, Inc.*, (San
18 Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-20-587665) Judge Richard Ulmer awarded a one-third fee
19 award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On June 30, 2022, in *Armstrong, et al. v. Prometric*
20 *LLC* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV29967), Judge Maren E. Nelson awarded a one-
21 third fee award in a wage and hour class action. On July 13, 2022, in *Crum v. S&D Carwash*
22 *Management LLC*, (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 2019-00251338), Judge Christopher E.
23 Krueger awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On September 7,
24 2022, in *Lucchese, et al. v. Kone, Inc.*, (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-20-588225),
25 Judge Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement.
26 On November 4, 2022, in *Infinity Energy Wage and Hour Cases* (San Diego Superior Court, Case No.
27 JCCP5139), Judge Keri Katz awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action
28 settlement. On February 1, 2023, in *Hogan v. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.* (Los Angeles Superior

1 Court Case No. 19STCV40072), Judge Stuart Rice awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour
2 class settlement. On February 28, 2023, in *Farthing v. Milestone Technologies* (San Francisco
3 Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-591251), Judge Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. awarded a one-third fee
4 award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On March 2, 2023, in *Leon v. Calaveras Materials*
5 (Kings County Superior Court Case No. 21C-0105), Judge Melissa D'Morias awarded a one-third fee
6 award in a wage and hour class settlement. On June 20, 2023, in *Gonzalez v. Pacific Western Bank*
7 (San Bernardino County Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2127657) Judge David Cohn awarded a one-
8 third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement, On June 30, 2023, in *Aguirre v. Headlands*
9 *Ventures* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2021-00297290), Judge Jill Talley
10 approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement.

11 30. To date, BNBD has incurred litigation expenses of \$11,246.27. These litigation
12 expenses include the expenses incurred for filing fees, mediation fees (Frank Feder) attorney service
13 charges (One Legal, CaseAnywhere), expert witness fees (Berger Consulting), downloads of Court
14 documents, and Courtcall charges, all of which are costs normally billed to and paid by the client.
15 These costs were reasonably incurred by BNBD in the prosecution of this matter and are set forth in
16 the BNBD billing records attached hereto as Exhibit #3 and #4.²

17
18 Service Awards:

19 31. I respectfully request that for their service as the class representatives, Plaintiffs should
20 be awarded the agreed Class Representative Service Awards of \$10,000 each, in accordance with the
21 Settlement Agreement for their time, risk and effort expended on behalf of the Class as the class
22 representatives. The Declarations of Willie Marquez, Andy Mikhael and Julio Carcia are attached
23 hereto as Exhibits #6, 7 and 8 and are submitted in support of their request. Defendant has agreed to
24 this payment and there have been no objections to the requested service award. As the representatives
25 of the Class, Plaintiffs performed their duty to the Class admirably and without exception. Plaintiffs
26

27 ² The Blumenthal Firm switched billing systems in June 2022, so Exhibit #3 contains the expense
28 billing from January 2020 to June 2022, and Exhibit #4 contains the expense billing for June
2022 to November 1, 2023.

1 worked extensively with Class Counsel during the course of the litigation, responding to numerous
2 requests, searching for documents, working with counsel, committing to responding to discovery and
3 depositions, and reviewing the settlement documentation. As set forth in the Settlement Agreement,
4 Plaintiffs are also providing a comprehensive release as part of the Settlement, far beyond the class
5 release. The Declarations of Plaintiffs, attached hereto, detail the involvement, stress and risks they
6 undertook as a result of this Action. The Plaintiffs also assumed the serious risk that they might
7 possibly be liable for costs and fees to Defendant, as well as the reputational risk of being
8 “blacklisted” by other future employers for having filed a class action on behalf of fellow former
9 employees. Without the Plaintiffs’ participation, cooperation and information, no other fellow
10 employees would be receiving any benefit. The payment of service awards to successful class
11 representatives is appropriate and the amount of \$10,000 each is well within the currently awarded
12 range for similar settlements. The requested award is also reasonable by reference to the amounts that
13 other California courts have found to be reasonable in wage and hour class action settlements:
14 *Zamora v. Balboa Life & Casualty, LLC*, Case No. BC360036, Los Angeles County Superior Court
15 (Mar. 7, 2013)(awarding \$25,000 service award); *Aguiar v. Cingular Wireless, LLC*, Case No. CV 06-
16 8197 DDP (AJWx)(C.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2011)(awarding \$14,767 service award); *Magee v. American*
17 *Residential Services, LLC*, Case No. BC423798, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Apr. 21,
18 2011)(awarding \$15,000 service award); *Mares v. BFS Retail & Commercial Operations, LLC*, Case
19 No. BC375967, Los Angeles County Superior Court (June 24, 2010)(awarding \$15,000 service
20 award); *Baker v. L.A. Fitness Int’l, LLC*, Case No. BC438654, L.A. County Superior Court (Dec. 12,
21 2012)(awarding \$10,000 service awards to three named plaintiffs); *Blue v. Coldwell banker*
22 *Residential Brokerage Co.*, Case No. BC417335, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Mar. 21,
23 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Buckmire v. Jo-Ann Stores, Inc.*, Case No. BC394795, Los
24 Angeles County Superior Court (June, 11, 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service awards); *Coleman v. Estes*
25 *Express Lines, Inc.*, Case No. BC429042, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Oct. 3, 2013)(awarding
26 \$10,000 service award); *Ethridge v. Universal Health Services, Inc.*, Case No. BC391958, Los
27 Angeles County Superior Court (May 27, 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Hickson v. South*
28 *Coast Auto Ins. Marketing, Inc.*, Case No. BC390395, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Mar. 27,

2012)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Hill v. sunglass Hut Int'l, Inc.*, Case No. BC422934, Los Angeles County Superior Court (July 2, 2012)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Kambamba v. Victoria's Secret Stores, LLC*, Case No. BC368528, Los Angeles County Superior Court, (Aug. 19, 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award together with additional compensation for their general release); *Nevarez v. Trader Joe's Co.*, Case No. BC373910, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Jan. 29, 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Ordaz v. Rose Hills Mortuary, L.P.*, Case No. BC386500, Los Angeles County Superior Court, (Mar. 19, 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Sheldon v. AHMC Monterey Park Hosp. LP*, Case No. BC440282, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Feb. 22, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Silva v. Catholic Mortuary Services, Inc.*, Case No. BC408054, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Feb. 8, 2011)(awarding \$10,000 enhancement award); *Weisbarth v. Banc West Investment Services, Inc.*, Case No. BC422202, Los Angeles County Superior Court (May 24, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Lazar v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan*, Case No. 14-cv-273289, Santa Clara County Superior Court (Dec. 28, 2015) (awarding \$10,000 service award); *Acheson v. Express, LLC*, Case No. 109CV135335, Santa Clara County Superior Court (Sept. 13, 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Bejarano v. Amerisave Mortgage Corp.*, Case No. EDCV 08-00599 SGL (Opx)(C.D. Cal. June 22, 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Carbajal v. Sally Beauty Supply LLC*, Case No. CIVVS 1004307, San Bernardino County Superior Court (Aug. 6, 2012)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Contreras v. Serco Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-04526-CAS-JEMx (C.D. Cal. Sep. 10, 2012)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Guerro v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co.*, Case No. RIC 10005196, Riverside County Superior Court (July 16, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Kisliuk v. ADT Security Services Inc.*, Case No. CV08-03241 DSF (RZx)(C.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2011)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Morales v. BCBG Maxazria Int'l Holdings, Inc.*, Case No. JCCP 4582, Orange County Superior Court (Jan. 24, 2013)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Barrett v. Doyon Security Services, LLC*, Case No. BS900199, BS900517, San Bernardino County Superior Court (Apr. 23, 2010)(awarding \$10,000 service award); *Zirpolo v. UAG Stevens Creek II*, Santa Clara Superior Court Case no. 17CV313457 (July 10, 2018) (awarding \$10,000 service award); *Taylor v. TIC - The Industrial Company*, U.S.D.C. Central District of California Case No. EDCV 16-186-VAP (Aug. 1, 2018) (awarding \$10,000 service award).

32. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 3.769, I make the following disclosure. The Class Counsel Fees Payment awarded shall be allocated between Class Counsel as follows: 50% to Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP and 50% to Haines Law Group, APC and Lidman Law, APC, collectively.

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

Executed this 1st day of November, 2023, at San Diego, California.



Kyle Nordrehaug

EXHIBIT #1

STIPULATION OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

This Stipulation of Settlement (“Settlement Agreement”) is reached by and between Plaintiffs Julio Garcia, Willie Marquez and Ahdy Mikhael (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of all members of the Settlement Class and PAGA Employees (both terms defined below), on one hand, and Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. (“Defendant”), on the other hand. Plaintiffs and Defendant are referred to herein collectively as the “Parties.” Plaintiffs, the Settlement Class, and the PAGA Employees are represented by Paul K. Haines of Haines Law Group, APC, Scott M. Lidman, Elizabeth Nguyen, and Milan Moore of Lidman Law, APC, and Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug and Aparajit Bhowmik of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (collectively, “Class Counsel”). Defendant is represented by Hekmat (Matt) Kordab of Kordab Law Offices and Stella Park and Yalan Zheng of the Law Offices of Park and Zheng.

On August 18, 2021, Plaintiff Julio Garcia filed a class action Complaint against Defendant in Los Angeles County Superior Court, in the matter entitled *Julio Garcia v. Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc., a California corporation; and Does 1 through 100, inclusive*, Case No. 21STCV30557. On January 27, 2022, pursuant to a request by Plaintiff Julio Garcia, the Los Angeles County Superior Court dismissed his action without prejudice.

On August 31, 2021, Plaintiff Willie Marquez filed a representative PAGA action against Defendant, entitled *Willie Marquez. v. Accurate Delivery Services, Inc.*, in the San Bernardino County Superior Court (Case No. CIVSB 2125174), before Hon. David Cohn of Dept. S-26. In June 2022, pursuant to a request by Plaintiff Willie Marquez, the San Bernardino County Superior Court dismissed his action without prejudice.

On August 31, 2021, Plaintiffs Willie Marquez and Ahdy Mikhael filed a class action against Defendant, entitled *Willie Marquez, et al. v. Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc.*, in the San Bernardino County Superior Court (Case No. CIVSB 2125337), before Hon. David Cohn of Dept. S-26 (hereinafter, the “Action”).

On January 11, 2022, a First Amended Complaint was filed in the Action on behalf of Plaintiffs alleging the following claims: (1) all claims for unfair business practices that could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above; (2) failure to pay all minimum wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (3) failure to pay all overtime wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, miscalculating the regular rate of pay, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (4) failure to provide meal periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant meal periods, and failure to record meal periods; (5) failure to authorize and permit rest periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant rest periods, or the failure to separately pay premiums for rest periods under the commission pay plan; (6) failure to issue accurate, itemized wage statements (7) failure to timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment; (8) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses; and (9) violations of the California Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) seeking civil penalties premised on the facts, claims, causes of action and legal theories described above.

On May 28, 2021, Plaintiffs Willie Marquez and Ahdy Mikhael sent a letter to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (a copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**) exhausting their administrative remedies before filing a civil claim under the PAGA against Defendant. The LWDA took no action in response to that letter.

On August 18, 2021, Plaintiffs Julio Garcia sent a letter to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (a copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**) exhausting his administrative remedies before filing a civil claim under the PAGA against Defendant. The LWDA took no action in response to that letter.

Given the uncertainty of litigation and Defendant's denial of Plaintiffs' claims, Plaintiffs and Defendant wish to settle both individually and on behalf of the Settlement Class, PAGA Employees, and the State of California. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and Defendant agree as follows:

1. **Settlement Class.** For the purposes of this Settlement Agreement only, Plaintiffs and Defendant stipulate to the certification of the "Settlement Class" defined as follows:

All current and former Delivery Drivers of Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. who worked at any time in California during the Class Period.

For purposes of this Settlement Agreement, the "Class Period" shall mean the time period between August 18, 2017 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023.

The Parties agree that certification for purposes of this Settlement Agreement is not an admission that class certification is proper under Section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure. If for any reason this Settlement Agreement is not approved or is terminated, in whole or in part, this conditional agreement to class certification will be inadmissible and will have no effect in this matter or in any claims brought on the same or similar allegations, and the Parties shall revert to the respective positions they held prior to entering into the Settlement Agreement.

2. **PAGA Employees.** For the purposes of this Settlement Agreement only, Plaintiffs and Defendant stipulate to the following definition of "PAGA Employees":

All current and former non-exempt, Delivery Drivers of Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. who worked at any time in California during the PAGA Period.

For purposes of this Settlement Agreement, the "PAGA Period" and release under the PAGA shall mean the time period between August 18, 2020 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023.

3. **Release by Settlement Class Members and Plaintiffs.** Plaintiffs and every member of the Settlement Class (except those who timely and properly submit a Request for Exclusion as set forth below) will fully and forever completely release and discharge Defendant, its past and present officers, directors, shareholders, managers, employees, agents, principals, heirs, representatives, accountants, auditors, consultants, and its respective successors and predecessors in interest, subsidiaries, affiliates, parents, and attorneys, (collectively the "Released Parties"), as follows:

- A. Settlement Class Members' Release: Settlement Class members and Plaintiffs will release all claims, demands, rights, liabilities and causes of action that were pled or could have been pled based upon the facts alleged in the operative First Amended Complaint in the Action, that arose during the Class Period defined above with respect to the following claims: (a) failure to pay all overtime wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, miscalculating the regular rate of pay, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (b) failure to pay all minimum wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (c) failure to provide meal periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant meal periods, and failure to record meal periods; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant rest periods, or the failure to separately pay premiums for rest periods under the commission pay plan; (e) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses; (f) failure to timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment or failure to timely pay wages when due; (g) failure to issue accurate, itemized wage statements; (h) failure to provide paid sick leave or to pay for sick leave; and (i) all claims for unfair business practices that reasonably could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above (collectively, the "Released Class Claims"). The Class Members do not release any claims other than those set forth above, including without limitation claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violations of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period.
- B. The time period for the release of the Released Class Claims shall be the same time period as the Class Period.
- C. PAGA Release: PAGA Employees, including Plaintiffs (and also including those who opt-out from the Class portion of the Settlement), will release and forever discharge the Released Parties from all claims, demands, rights, liabilities and causes of action for civil penalties under California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 which were pled in the letters to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") dated May 28, 2021 and August 18, 2021 (**Exhibits A-B**) and the operative First Amended Complaint in the Action, or which could have been pled based upon the facts alleged in the operative First Amended Complaint in the Action that arose during the PAGA Period predicated on the following alleged violations: (a) failure to pay all overtime wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, miscalculating the regular rate of pay, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (b) failure to pay all minimum wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (c) failure to provide meal periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant meal periods, and failure to record meal periods; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods, pay premium wages for non-

compliant rest periods, or the failure to separately pay premiums for rest periods under the commission pay plan; (e) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses; (f) failure to timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment or failure to timely pay wages when due; (g) failure to issue accurate, itemized wage statements; and (h) failure to provide paid sick leave or to pay for sick leave (collectively, “PAGA Released Claims”).

- D. The time period for the release of the PAGA Released Claims shall be the same time period as the PAGA Period.
- E. In light of the Class Representative Service Awards, Plaintiffs agree to release, in addition to the Released Class Claims described above, all claims, whether known or unknown, under federal law or state law against the Released Parties. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Plaintiffs understand that this release includes unknown claims, which includes waiving all rights and benefits afforded by Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides:

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.

- F. Notwithstanding the above, nor anything else in this Settlement, the waiver and release in this Settlement by Plaintiffs does not apply to (i) those rights that as a matter of law cannot be waived, including, but not limited to, workers’ compensation claims, pending or otherwise and/or benefits to be received by Plaintiffs in workers’ compensation pursuant to the jurisdiction of workers’ compensation; and (ii) rights or claims arising out of this Settlement.
 - G. The releases identified herein will only be effective upon the date that Defendant fully funds the Gross Settlement Amount and any required employer-side taxes.
4. **Gross Settlement Amount.** As consideration, Defendant agrees to pay a “Gross Settlement Amount” of Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$900,000.00) (unless such Gross Settlement Amount is increased pursuant to Paragraph 4.H. below) in full and complete settlement of the Action, as follows:

- A. The Parties have agreed to engage Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as the “Settlement Administrator” to administer this Settlement. All administrative costs due and owing to the Settlement Administrator shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.
- B. With the exception of the Settlement Administrator’s fees, if required by the Settlement Administrator, the Gross Settlement Amount shall be deposited by Defendant into a qualified settlement fund set up by the Settlement Administrator for the benefit of participating Settlement Class members and PAGA Employees.

Defendant agrees to deposit the Gross Settlement Amount with the Settlement Administrator in twenty-four (24) equal monthly installments of Thirty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$37,500.00). The first Settlement Installment shall be paid by no later than June 6, 2023, and will be deposited with the Settlement Administrator in an escrow account set up by it. The second through twenty-fourth Settlement Installment payments shall be due no later than the 6th day of each month thereafter. The employer's share of payroll taxes and any increase to the Gross Settlement Amount due pursuant to the Escalator Clause, if applicable, shall be deposited with the Settlement Administrator along with the twenty-fourth and final Settlement Installment.

- C. The Settlement Administrator shall hold all portions of the Gross Settlement Amount in an interest-bearing account for benefit of the Settlement Class until the time for disbursement. In the event that the Gross Settlement amount is not paid as required under Paragraph 4.B. of this Agreement, after Defendant's counsel receives written notice of the default, and given ten (10) days to cure, then at Plaintiffs' option, the Settlement, Final Approval Order, and Judgment may be enforced by remedies available and Defendant agrees to the payment of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs necessary in enforcing the Agreement. The Parties agree that unless otherwise ordered by the Court, there shall be no disbursements of the Gross Settlement Amount unless and until the Court has issued final approval of the Settlement, and the Gross Settlement Amount and employer-side taxes have been fully funded. If for any reason the Court denies approval with prejudice of the Settlement, any portion of the Gross Settlement Amount deposited by Defendant with the Administrator as of that date of denial shall be returned to Defendant in full.
- D. This Settlement shall become effective on the latter of: (a) the Court's final approval of the settlement if no objections by or on behalf of Settlement Class members have been filed; (b) the time for appeal has expired if an objection has been filed and no appeal has been filed or withdrawn; or (c) the final resolution of any appeal that has been filed (hereinafter, "Effective Date").
- E. The Parties agree that this Settlement is conditioned upon Plaintiffs' counsel's review of a Defendant declaration to be provided by Defendant which attests to and confirms that Defendant's financial condition is consistent with the representations made by Defendant at the mediation. To the extent the declaration is not consistent with the representations made at mediation, Plaintiffs have the sole right to withdraw from this Settlement. Following the execution of this Settlement, the Parties agree to meet and confer regarding Defendant providing a declaration under oath confirming the various data points and information discussed during mediation. Defendant agrees to cooperate and provide any declarations and/or necessary information regarding the payment plan in support of preliminary approval and/or final approval should the Court request additional information regarding the payment plan.
- F. This is a non-reversionary settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount includes:

- (1) All payments (including interest) to the Settlement Class members;
 - (2) All costs of the Settlement Administrator and settlement administration, which are anticipated to be no greater than Five Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents (\$5,750.00);
 - (3) Up to Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00) for each of the three Plaintiffs' Class Representative Service Awards (for a total of up to \$30,000.00), in recognition of their contributions to the Action, and their service to the Settlement Class. Even in the event that the Court reduces or does not approve the requested Class Representative Service Awards, Plaintiffs shall not have the right to revoke this Settlement Agreement, and this Settlement shall remain binding;
 - (4) Up to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount in Class Counsel's attorneys' fees [estimated to be Three Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$300,000.00), unless the Gross Settlement Amount is increased pursuant to Paragraph 4.H. below], plus actual costs and expenses incurred by Class Counsel related to the Action as supported by declaration, which are currently estimated to be no greater than Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$30,000.00). In the event that the Court reduces or does not approve the requested Class Counsel attorneys' fees and/or costs, Class Counsel shall not have the right to revoke this Settlement Agreement, and it will remain binding; and
 - (5) Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$30,000.00) of the Gross Settlement Amount has been set aside by the Parties as PAGA civil penalties. Per Labor Code § 2699(i), seventy-five percent (75%) of such penalties, or Twenty-Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$22,500.00) will be payable to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%), or Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$7,500.00), will be payable to the PAGA Employees as the "PAGA Amount," as described below.
- G. Defendant's share of payroll taxes shall be paid by Defendant separately from, and in addition to, the Gross Settlement Amount. These taxes will not be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount.
- H. **Unexpected Workweeks/Escalator Clause.** Defendant represents that there are an estimated 14,814 workweeks worked by Settlement Class members during the Class Period. If the number of workweeks worked by Settlement Class members during the Class Period is more than 10% greater than this figure (*i.e.*, if there are 16,296 or more workweeks) worked by the Settlement Class members, Defendant agrees to increase the Gross Settlement Amount on a *pro rata* basis above the 10% (*i.e.*, if there was 11% increase in the number workweeks during

the Class Period, Defendant would agree to increase the Gross Settlement Amount by 1%).

5. **Payments to the Settlement Class.** Settlement Class members are not required to submit a claim form to receive a payment (“Settlement Award”) from the Settlement. Settlement Awards will be determined and paid as follows:

- A. The Settlement Administrator shall first deduct from the Gross Settlement Amount the amounts approved by the Court for Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees, Class Counsel’s costs and expenses, Plaintiffs’ Class Representative Service Awards, the Settlement Administrator’s fees and expenses for administration, and the amount designated as PAGA civil penalties payable to the LWDA. The remaining amount shall be known as the “Net Settlement Amount.”
- B. From the Net Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator will calculate each Settlement Class member’s Settlement Award based on the following formula:
 - i. The Net Settlement Amount shall be allocated to Settlement Class members who worked during the Class Period, as follows: each participating Settlement Class member shall receive a proportionate settlement share based upon the number of workweeks worked as a Delivery Driver during the Class Period, the numerator of which is the Settlement Class member’s total workweeks worked as a Delivery Driver during the Class Period, and the denominator of which is the total workweeks worked as Delivery Drivers by all Settlement Class members (who do not opt out) who worked during the Class Period.
- C. PAGA Amount: Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$7,500.00) of the Gross Settlement Amount has been designated as the “PAGA Amount” as described above. Each PAGA Employee shall receive a portion of the PAGA Amount proportionate to the number of pay periods that he or she worked during this PAGA Period which will be calculated by multiplying the PAGA Amount by a fraction, the numerator of which is the PAGA Employee’s number of pay periods worked as a non-exempt employee during this time period, and the denominator of which is the total number of pay periods worked by all PAGA Employees. The payments to PAGA Employees shall be reported as penalties on a Form 1099.
- D. Within ten (10) calendar days following Defendant’s deposit of the final Settlement Installment of Gross Settlement Amount and all employer-side taxes with the Settlement Administrator, the Settlement Administrator will calculate Settlement Award amounts and provide the same to counsel for the Parties for review and approval. Within seven (7) calendar days of approval by counsel for the Parties, the Settlement Administrator will prepare and mail Settlement Awards to participating Settlement Class members.

- E. For purposes of calculating applicable taxes and withholdings, each Settlement Award shall be allocated as follows: twenty percent (20%) as wages; and eighty percent (80%) as penalties and interest. The Settlement Administrator will be responsible for issuing to participating Settlement Class members IRS Forms W-2 for amounts deemed “wages” and IRS Forms 1099 for the amounts allocated as penalties and interest. Each Settlement Class member who receives a Settlement Award will be responsible for correctly characterizing the payment for tax purposes and for payment of any taxes owing on said amount. Notwithstanding the treatment of the payments to each Settlement Class member above, none of the payments called for by this Settlement Agreement, including the wage portion, are to be treated as earnings, wages, pay or compensation for any purpose of any applicable benefit or retirement plan, unless required by such plans.
- F. Each member of the Settlement Class who receives a Settlement Award must cash the check(s) within 180 days from the date the Settlement Administrator mails it/them. Any funds payable to Settlement Class members whose checks were not cashed within 180 days after mailing will escheat to the California Secretary of State- Unclaimed Property Fund under the unclaimed property laws in the name of the Settlement Class member. Any uncashed funds from the PAGA Amount shall be handled in the same manner.

6. **Attorneys’ Fees and Costs.** Defendant will not object to Class Counsel’s request for a total award of attorneys’ fees of one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be Three Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cent (\$300,000.00), unless the Gross Settlement Amount is increased pursuant to Paragraph 4.H. above, in which case the attorneys’ fees shall increase accordingly. Additionally, Class Counsel will request an award of actual costs and expenses as supported by declaration, in an amount not to exceed Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$30,000.00) from the Gross Settlement Amount. These amounts will cover any and all work performed and any and all costs incurred in connection with this litigation, including without limitation: all work performed, and all costs incurred to date; and all work to be performed and costs to be incurred in connection with obtaining the Court’s approval of this Settlement Agreement, including any objections raised and any appeals necessitated by those objections. The attorneys’ fees awarded by the Court shall be allocated between Class Counsel as follows: 50% to Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP and 50% to Haines Law Group, APC and Lidman Law, APC, collectively. The award of litigation costs and expenses shall be allocated based upon the expense incurred by each firm as documents in their declarations. Class Counsel will be issued an IRS Form 1099 by the Settlement Administrator when the Settlement Administrator pays the fee award and cost award allowed by the Court.

7. **Class Representative Service Awards.** Defendant will not object to a request for a Class Representative Service Awards of up to Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00) to each of the Plaintiffs (for a total of \$30,000.00) for their time and risk in prosecuting this case, their service to the Settlement Class, and their execution of a general release. This award will be in addition to Plaintiffs’ Settlement Award as a Settlement Class member and shall be reported on an IRS Form 1099 issued by the Settlement Administrator. Even in the event that the Court reduces or does not approve the requested Class Representative Service Awards, Plaintiffs shall not have the right to revoke this Settlement, and it will remain binding.

8. **Settlement Administrator.** Defendant will not object the appointment of Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as Settlement Administrator. Defendant will not object to Plaintiffs' seeking permission to pay up to Five Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents (\$5,750.00) for its services from the Gross Settlement Amount. The Settlement Administrator shall be responsible for sending notices and for calculating Settlement Awards and preparing all checks and mailings, calculating Defendant's share of taxes payable on the wages, which shall be paid by Defendant separate and apart from the Gross Settlement Amount, and other duties as described in this Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall be authorized to pay itself from the Gross Settlement Amount by Class Counsel only after Settlement Awards have been mailed to all participating Settlement Class members.

9. **Preliminary Approval.** Within a reasonable time after execution of this Settlement Agreement by the Parties, Plaintiffs shall apply to the Court for the entry of an Order:

- A. Conditionally certifying the Settlement Class for purposes of this Settlement Agreement;
- B. Appointing Paul K. Haines of Haines Law Group, APC, Scott M. Lidman, Elizabeth Nguyen, and Milan Moore of Lidman Law, APC, and Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug and Aparajit Bhowmik of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP as Class Counsel;
- C. Appointing Julio Garcia, Ahdy Mikhael and Willie Marquez as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class;
- D. Approving Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as Settlement Administrator;
- E. Preliminarily approving this Settlement Agreement and its terms as fair, reasonable, and adequate;
- F. Approving the form and content of the Notice Packet (which is comprised of the Notice of Pendency of Class Action and Settlement and Notice of Settlement Award, drafts of which are attached collectively hereto as **Exhibit C**), and directing the mailing of same; and
- G. Scheduling a Final Approval hearing.

10. **Notice to Settlement Class.** Following preliminary approval, the Settlement Class shall be notified as follows:

- A. Within fifteen (15) calendar days after entry of an order preliminarily approving this Agreement, Defendant will provide the Settlement Administrator with the names, last known addresses, phone numbers, social security numbers, the number of weeks worked during the Class Period, number pay periods worked during the PAGA Period (or information allowing the Settlement Administrator to calculate same) for each Settlement Class member while employed during the Class Period

and PAGA Period (the “Class Data”). The Class Data shall be provided to the Settlement Administrator in an electronic format satisfactory to the Settlement Administrator.

- B. Within ten (10) business days from receipt of this information, the Settlement Administrator shall (i) run the names of all Settlement Class members through the National Change of Address (“NCOA”) database to determine any updated addresses for Settlement Class members; (ii) update the address of any Settlement Class member for whom an updated address was found through the NCOA search; (iii) calculate the estimated Settlement Award for each Settlement Class member; and (iv) mail a Notice Packet to each Settlement Class member at his or her last known address or at the updated address found through the NCOA search, and retain proof of mailing.
- C. Requests for Exclusion. Any Settlement Class member who wishes to opt-out of the Settlement must complete and mail a Request for Exclusion (defined below) to the Settlement Administrator within sixty (60) calendar days of the date of the initial mailing of the Notice Packets (the “Response Deadline”). The Response Deadline shall be extended by fourteen (14) days in the event of a re-mailing of a Notice Packet.
 - i. The Notice Packet shall state that Settlement Class members who wish to exclude themselves from the Settlement must submit a Request for Exclusion by the Response Deadline. The Request for Exclusion must: (1) contain the name, address, telephone number and the last four digits of the Social Security number of the Settlement Class member; (2) contain a statement that the Settlement Class member wishes to be excluded from the Settlement; (3) be signed by the Settlement Class member; and (4) be postmarked by the Response Deadline and mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address specified in the Class Notice. If the Request for Exclusion does not contain the information listed in (1)-(3), it will not be deemed valid for exclusion from the Settlement, except a Request for Exclusion not containing a Class Member’s telephone number and/or last four digits of the Social Security number will be deemed valid. The date of the postmark on the Request for Exclusion shall be the exclusive means used to determine whether a Request for Exclusion has been timely submitted. Any Settlement Class member who requests to be excluded from the Settlement Class will not be entitled to any recovery under this Settlement Agreement and will not be bound by the terms of the Settlement or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon.
 - ii. Plaintiffs agree that they shall not request to be excluded from the Settlement.
 - iii. The Parties agree there is no statutory or other right for any Settlement Class member to opt out or otherwise exclude himself or herself from the PAGA portion of the Settlement. A Settlement Class member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion shall still receive his or her proportionate share of the PAGA Amount.

- D. Objections. Members of the Settlement Class who do not request exclusion may object to this Settlement Agreement as explained in the Class Notice by mailing a written objection with the Settlement Administrator (who shall serve all objections as received on Class Counsel and Defendant's counsel) postmarked by the Response Deadline. Class Counsel shall file any objections with the Court. Defendant's counsel and Class Counsel shall file any responses to objections no later than the deadline to file the Motion for Final Approval. To be valid, any written objection must: (1) contain the objecting Settlement Class member's full name and current address, as well as contact information for any attorney representing the objecting Settlement Class member for purposes of the objection; (2) include all objections and the factual and legal bases for same; (3) include any and all supporting papers, briefs, written evidence, declarations, and/or other evidence, if any; and (4) be postmarked no later than the Response Deadline. Members of the Settlement Class who do not request exclusion may also object to the Settlement by appearing at the Final Approval Hearing in person or virtually irrespective of whether they submitted any written objections.
- E. Notice of Settlement Award / Disputes. Each Notice Packet mailed to a Settlement Class member shall disclose the amount of the Settlement Class member's estimated Settlement Award as well the Settlement Class member's number of pay periods worked as a non-exempt employee during the Class Period and PAGA Period. Settlement Class members will have the opportunity, should they disagree with Defendant's records regarding the information stated in the Notice of Settlement Award, to provide documentation and/or an explanation to show contrary information. Any such dispute, including any supporting documentation, must be mailed to the Settlement Administrator and postmarked by the Response Deadline. If there is a dispute, the Settlement Administrator will consult with the Parties to determine whether an adjustment is warranted. The Settlement Administrator shall determine the eligibility for, and the amounts of, any Settlement Awards under the terms of this Settlement Agreement. If a resolution cannot be reached by and among the Parties and the Settlement Administrator, the Court will render all final decisions on disputes.
- F. Any Notice Packets returned to the Settlement Administrator as non-delivered on or before the Response Deadline shall be re-mailed to the forwarding address affixed thereto. If no forwarding address is provided, the Settlement Administrator shall make reasonable efforts, including utilizing a "skip trace," to obtain an updated mailing address within three (3) business days of receiving the returned Notice Packet. If an updated mailing address is identified before the Response Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall resend the Notice Packet to the Settlement Class member immediately, and in any event within three (3) business days of obtaining the updated address. The address identified by the Settlement Administrator as the current mailing address shall be presumed to be the best mailing address for each Settlement Class member. Settlement Class members to whom Notice Packets are re-mailed after having been returned as undeliverable to the Settlement Administrator shall have their Response Deadline extended by

fourteen (14) calendar days to submit a Request for Exclusion, Objection, or dispute. Notice Packets that are re-mailed shall inform the recipient of this adjusted deadline. If a Settlement Class member's Notice Packet is returned to the Settlement Administrator more than once before the Response Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall continue to make reasonable efforts to obtain an updated mailing address. Nothing else shall be required of, or done by, the Parties, Class Counsel, or Defendant's Counsel to provide notice of the proposed settlement.

11. **Final Approval.** Following preliminary approval and the close of the period for filing requests for exclusion, objections, or disputes under this Settlement Agreement, Plaintiffs shall apply to the Court for entry of an Order:

- A. Granting final approval to the Settlement Agreement and adjudging its terms to be fair, reasonable, and adequate;
- B. Approving Plaintiffs' and Class Counsel's application for attorneys' fees and costs, Class Representative Service Award, and settlement administration costs; and
- C. Entering judgment pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769 and posting notice of the judgment on a static website created and maintained by the Settlement Administrator.

12. **Non-Admission of Liability.** Nothing in this Settlement Agreement shall operate or be construed as an admission of any liability or that class certification is appropriate in any context other than this Settlement. In particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, nothing about this Settlement Agreement shall be offered or construed as an admission of liability, wrongdoing, impropriety, responsibility, or fault whatsoever on the part of Defendant and/or the Released Parties, and it shall not be construed as or deemed to be evidence of, or an admission or concession that the any Settling Class member has suffered any damage. Each of the Parties has entered into this Settlement Agreement to avoid the burden and expense of further litigation. Pursuant to California Evidence Code Section 1152, this Settlement Agreement is inadmissible in any proceeding, except a proceeding to approve, interpret, or enforce this Settlement Agreement. If Final Approval does not occur, the Parties agree that this Settlement Agreement is void, but remains protected by California Evidence Code Section 1152.

13. **Non-disclosure and Non-publication.** Prior to the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel agree not to disclose or publicize the Settlement Agreement contemplated herein, the fact of the Settlement Agreement, its terms or contents, or the negotiations underlying the Settlement Agreement, in any manner or form, directly or indirectly, to any person or entity, except to Settlement Class members and as shall be contractually required to effectuate the terms of the Settlement Agreement as set forth herein. Thereafter, however, the Parties will agree to make no comments to the media or otherwise publicize the terms of the settlement; provided, however, for the limited purpose of allowing Class Counsel to prove adequacy as class counsel in other actions, Class Counsel may disclose the names of the Parties in this Action, the venue/case number of this Action, and a general description of the Action, to a court in a declaration by Class Counsel. Class Counsel may also include a general description of

the Settlement on their respective websites but may not include the name(s) of any of the Parties, or the case name or case number of the Action.

14. **Legal Developments.** The Parties agree that Plaintiffs will submit to the Court a motion for preliminary approval of this Settlement containing all of the terms and conditions contained herein notwithstanding any new legal developments regarding the Released Class Claims.

15. **Waiver and Amendment.** The Parties may not waive, amend, or modify any provision of this Settlement Agreement except by a written agreement signed by all of the Parties, and subject to any necessary Court approval. A waiver or amendment of any provision of this Settlement Agreement will not constitute a waiver of any other provision.

16. **Enforcement Action:** The Parties agree that this Settlement is enforceable pursuant to the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure §664.6. Further, in the event of any dispute arising out of the interpretation, performance, or breach of any provision of this Settlement Agreement, the prevailing party in such dispute(s) shall be entitled to recover their, his and/or its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, including any expert witness fees, incurred arising from such dispute.

17. **Staying of Action and Five-Year Rule:** The Parties agree that upon full execution of this Settlement, the Action shall be stayed for all purposes except with respect to seeking approval of the Settlement and/or enforcing the terms thereof. The Parties further stipulate that the time within which to bring the Action to trial under C.C.P. Section 583.310 shall be extended for a period of not less than one (1) year starting from the date of the signing of this Settlement by all Parties until the entry of the final approval order and judgment or if not entered the date this Agreement shall no longer be of any force or effect.

18. **Notices.** All notices, demands, and other communications to be provided concerning this Settlement Agreement shall be in writing and delivered by receipted delivery and by e-mail at the addresses set forth below, or such other addresses as either Party may designate in writing from time to time:

if to Defendant: Stella Park and Yalan Zheng, Park & Zheng, 6 Venture, Suite 265, Irvine, California 92618; spark@parkandzheng.com and yzheng@parkandzheng.com

Hekmat (Matt) Kordab, Kordab Law Offices, 300 S. Harbor Blvd., Suite 820, Anaheim, California 92805; matt@kordablalaw.com

if to Plaintiffs: Scott M. Lidman, Elizabeth Nguyen, and Milan Moore of Lidman Law, APC, 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 150, El Segundo, California 90245; slidman@lidmanlaw.com; enguyen@lidmanlaw.com and mmoore@lidmanlaw.com

Paul K. Haines, Haines Law Group, APC, 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180, El Segundo, California 90245; phaines@haineslawgroup.com

Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug and Aparajit Bhowmik
of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 2255 Calle
Clara, La Jolla, California 92037; norm@bamlawca.com;
kyle@bamlawca.com and aj@bamlawca.com

19. **Cooperation.** The Parties agree to work cooperatively, diligently and in good faith to ensure that all documents necessary to effectuate this Settlement are properly and timely filed.

20. **Entire Agreement.** This Settlement Agreement contains the entire agreement between the Parties with respect to the transactions contemplated hereby, and supersedes all negotiations, presentations, warranties, commitments, offers, contracts, and writings prior to the date hereof relating to the subject matters hereof.

21. **Counterparts.** This Settlement Agreement may be executed by one or more of the Parties on any number of separate counterparts by facsimile, electronic signature, or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original, and such signatures may be delivered electronically, and all of said counterparts taken together shall be deemed to constitute one and the same instrument.

DATED: 4-17-2023

DEFENDANT ACCURATE DELIVERY
SYSTEMS, INC.

By: 

Its: PRESIDENT

DATED:

PLAINTIFF JULIO GARCIA

By: _____

Plaintiff and Settlement Class Representative

DATED: Apr 11, 2023

PLAINTIFF WILLIE MARQUEZ

By: Willie Marquez
Willie Marquez (Apr 11, 2023 13:42 PDT)

Plaintiff and Settlement Class Representative

Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug and Aparajit Bhowmik
of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 2255 Calle
Clara, La Jolla, California 92037; norm@bamlawca.com;
kyle@bamlawca.com and aj@bamlawca.com

19. **Cooperation.** The Parties agree to work cooperatively, diligently and in good faith to ensure that all documents necessary to effectuate this Settlement are properly and timely filed.

20. **Entire Agreement.** This Settlement Agreement contains the entire agreement between the Parties with respect to the transactions contemplated hereby, and supersedes all negotiations, presentations, warranties, commitments, offers, contracts, and writings prior to the date hereof relating to the subject matters hereof.

21. **Counterparts.** This Settlement Agreement may be executed by one or more of the Parties on any number of separate counterparts by facsimile, electronic signature, or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original, and such signatures may be delivered electronically, and all of said counterparts taken together shall be deemed to constitute one and the same instrument.

DATED: 4-17-2023

DEFENDANT ACCURATE DELIVERY
SYSTEMS, INC.

By: 

Its: PRESIDENT

DATED:

PLAINTIFF JULIO GARCIA

By: _____

Plaintiff and Settlement Class Representative

DATED: Apr 11, 2023

PLAINTIFF WILLIE MARQUEZ

By: Willie Marquez
Willie Marquez (Apr 11, 2023 13:42 PDT)

Plaintiff and Settlement Class Representative

Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug and Aparajit Bhowmik of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 2255 Calle Clara, La Jolla, California 92037; norm@bamlawca.com; kyle@bamlawca.com and aj@bamlawca.com

19. **Cooperation.** The Parties agree to work cooperatively, diligently and in good faith to ensure that all documents necessary to effectuate this Settlement are properly and timely filed.

20. **Entire Agreement.** This Settlement Agreement contains the entire agreement between the Parties with respect to the transactions contemplated hereby, and supersedes all negotiations, presentations, warranties, commitments, offers, contracts, and writings prior to the date hereof relating to the subject matters hereof.

21. **Counterparts.** This Settlement Agreement may be executed by one or more of the Parties on any number of separate counterparts by facsimile, electronic signature, or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original, and such signatures may be delivered electronically, and all of said counterparts taken together shall be deemed to constitute one and the same instrument.

DATED:

DEFENDANT ACCURATE DELIVERY
SYSTEMS, INC.

By: _____

Its: _____

DATED: Apr 11, 2023

PLAINTIFF JULIO GARCIA

By:  _____
Julio Garcia (Apr 11, 2023 11:39 PDT)

Plaintiff and Settlement Class Representative

DATED:

PLAINTIFF WILLIE MARQUEZ

By: _____

Plaintiff and Settlement Class Representative

DATED: Apr 11, 2023

PLAINTIFF AHDY MIKHAEL

By: 
Ahdy Mikhael (Apr 11, 2023 19:24 PDT)

Plaintiff and Settlement Class Representative

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DATED: April 20, 2023

KORDAB LAW OFFICES.

By: 
Hekmat (Matt) Kordab
Attorneys for Defendant Accurate Delivery
Services, Inc.

DATED:

PARK & ZHENG

By: _____
Stella Park
Attorneys for Defendant Accurate Delivery
Services, Inc.

DATED: April 11, 2023

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

By:  _____
Paul K. Haines
Attorneys for Plaintiff Julio Garcia

DATED: April 11, 2023

LIDMAN LAW, APC

By:  _____
Scott M. Lidman
Attorneys for Plaintiff Julio Garcia

DATED:

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE
DE BLOUW LLP

By: _____
Kyle Nordrehaug
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Willie Marquez and
Ahdy Mikhael

DATED: *April 17, 2023*

PARK & ZHENG

By: 

Stella Park
Attorneys for Defendant Accurate Delivery
Services, Inc.

DATED:

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

By: _____

Paul K. Haines
Attorneys for Plaintiff Julio Garcia

DATED:

LIDMAN LAW, APC

By: _____

Scott M. Lidman
Attorneys for Plaintiff Julio Garcia

DATED: April 12, 2023

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE
DE BLOUW LLP

By: 

Kyle Nordrehaug
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Willie Marquez and
Ahdy Mikhael

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

**2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

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

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

Bvb WRITERS E-MAIL:

Nick@bamlawca.com

**WRITER
S EXT:
1004**

May 28, 2021
CA2271

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc.
Online Filing Certified Mail #70200640000213198216
Mamoud Maraach
173 W. Resource Drive
Bloomington, CA 92316

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 351, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. in California as Delivery Drivers and other similar job titles. “Aggrieved Employees” also refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendant in California and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of May 28, 2020 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Willie Marquez (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California as a non-exempt employee in the position of a Delivery Driver from April of 2018 to September 2020 and entitled to the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment for all time worked under Defendant’s control. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and

Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to him, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 351, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

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

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

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

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

2 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

3 Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

2255 Calle Clara

4 La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

5 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

7 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

8 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO**

9
10 WILLIE MARQUEZ and AHDY MIKHAEL,
on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all
11 persons similarly situated,

12
13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 ACCURATE DELIVERY SYSTEMS, INC.,
a California Corporation; and DOES 1
16 through 50, inclusive,

17
18 Defendants.

Case No. _____

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
2. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
3. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, *et seq.*;
4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
8. FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Willie Marquez and Ahdy Mikhael (“PLAINTIFFS”) individuals, on behalf of
2 themselves and all other similarly situated current and former employees allege on information
3 and belief, except for their own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge,
4 the following:

5
6 **THE PARTIES**

7 1. Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. (“DEFENDANT”) is a California
8 corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct
9 substantial business in the state of California.

10 2. DEFENDANT is the premier Hotshot delivery service of all goods, perishable and
11 in demand.

12 3. Plaintiff Marquez was employed by DEFENDANT from April of 2018 to
13 September of 2020 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee,
14 paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment
15 of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

16 4. Plaintiff Mikhael was employed by DEFENDANT from November of 2019 to
17 March of 2020 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee,
18 paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment
19 of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

20 5. PLAINTIFFS bring this Class Action on behalf of themselves and a California
21 class, defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT as
22 Delivery Drivers and other similar job titles. PLAINTIFFS also bring this class action on behalf
23 of all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and
24 classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the
25 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as
26 determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy
27 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
28 (\$5,000,000.00).

1 6. PLAINTIFFS bring this Class Action on behalf of themselves and a
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses
3 incurred during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT's policy and
4 practice which failed to lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT's policy and
5 practice alleged herein is an unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice whereby
6 DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain wages due PLAINTIFFS and the other members
7 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
8 CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the
9 named PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been
10 economically injured by DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other
11 appropriate legal and equitable relief.

12 7. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
13 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently
14 unknown to PLAINTIFFS who therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names
15 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend this Complaint
16 to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are
17 ascertained. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe, and based upon that information and
18 belief allege, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,
19 inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that
20 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

21 8. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting
22 on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the
23 agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct
24 alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein.
25 Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and
26 all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the
28 Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

THE CONDUCT

9. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT is required to pay PLAINTIFFS and 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. DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work from time to time while they were clocked out for what was supposed to be their off duty meal break. DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work off the clock without paying them for all the time they performed duties while on their meal break, specifically by failing to provide enough labor hours to accomplish all the job tasks that DEFENDANT expected PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to complete on a daily and/or weekly basis. Further, PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS from time to time were not paid wages for all time worked, including overtime wages, such that in the aggregate employees were underpaid wages as a result of DEFENDANT's pattern and practice of unevenly rounding time worked by its employees. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time only paid a piece rate for deliveries made during specific pay periods. In these pay periods DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their non-driving work tasks that included but were not limited to, completing mandatory paperwork, loading and unloading the truck with goods, waiting for goods to be ready for transport, cleaning the trucks and other non-driving related work tasks. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by from time to time working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

10. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also from time to time unable to take off duty meal

1 breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for meal periods. PLAINTIFFS and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time required to perform work as ordered
3 by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal
4 break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS
5 Members with a second off-duty meal period from time to time in which these employees were
6 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. PLAINTIFFS and
7 the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional
8 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice. Industrial
9 Welfare Commission Wage Order 4-2001 provides: "Every employer shall pay to each
10 employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable
11 minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is
12 measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise." "Hours worked" is defined in the Wage
13 Order as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and
14 includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to
15 do so." Here, PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to separate
16 hourly compensation for time spent performing other non-driving tasks directed by
17 DEFENDANT during their work shifts.

18 11. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four
20 (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were
21 denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two
22 (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes
23 for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first,
24 second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours
25 or more from time to time. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also
26 not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules,
27 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time denied their
28 proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. In addition, because of

1 DEFENDANT's commission/piece rate pay plan described herein, DEFENDANT failed to
2 compensate PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as
3 required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code, and more specifically Cal. Lab. Code
4 Section 226.2. DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which paid for off-duty rest
5 periods to PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
6 DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with
7 all the legally required paid rest periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

8 12. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half
9 times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
10 were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
11 employee's performance.

12 13. The second component of PLAINTIFFS's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members' compensation was DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
14 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
15 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
16 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
17 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate
18 of pay in order to pay overtime to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members,
19 DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the employees' "regular
20 rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay. Management and supervisors described
21 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As
22 a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has
24 resulted in an underpayment of overtime compensation to PLAINTIFFS and other
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

26 14. DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show,
28 among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that

1 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage
2 statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly
3 rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each
4 hourly rate. Specifically, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2) by failing
5 to list the total hours worked. Aside, from the violations listed above, DEFENDANT failed to
6 issue to PLAINTIFFS an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under
7 California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided
8 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements
9 which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

10 15. Cal. Lab. Code § 204 provides that “[a]ll wages. . . earned by any person in any
11 employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in
12 advance by the employer as the regular paydays.” Further, Cal. Lab. Code § 204(a) expressly
13 requires employers to pay employees all wages owed within eleven (11) days of the close of the
14 payroll period. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and other
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members all wages owed to them within eleven (11) days of the close
16 of the payroll period.

17 16. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, “It shall be unlawful for any employer
18 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to
19 said employee.” DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFFS and other
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, made unlawful deductions from compensation
21 payable to PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, failed to disclose
22 all aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA
23 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at
24 each applicable pay period and upon termination. PLAINTIFFS and members of the
25 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS seek recovery of all illegal deductions from wages
26 according to proof, related penalties, interest, attorney fees and costs.

27 17. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFFS and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay.

1 Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other non-exempt employees earn non-discretionary
2 remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick
3 pay to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at their base rates of pay.

4 18. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
5 PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses
6 incurred by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence of
7 discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section
8 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course
9 and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall
10 indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee
11 in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the
12 directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying
13 the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

14 19. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal
16 cellular phones and personal vehicles as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as
17 employees for DEFENDANT but were not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the
18 cost associated with the use of their personal cellular phones and personal vehicles for
19 DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 Members were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones to respond to
21 managers while off the clock (which also results in minimum wage and overtime violations).
22 As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFFS and other
23 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which
24 included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all
25 on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

26 20. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
27 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as
28 a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to

1 compensate PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed
2 meal and rest periods. This policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully
3 avoid the payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows
4 DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied
5 with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
7 accordingly.

8 21. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFFS and all CALIFORNIA
9 CLASS Members, DEFENDANT committed acts of unfair competition in violation of the
10 California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”), by
11 engaging in a company-wide policy and procedure which fails to accurately calculate and record
12 all missed meal and rest periods and failed to pay all minimum and overtime wages due to
13 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. The proper recording of these
14 employees’ missed meal and rest breaks is the DEFENDANT’s burden. As a result of
15 DEFENDANT’s intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT fails
16 to properly calculate and/or pay all required compensation for work performed by the members
17 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and violated the California Labor Code and regulations
18 promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

19 22. Specifically as to PLAINTIFFS, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
20 required off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS as required by the applicable Wage
21 Order and Labor Code and failed to pay PLAINTIFFS all minimum and overtime wages due
22 to PLAINTIFFS. DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which provided timely off-
23 duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS and also failed to compensate PLAINTIFFS for
24 PLAINTIFFS’s missed meal and rest breaks. The nature of the work performed by the
25 PLAINTIFFS did not prevent PLAINTIFFS from being relieved of all of PLAINTIFFS’ duties
26 for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result, DEFENDANT’s failure to provide
27 PLAINTIFFS with the legally required meal periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business
28 records. DEFENDANT also required PLAINTIFFS to work off the clock without paying

1 PLAINTIFFS for all the time PLAINTIFFS were working for DEFENDANT, specifically by
2 failing to provide enough labor hours to accomplish all the job tasks that DEFENDANT
3 expected PLAINTIFFS to complete on a daily and/or weekly basis. The amount in controversy
4 for PLAINTIFFS individually do not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000. To date,
5 DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFFS for all PLAINTIFFS' wages still owed to
6 PLAINTIFFS or any penalties owed to PLAINTIFFS under California Labor Code § 203.

7 8 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

19 20 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

21 25. PLAINTIFFS bring the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
22 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as a Class
23 Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as
24 all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT as Delivery Drivers and
25 other similar job titles. PLAINTIFFS also bring this class action on behalf of all individuals
26 who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified as non-
27 exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four
28 (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court

1 (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim
2 of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

3 26. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
5 accordingly.

6 27. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
7 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
8 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
9 wilfully, engages in a practice whereby DEFENDANT fails to record all meal and rest breaks
10 missed by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though
11 DEFENDANT enjoys the benefit of this work, requires employees to perform this work and
12 permits or suffers to permit this work.

13 28. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately for all meal and rest breaks missed as
15 required by California laws. The DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of policy and procedure
16 failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in
17 place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid
18 as required by law. This common business practice is applicable to each and every
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair,
20 and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as
21 causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this claim.

22 29. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS Members is impracticable.

24 30. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California
25 law by:

- 26 (a) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of, Cal. Bus. & Prof.
27 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL"), by unlawfully, unfairly and/or
28 deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures

1 that failed to record and pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked minimum wages owed and
3 overtime wages owed for work performed by these employees;

4 (b) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by
5 failing to provide the PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods;
7 and,

8 (c) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California
9 Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*, by
10 violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and
11 the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in
12 the discharge of their job duties.

13 31. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
14 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

15 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous
16 that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of
17 their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;

18 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues
19 that are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA
20 CLASS will apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

21 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS are typical of the claims of
22 each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFFS, like all the
23 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, is classified as a non-
24 exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who has been subjected to the
25 DEFENDANT's deceptive practice and policy which failed to provide the
26 legally required meal and rest periods to the CALIFORNIA CLASS and
27 thereby underpaid compensation to PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA
28 CLASS. PLAINTIFFS sustained economic injury as a result of

1 DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFFS and the members
2 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or identically harmed
3 by the same unlawful, deceptive and unfair misconduct engaged in by
4 DEFENDANT; and,

- 5 (d) The representative PLAINTIFFS will fairly and adequately represent and
6 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained
7 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation.
8 There are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative
9 PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would
10 make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA
11 CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA CLASS
12 Members.

13 32. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
14 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 15 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
16 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of
17 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
18 create the risk of:

- 19 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish
21 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
23 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be
25 dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the
26 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
27 protect their interests.

- 28 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused to

1 act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, making
2 appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
3 as a whole in that DEFENDANT failed to pay all wages due to members
4 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;

5 1) With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf
6 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to
7 restitution because through this claim PLAINTIFFS seeks
8 declaratory relief holding that the DEFENDANT's policy and
9 practices constitute unfair competition, along with declaratory
10 relief, injunctive relief, and incidental equitable relief as may be
11 necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct declared to constitute
12 unfair competition;

13 (c) Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of
15 California law as listed above, and predominate over any question
16 affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class
17 Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
18 adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

19 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
20 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate
21 actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will be
22 avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic losses
23 sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when
24 compared to the substantial expense and burden of individual
25 prosecution of this litigation;

26 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
27 litigation that would create the risk of:

28 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to

individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,

B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests;

3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through a representative; and,

4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

33. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

(a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members because the DEFENDANT's employment practices are applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

(b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial

1 number of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid
2 asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse
3 impact on their employment;

4 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is
5 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the
6 Court;

7 (d) PLAINTIFFS, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be
8 able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is
9 maintained as a Class Action;

10 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
11 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and
12 other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the
13 damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon
14 the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

15 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
16 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of
17 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;

18 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable
19 to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief
20 appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;

21 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from
22 the business records of DEFENDANT; and,

23 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring
24 a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour
25 related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

27 34. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
28 by job title each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally subjected to

1 DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFFS
2 will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles of similarly situated
3 employees when they have been identified.

4
5 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

6 35. PLAINTIFFS further bring the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and
7 Eighth Causes of Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of the
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT as Delivery
9 Drivers and other similar job titles. PLAINTIFFS also bring this class action on behalf of all
10 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified
11 as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any time during the
12 period three (3) years prior to the filing of the complaint and ending on the date as determined
13 by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of
14 Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR
15 SUB-CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

16 36. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
17 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
18 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
19 wilfully, engages in a practice whereby DEFENDANT fails to correctly calculate compensation
20 for the time worked by PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
21 SUB-CLASS and reporting time wages owed to these employees, even though DEFENDANT
22 enjoys the benefit of this work, requires employees to perform this work and permits or suffers
23 to permit this work. DEFENDANT has denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
24 Members wages to which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly cheat the competition
25 and unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR
27 SUB-CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

28 37. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify

1 by name and job title, each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally
2 subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged.
3 PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend the complaint to include any additional job titles of
4 similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

5 38. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

7 39. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
8 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

- 9 (a) Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
10 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
11 CLASS for missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California
12 Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable California Wage
13 Order;
14 (b) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide the PLAINTIFFS and the other
15 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate
16 itemized wage statements;
17 (c) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the
18 above-listed conduct;
19 (d) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,
21 (e) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

22 40. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
23 under California law by:

- 24 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*, by failing to correctly pay the
25 PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS all wages due for overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is
27 liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194;
28 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to

1 accurately pay PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wage pay for which
3 DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;

4 (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFFS and
5 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an
6 accurate itemized statement in writing showing the corresponding correct
7 amount of wages earned by the employee; and,

8 (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide
9 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
10 SUB-CLASS with all legally required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty (30)
11 minute meal breaks and the legally required off-duty rest breaks;

12 (e) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFFS
13 and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members with necessary
14 expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties.

15 41. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
16 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

17 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are
18 so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
19 Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class
20 will benefit the parties and the Court;

21 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues
22 that are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA
23 LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply to every member of the
24 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;

25 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS are typical of the claims of
26 each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
27 PLAINTIFFS, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
28 SUB-CLASS, is a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who has

1 been subjected to the DEFENDANT's practice and policy which fails to
2 pay the correct amount of wages due to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
3 CLASS. PLAINTIFFS sustained economic injury as a result of
4 DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFFS and the members
5 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or
6 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive and unfair misconduct
7 engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,

- 8 (d) The representative PLAINTIFFS will fairly and adequately represent and
9 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has
10 retained counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action
11 litigation. There are no material conflicts between the claims of the
12 representative PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA
13 LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate.
14 Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will vigorously
15 assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members.

16 42. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
17 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 18 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
19 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of
20 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
21 SUB-CLASS will create the risk of:

- 22 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
23 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which
24 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties
25 opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,
26 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical
28 matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to

1 the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
2 protect their interests.

3 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted
4 or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA
5 LABOR SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect
6 to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that
7 DEFENDANT fails to pay all wages due. Including the correct wages for
8 all time worked by the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
9 CLASS as required by law;

10 (c) Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and
12 violations of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any
13 question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available methods for
15 the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including
16 consideration of:

17 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
18 CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of
19 separate actions in that the substantial expense of individual
20 actions will be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of
21 economic losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA
22 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared to the substantial
23 expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

24 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
25 litigation that would create the risk of:

26 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
27 individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
28 CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of

conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,

B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests;

3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through a representative; and,

4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

43. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

(a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;

(b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of

1 retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;

2 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
3 numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA
4 LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;

5 (d) PLAINTIFFS, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
6 Members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress
7 unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;

8 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
9 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and
10 other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the
11 damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon
12 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;

13 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
14 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of
15 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;

16 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable
17 to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-
18 wide relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
19 CLASS as a whole;

20 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
21 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS Members who worked for DEFENDANT in California at any
24 time during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and,

25 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring
26 a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour
27 related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the
28 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

3 **[Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*]**

4 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

8 45. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. and Prof.
9 Code § 17021.

10 46. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) defines
11 unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section
12 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair
13 competition as follows:

14 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair
15 competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court
16 may make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as
17 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.

18 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

19 47. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
20 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
21 applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California
22 Labor Code including Sections 204, 210, 221, 226.7, 246, 248.5, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
23 1198, 2802 and the Fair Labor Standards Act and federal regulations promulgated thereunder,
24 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus.
25 & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute
26 unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

27 48. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices are unlawful and unfair
28 in that these practices violate public policy, are immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous

1 or substantially injurious to employees, and are without valid justification or utility for which
2 this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the
3 California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

4 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices are deceptive and
5 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's policy and practice fails to provide the legally mandated
6 meal and rest periods, and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest
7 periods, reporting time pay, and overtime and minimum wages owed, and Fair Labor Standards
8 Act overtime wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing to include non-discretionary
9 incentive compensation into their regular rate for purposes of computing the proper overtime
10 pay, due to a business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab.
11 Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§
12 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant
13 to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

14 50. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices are also unlawful, unfair
15 and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices cause PLAINTIFFS and the other
16 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
17 DEFENDANT.

18 51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices are also unlawful, unfair
19 and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's policies, practices and procedures fail to provide all
20 legally required meal breaks to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

22 52. Therefore, PLAINTIFFS demand on behalf of themselves and on behalf of each
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty
24 meal period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay
25 for each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten
26 (10) hours of work.

27 53. PLAINTIFFS further demand on behalf of themselves and each member of the
28 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off

1 duty paid rest period was not timely provided as required by law.

2 54. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
3 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFFS and the
4 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and
5 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
6 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
7 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

8 55. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial
9 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California
10 Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy, are immoral, unethical, oppressive
11 and unscrupulous, are deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair and deceptive business
12 practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

13 56. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled
14 to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property
15 which DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and
17 unfair business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

18 57. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
19 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair
20 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from
21 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

22 58. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
23 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices
24 of DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated.
25 As a result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFFS and
26 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer
27 irreparable legal and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to
28 engage in these unlawful and unfair business practices.

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1]**

4 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

5 **and Against All Defendants)**

6 59. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
8 paragraphs of this Complaint.

9 60. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California
11 Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure
12 to accurately calculate and pay reporting time and minimum wages to PLAINTIFFS and
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

14 61. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and
15 public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

16 62. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
17 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than
18 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

19 63. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages,
20 including reporting time pay and minimum wage compensation and interest thereon, together
21 with the costs of suit.

22 64. DEFENDANT maintains a wage practice of paying PLAINTIFFS and the other
23 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct amount of
24 time they work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's policy and practice is to unlawfully and
25 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

27 65. DEFENDANT's pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without
28 limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of

1 implementing a policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the
2 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.

3 66. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
4 inaccurately calculates the correct time worked and consequently underpays the actual time
5 worked by PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
6 DEFENDANT acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other
7 benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission
8 requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

9 67. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
10 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS do not
11 receive the correct reporting time pay and minimum wage compensation for their time worked
12 for DEFENDANT.

13 68. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and
14 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are paid less for time worked
15 that they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages. DEFENDANT fails to
16 accurately pay the PLAINTIFFS and members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the
17 wages for the time they work in accordance with 1197 & 1197.1, even though the PLAINTIFFS
18 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are regularly required,
19 permitted or suffered to work, and do in fact work, off the clock time as to which
20 DEFENDANT fails to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
21 records and witnessed by employees.

22 69. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
23 compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS for the true time they work, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
25 LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts
26 which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

27 70. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are under compensated for their time

1 worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance,
2 to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and
3 DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members
4 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct reporting time pay and minimum wages
5 for their time worked.

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

14 72. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory
16 costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as
17 provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. DEFENDANT's
18 conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFFS
19 and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover
20 statutory costs.

21
22 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

24 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*]**

25 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
26 **Defendants)**

27 73. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
28 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though full set forth herein, the prior

1 paragraphs of this Complaint.

2 74. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
3 CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California
4 Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure
5 to pay these employees for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight
6 (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any
7 workweek.

8 75. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and
9 public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

10 76. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not be
11 employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and more than forty (40) hours per workweek
12 unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified
13 by law.

14 77. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages,
15 including reporting time pay and minimum wage and overtime compensation and interest
16 thereon, together with the costs of suit. Cal. Lab. Code § 1198 further states that the
17 employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare
18 Commission is unlawful.

19 78. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are required, permitted or suffered by
21 DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and are not paid for all the time they work, including
22 overtime work.

23 79. DEFENDANT's pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without
24 limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of
25 implementing a policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime work by
26 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members and denied accurate
27 compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
28 CLASS for overtime work, including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours

1 in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

2 80. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
3 inaccurately records overtime worked and consequently underpays the overtime worked by
4 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted
5 in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation
6 of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other
7 applicable laws and regulations.

8 82. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required, permitted or suffered by
10 DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked
11 including overtime work.

12 83. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
13 the PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are not
14 receiving full compensation for overtime worked.

15 84. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
16 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the
17 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. Further,
18 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are not
19 subject to a valid collective bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action
20 contained herein this Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFFS brings this Action on behalf of
21 themselves and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS based on DEFENDANT's violations
22 of non-negotiable, non-waiveable rights provided by the State of California.

23 85. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and
24 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are paid less for overtime
25 worked that they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

26 86. DEFENDANT fails to accurately pay the PLAINTIFFS and the other members
27 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which
28 was in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510,

1 1194 & 1198, even though PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
2 SUB-CLASS are required to work, and did in fact work, overtime as to which DEFENDANT
3 fails to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
4 witnessed by employees.

5 87. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
6 compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS for the true amount of time they worked, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic
9 injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained
10 according to proof at trial.

11 88. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and the other
12 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are under compensated for all overtime
13 worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance,
14 to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and
15 DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members
16 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked.

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

25 90. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS therefore request recovery of all overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory
27 costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as
28 provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. DEFENDANT's

1 conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFFS
2 and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover
3 statutory costs.

4
5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **For Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

7 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

8 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

9 91. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
11 paragraphs of this Complaint.

12 92. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT fails to provide all
13 the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR
14 SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature
15 of the work performed by PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS
16 does not prevent these employees from being relieved of all of their duties for the legally
17 required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and
18 other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are from time to time not fully relieved
19 of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT's failure to
20 provide PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally
21 required meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's
22 business records. Further, DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these
24 employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result,
25 PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS therefore forfeit
26 meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict
27 corporate policy and practice.

28 93. DEFENDANT further violates California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable

1 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
2 CLASS Members who are not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable Wage
3 Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each
4 workday that a meal period was not provided.

5 94. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFFS and
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according
7 to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of
8 suit.

9
10 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **For Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods**

12 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

13 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
14 **Defendants)**

15 95. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
16 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
17 paragraphs of this Complaint.

18 96. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are
19 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
20 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for
21 some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least
22 ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first,
23 second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours
24 or more. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are also not
25 provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules,
26 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are periodically denied
27 their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

28 97. DEFENDANT further violates California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable

1 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
2 CLASS Members who are not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage
3 Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each
4 workday that rest period was not provided.

5 98. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFFS and
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according
7 to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of
8 suit.

9
10 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **For Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

12 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]**

13 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
14 **Defendants)**

15 99. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
16 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
17 paragraphs of this Complaint.

18 100. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with
19 an "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

20 (1) gross wages earned,

21 (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation
22 is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under
23 subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
24 Commission,

25 (3) the number of piecerate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
26 is paid on a piece-rate basis,

27 (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
28 may be aggregated and shown as one item,

1 (5) net wages earned,
2 (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
3 (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
4 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an
5 employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on
6 the itemized statement,
7 (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
8 (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
9 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

10 101. DEFENDANT also fails to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed
12 to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226
13 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate
14 itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all
15 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
16 worked at each hourly rate. Aside, from the violations listed above, DEFENDANT failed to
17 issue to PLAINTIFFS an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under
18 California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided
19 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with wage
20 statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

21 102. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally fails to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
22 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs
24 expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of
25 employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These
26 damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars
28 (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars

1 (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in
2 an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand
3 dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFFS and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA
4 LABOR SUB-CLASS herein).

5
6 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **For Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

8 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

9 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
10 **Defendants)**

11 103. PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members
12 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
13 paragraphs of this Complaint.

14 104. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

15 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary
16 expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the
17 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.

18 105. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802,
19 by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
20 CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for
21 DEFENDANT's benefit. DEFENDANT fails to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses which include, but are not
23 limited to, costs related to using their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the
24 benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR
25 SUB-CLASS Members are required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cell phones to
26 respond to work related issues. DEFENDANT's policy, practice and procedure is to not
27 reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for
28

1 expenses resulting from using their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT within the
2 course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses are necessary to
3 complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct
4 to assert any waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses are necessary expenses
5 incurred by PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members,
6 DEFENDANT fails to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA
7 LABOR SUB-CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under
8 the laws and regulations of California.

9 106. PLAINTIFFS therefore demand reimbursement for expenditures or losses
10 incurred by them and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members in the discharge of
11 their job duties for DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT,
12 with interest at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

13 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **For Failure to Pay Wages When Due**

15 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203]**

16 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

17 **and Against All Defendants)**

18 107. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
19 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
20 paragraphs of this Complaint.

21 108. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides, in relevant part, that:

22 As used in this article:

- 23 (a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of
24 every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the
25 standard of time, task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.
26 (b) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or
27 performed under contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other
28 agreement if the labor to be paid for is performed personally by the person
demanding payment.

109. 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

1 payable immediately.”

2 110. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

13 111. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFFS’s or any CALIFORNIA LABOR
14 SUB-CLASS Members’ employment contract.

15 112. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

22 113. The employment of PLAINTIFFS and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
23 CLASS Members has terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages
24 owed as required by law.

25 114. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of themselves and
26 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has
27 terminated and who have not been fully paid their wages due to them, PLAINTIFFS
28 demands thirty days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for
all employees who terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
PERIOD and demands an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and
statutory costs as allowed by law.

29 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 1 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:
- 2 A) That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
- 3 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 4 B) An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
- 5 DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
- 6 C) An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully
- 7 withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
- 8 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and,
- 9 D) Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund
- 10 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to
- 11 PLAINTIFFS and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.
- 12 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:
- 13 A) That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth
- 14 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a class
- 15 action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 16 B) Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
- 17 damages for minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFFS and the
- 18 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the
- 19 applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon
- 20 at the statutory rate;
- 21 C) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to California Labor Code Section
- 22 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 23 D) Liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194.2 and 1197.1;
- 24 E) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period
- 25 in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of
- 26 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay
- 27 period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and
- 28 an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;

1 F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFFS and each member of the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties,
3 plus interest, and costs of suit; and,

4 G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR
5 SUB-CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or
6 until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

7 3. On all claims:

8 A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;

9 B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,

10 C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the
11 law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §226, §1194 and/or
12 §2802.

13
14 Dated: May 19, 2021 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
15

16
17 By: _____
18 Norman B. Blumenthal
19 Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFFS demand a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

Dated: May 19, 2021 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: _____
Norman B. Blumenthal
Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B

August 18, 2021

VIA LWDA WEBSITE

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Suite 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL – RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc.
c/o Mahmoud Maraach, Registered Agent for Service of Process:
173 W Resource Drive
Bloomington, CA 92316

Re: *Julio Garcia v. Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that this law firm represents Julio Garcia in claims arising from his employment with Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc., a California corporation (“Defendant”). Mr. Garcia is an “aggrieved employee” as defined by Labor Code sections 2699, *et seq.* due to Defendant’s numerous violations of the Labor Code as set forth below. The purpose of this letter is to comply with Labor Code section 2699.3, which requires aggrieved employees to notify their employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) of the specific provisions of the Labor Code allegedly violated. For purposes of this letter, if the LWDA decides not to investigate, Mr. Garcia intends to pursue a lawsuit on behalf of other “Aggrieved Employees”, which should be considered to include all current and former employees who worked as delivery drivers (and other similar job positions/titles) in California who worked, at least in part, during the one year immediately preceding the date of this letter through the date of trial, the date judgment is entered, the date of settlement and/or other date approved by the Court.

Mr. Garcia was employed by Defendant as a delivery driver from on or about 2018 through approximately September 23, 2020, at which time Mr. Garcia’s employment with Defendant was separated. During his employment, Mr. Garcia worked out of Defendant’s facility in Bloomington, California. Mr. Garcia’s primary job responsibilities, included without limitation, loading and unloading his transportation vehicle and making deliveries to Defendant’s customers throughout California, including to San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Bakersfield.

During his employment with Defendant, Mr. Garcia generally would be scheduled to work from approximately 8:00 a.m. until approximately 4:00 p.m., five days per week. Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not required to keep track of their work

time, and Defendant did not otherwise track the time worked by Mr. Garcia or other Aggrieved Employees.

During his employment, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were compensated through a commission structure that paid them a certain percentage for each delivery. Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not otherwise compensated by Defendant, and were not paid based on their time worked, including not being paid an hourly rate. Indeed, Defendant did not track the time worked by Mr. Garcia or other Aggrieved Employees and did not require Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees to keep track of their time worked.

Defendant required Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees to complete a number of tasks unrelated to their deliveries. Such tasks included, without limitation, waiting around for customers, fueling his delivery van, washing his delivery van, completing paperwork, conducting a pre- and post-shift inspection on their van at the beginning and end of their shift, and loading and unloading the delivery vehicle. Due to the fact that Defendant compensated Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees solely by commissions per delivery, all of these tasks unrelated to their deliveries were non-productive and Defendant did not compensate them for the time completing these tasks. As a result, Defendant failed to pay Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees all required minimum and overtime wages.

Throughout his employment, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided all required meal periods due to Defendant's meal period policies and practices which fail to provide uninterrupted, duty-free 30-minute meal periods when employees work in excess of 5.0 hours in a day. Specifically, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were often unable to take a legally compliant meal period because of the heavy work demands imposed by Defendant which prevented them from taking legally compliant meal periods. Further, Defendant did not track any meal periods for Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees and did not require any tracking of meal periods purportedly taken.

Although Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all legally-compliant meal periods to which they were entitled, Defendant failed to compensate Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees with the required meal period premium for each workday in which they experienced a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Further, upon information and belief during at least a portion of the relevant time period, Defendant maintained no payroll code or other mechanism for the payment of meal period premium payments under Labor Code § 226.7 in the event that a legally compliant meal period was not provided to Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees.

In addition, throughout Mr. Garcia's employment with Defendant, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not authorized and permitted to take legally required rest periods due to Defendant's unlawful rest period policies and practices. Defendant's rest period policies and practices fail to authorize and permit paid rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof. Specifically, as a result of the work demands

imposed by Defendant, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were often not authorized and permitted to take their rest periods. Additionally, while working on a commission-only basis, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees worked shifts in excess of 3.5 hours, but were never authorized and permitted to take a paid rest period for every 4-hour period worked, or major fraction thereof, because Defendant's commission compensation plan failed to separately compensate Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees for required rest periods. See *Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture LLC*, 9 Cal.App.5th 98 (2017). As a result, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not authorized and permitted to take compensated rest periods as required by Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 9 § 12(A). Further, upon information and belief during at least a portion of the relevant time period, Defendant maintained no payroll code or other mechanism for the payment of rest period premium payments under Labor Code § 226.7 in the event that a legally compliant rest period was not authorized and permitted to their delivery drivers.

Throughout Mr. Garcia's employment with Defendant, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were required to use their personal cellular phone to discharge their duties. Specifically, Defendant would regularly contact Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees through their personal cellular phone for a variety of required work activities, including, but not limited to, checking the status of their assigned tasks. Defendant knew or should have known that Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were necessarily incurring expenses due to the use of their personal cellular phone in the direct discharge of their duties. Yet, despite the necessity of Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees using their cellular phone for work activities and Defendant knowing or should have knowing about same, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were never reimbursed for a reasonable portion of their cellular phone expenses by Defendant, as mandated by *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137.

As a result of Defendant's failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendant failed to pay all wages owed to Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees upon their separation of employment from Defendant.

As a result of Defendant's failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendant failed to provide Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements. In addition, Defendant failed to include the total hours worked during the pay period on Mr. Garcia's and other Aggrieved Employees' wage statements, in further violation of Labor Code section 226.

As described above, Defendant committed the following violations of the Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 9 ("Wage Order 9"):

Overtime Violations

Defendant was required to pay Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees overtime wages for all hours worked in excess of eight hours per workday and/or forty hours per workweek. See Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1198; the Wage Order 9, § 3.

According to Labor Code § 510(a), “Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.” This Section further provides, “Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated equal to one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for all overtime hours worked. As explained above, Defendant had a policy/practice of not keeping track of and compensating Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees for all of their time worked, including without limitation, compensable “non-productive” time. Further, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees routinely worked in excess of eight hours per workday and/or more than forty hours per workweek, but did not receive overtime compensation equal to one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for working overtime hours. As a result of these policies/practices, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for all overtime wages on occasions when they worked over eight hours in a workday and/or 40 hours in a workweek.

Minimum Wage Violations

Defendant was required to pay Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees an hourly rate at least equal to the minimum wage for each hour actually worked. *See* Labor Code §§ 1194; 1194.2, 1197; The Wage Order 9, § 4. Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid for all hours worked due to Defendant’s timekeeping and compensation practices. As alleged above, Defendant caused Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees to work hours in a workweek but did not properly compensate Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees at least minimum wages for all such hours, due to Defendant’s unlawful timekeeping practices and/or commission-based compensation plans. This practice by Defendant resulted in Defendant not paying Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages owed for the work they performed, including failing to pay all required minimum wages.

Meal Period Violations

As alleged above, Defendant failed to provide Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees with all required and compliant meal periods. *See* Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; Wage Order 9, § 11. Throughout Mr. Garcia’s employment with Defendant, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided all required meal periods due to Defendant’s meal period policies/practices which fail to provide uninterrupted, duty-free and timely 30-minute meal periods when employees work in excess of 5.0 hours in a day. Specifically, due to the job duties imposed on Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees, they were often prevented from taking meal periods that commenced before the end of the 5th hour of work and/or which were at least 30 minutes in length. As a result, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees are owed an additional hour of wages at their regular rate of compensation for each workday they experienced a meal period violation. *See* Labor Code § 226.7 (“If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery

period in accordance with ... [an] order of the Industrial Welfare Commission ... the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided."). Although Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all legally-compliant meal periods to which they were entitled, Defendant failed to compensate Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees with the required meal period premium for each workday in which they experienced a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.

Rest Period Violations

Defendant also failed to authorize and permit Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees to take all required rest periods. *See* Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516; Wage Order 9, § 12. Due to work demands, Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees were not authorized and permitted to take rest periods regardless of whether they were actually paid. Defendant's commission-based compensation plan failed to separately compensate Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees for required rest periods. As a result, Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees are owed an additional hour of wages at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that they were not authorized and permitted to take all legally required rest periods. *See* Labor Code § 226.7 ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest period is not provided.")

Wage Statement Violations

Defendant knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform practice and policy, failed to furnish Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements that included, among other requirements, all minimum and overtime wages earned, and total meal and rest period premium wages, in violation of Labor Code § 226 *et seq.* Defendant's failure to furnish Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led to, among other things, the non-payment of all minimum and overtime wages earned, and meal and rest period premium wages, and deprived them of the information necessary to identify discrepancies in Defendant's reported data.

Waiting Time Penalties

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require that employees receive all of their final wages at the time of their separation of employment. Defendant failed to timely pay Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees all of their final wages at the time of separation, which included, among other things, underpaid minimum and overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages. Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendant's failure to pay all final wages due to Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees was willful and, consequently, entitles Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees to wages 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.

Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses

Defendant failed to reimburse Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees for necessary work expenses, including, but not limited to, expenses related to use of their personal cellular phone to discharge their duties. Defendant's policy of not providing reimbursement for necessary work-related expenses is in violation of Wage Order 9 § 9, and Labor Code § 2802 ("An employer shall indemnify his or her employees 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.") Mr. Garcia and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to reimbursement of such unpaid work expenses with interest.

As an "aggrieved employee," Mr. Garcia will initiate a civil action on behalf of himself and other Aggrieved Employees to recover damages, statutory penalties, and civil penalties resulting from the wage and hour violations alleged herein. Based on Mr. Garcia's own investigation, and on information and belief, Defendant committed the following Labor Code violations:


- a) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198 by failing to pay Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees all overtime compensation earned;
- b) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, and 1197 by failing to pay Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees the statutory minimum wage for all hours worked;
- c) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558 by failing to provide all legally required meal periods and failing to pay meal period premiums to Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees;
- d) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558 by failing to provide all legally required rest periods and failing to pay rest period premiums to Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees;
- e) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203 by failing to timely pay all final wages due to Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees;
- f) Defendant violated Labor Code § 226 by failing to furnish Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate and compliant itemized wage statements;

- g) Defendant violated Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month;
- h) Defendant violated Labor Code § 1174 by failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees; and
- i) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 2802 by failing to reimburse Mr. Garcia and other Aggrieved Employees for all necessary expenditures incurred.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(2)(A), please notify us and Defendant if the LWDA intends to investigate these alleged violations of the Labor Code. Please contact me should you require additional information.

Very truly yours,

LIDMAN LAW, APC



Scott M. Lidman

EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT C

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

WILLIE MARQUEZ and AHDY MIKHAEL, on
behalf of themselves and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ACCURATE DELIVERY SYSTEMS, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB2125337

**NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF CLASS
ACTION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT**

To: All current and former Delivery Drivers of Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. who worked at any time in California during the time period between August 18, 2017 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023. Collectively, these employees will be referred to as “Settlement Class Members.”

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

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. In exchange for the settlement payment, you will release claims against the Defendant as detailed below. Your estimated Settlement Award is explained in the accompanying Notice of Settlement Award. 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, you must notify the Settlement Administrator as explained below.
Exclude Yourself	To exclude yourself, you must send a written request for exclusion to the Settlement Administrator as provided below. If you request exclusion, you will receive no money from the Settlement. However, if you are an PAGA Employee who requests exclusion, you will still receive a small amount as your share of the PAGA civil penalties described below. Instructions are set forth below.
Object	Write to the Court about why you do not agree with the Settlement, and/or appear at the Final Approval Hearing to make an oral objection. Directions are provided below.

Why should you read this notice?

The Court has granted preliminary approval of a proposed class action settlement (the “Settlement”) entitled *Willie*

Marquez and Ahdy Mikhael, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

v. Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc., San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2125337 (the “Lawsuit”). Because your rights may be affected by the Settlement, it is important that you read this notice carefully.

You may be entitled to money from this Settlement. Defendant Accurate Delivery System, Inc.’s (“Defendant”) records show that you were employed by Defendant as a Delivery Driver in California at some time between August 18, 2017 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023 (the “Class Period”). The Court ordered that this Notice be sent to you because you may be entitled to money under the Settlement and because the Settlement affects your legal rights.

The purpose of this Notice is to provide you with a brief description of the Lawsuit, to inform you of the terms of the Settlement, to describe your rights in connection with the Settlement, and to explain what steps you may take to participate in, object to, or exclude yourself from the Settlement. If you do not exclude yourself from the Settlement and the Court finally approves the Settlement, you will be bound by the terms of the Settlement and any final judgment.

What is this case about?

Plaintiffs Willie Marquez, Ahdy Mikhael, and Julio Garcia (“Plaintiffs”) brought this Lawsuit against Defendant, seeking to assert claims on behalf of a class of current and former Delivery Drivers who worked for Defendant in California at any time on or after August 18, 2017. Plaintiffs are known as the “Class Representatives,” and their attorneys, who also represent the interests of all Settlement Class members, are known as “Class Counsel.”

The Lawsuit alleges that Defendant failed to provide Settlement Class members all minimum and/or overtime wages, failed to provide all legally required meal periods, failed to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failed to reimburse necessary business expenses. As a result of the foregoing alleged violations, Plaintiffs also allege that Defendant failed to provide accurate, itemized wages statements, failed to pay all wages upon termination, engaged in unfair business practices and is liable for civil penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”).

Defendant denies that it has done anything wrong. Defendant further denies that it owes Settlement Class members any wages, restitution, penalties, or other damages. No Court has made any determination as to the factual allegations in the Lawsuit. Rather, the Settlement constitutes a compromise of disputed claims and should not be construed as an admission of liability on the part of Defendant, and it expressly denies all liability.

The Court has not ruled that Defendant violated any laws or whether Plaintiffs or any other person is entitled to damages or other relief. However, to avoid additional expense, inconvenience, and interference with their business operations, Defendant has concluded that it is in their best interests and the interests of Settlement Class members to settle the Lawsuit on the terms summarized in this Notice. After Defendant provided relevant information to Class Counsel, the Settlement was reached after mediation and arm’s-length negotiations between the Parties.

The Class Representatives and Class Counsel support the Settlement. Among the reasons for support are the defenses to liability potentially available to Defendant, the risk of denial of class certification, the inherent risks of trial on the merits, and the delays and uncertainties associated with litigation.

If you are still employed by Defendant, your decision about whether to participate in the Settlement will not affect your employment. California law and Defendant’s policies strictly prohibit unlawful retaliation. Defendant will not take any adverse employment action against or otherwise target, retaliate, or discriminate against any Settlement Class member because of the Settlement Class member’s decision to either participate or not participate in the Settlement.

Who are the Attorneys?

Attorneys for the Plaintiffs / Settlement Class Members:	Attorneys for Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc.
--	---

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP Norman B. Blumenthal Kyle R. Nordrehaug 2255 Calle Clara La Jolla, CA 92037 Telephone: (858) 551-1223 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232 Email: kyle@bamlawca.com Website: www.bamlawca.com LIDMAN LAW, APC Scott M. Lidman slidman@lidmanlaw.com Elizabeth Nguyen enguyen@lidmanlaw.com Milan Moore mmoore@lidmanlaw.com 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 150 El Segundo, California 90245 Tel: (424) 322-4772 Fax: (424) 322-4775 www.lidmanlaw.com HAINES LAW GROUP, APC Paul K. Haines phaines@haineslawgroup.com 155 Campus Drive, Suite 180 El Segundo, California 90245 Tel: (424) 292-2350 Fax: (424) 292-2355 www.haineslawgroup.com	KORDAB LAW OFFICES Hekmat (Matt) Kordab, Esq. Yadira De La Rosa, Esq. 300 S. Harbor Blvd. Suite 820 Anaheim, California 92805 Telephone: (714) 881-0581 Facsimile: (714) 881-0582 PARK & ZHENG Stella Park, Esq. Yalan Zheng, Esq. 6 Venture, Suite 265 Irvine, CA 92618 Telephone: (949) 679-3372 Facsimile: 949-258-9808
---	--

What are the terms of the Settlement?

On **[INSERT DATE OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL]**, the Court preliminarily certified a class, for settlement purposes only, of all current and former Delivery Drivers of Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. who worked at any time in California during the time period between August 18, 2017 **and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023**. Settlement Class members who do not opt out of the Settlement pursuant to the procedures set forth in this Notice will be bound by the Settlement and will release their claims against Defendant as described below.

Defendant has agreed to pay \$900,000.00 (the “Gross Settlement Amount”) to fully resolve all claims in the Lawsuit, which includes payments to Settlement Class members, attorneys’ fees and expenses, payment to the Labor Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), settlement administration costs, and the Class Representatives’ Service Awards.

The following deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount will be requested by the Parties:

Settlement Administration Costs. The Court has approved Phoenix Settlement Administrators to act as the “Settlement Administrator,” who is sending this Notice to you and will perform many other duties relating to the Settlement. The Court has approved setting aside an amount not to exceed \$5,750.00 from the Gross Settlement Amount to pay the Settlement administration costs.

Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses. Class Counsel have been prosecuting the Lawsuit on behalf of the Settlement Class Members on a contingency fee basis (that is, without being paid any money to date) and have been paying all litigation costs and expenses. The Court will determine the actual amount awarded to Class Counsel as

attorneys' fees, which will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Settlement Class members are not personally responsible for any of Class Counsel's attorneys' fees or expenses. Class Counsel will ask for fees of up to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is estimated to be \$300,000.00, as reasonable compensation for the work Class Counsel performed and will continue to perform in this Lawsuit through Settlement finalization. Class Counsel also will ask for reimbursement in an amount not to exceed \$30,000.00 for verified costs Class Counsel incurred in connection with the Lawsuit.

Service Awards to Class Representatives. Class Counsel will ask the Court to award the Class Representatives a service award in the amount not to exceed \$10,000.00 each or a total of \$30,000.00, to compensate them for their services and extra work provided on behalf of the Settlement Class members.

LWDA Payment. Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve a payment in the total amount of \$30,000.00 as and for alleged civil penalties, payable pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA"). Per Labor Code § 2699(i), seventy-five percent (75%) of such penalties, or Twenty-Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$22,500.00) will be payable to the LWDA, and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%), or Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$7,500.00), will be payable to certain Settlement Class members as the "PAGA Amount," as described below.

Calculation of Individual Settlement Class Members' Settlement Award. After deducting the Court-approved amounts above, the balance of the Gross Settlement Amount will form the Net Settlement Amount ("NSA"), which will be distributed to all Settlement Class members who do not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion (described below). The NSA is estimated at approximately \$<< >>, to be shared among an up to << >> estimated Settlement Class members. The NSA will be divided as follows:

- (i) The Net Settlement Amount shall be allocated to Settlement Class members who worked during the Class Period, as follows: each participating Settlement Class member shall receive a proportionate settlement share based upon the number of workweeks worked as a Delivery Driver during the Class Period, the numerator of which is the Settlement Class member's total workweeks worked as a Delivery Driver during the Class Period, and the denominator of which is the total workweeks worked as Delivery Drivers by all Settlement Class members (who do not opt out) who worked during the Class Period.

PAGA Amount. In addition, Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$7,500.00) of the Gross Settlement Amount has been designated as the "PAGA Amount" as described above. Each PAGA Employee shall receive a portion of the PAGA Amount proportionate to the number of pay periods that he or she worked during this PAGA Period which will be calculated by multiplying the PAGA Amount by a fraction, the numerator of which is the PAGA Employee's number of pay periods worked as a non-exempt employee during this time period, and the denominator of which is the total number of pay periods worked by all PAGA Employees. The payments to PAGA Employees shall be reported as penalties on a Form 1099.

Payments to Settlement Class Members. If the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, Settlement Awards will be mailed to all Settlement Class members who did not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.

If you submit a Request for Exclusion, you will still receive a proportionate share of the PAGA Amount regardless of whether you exclude yourself from the Settlement if you are a PAGA Employee.

Each member of the Settlement Class who receives a Settlement Award must cash the check within 180 days from the date the Settlement Administrator mails it. Any funds payable to Settlement Class Members whose checks were not cashed within 180 days after mailing will be transferred to the California State Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund under the unclaimed property laws in the name of the Settlement Class Member. Funds can be claimed by such individuals by submitting a claim at www.claimit.ca.gov.

Payment by Defendant of Gross Settlement Amount. The Gross Settlement Amount shall be deposited by Defendant into a qualified settlement fund set up by the Settlement Administrator for the benefit of participating Settlement Class members and PAGA Employees. Defendant agrees to deposit the Gross Settlement Amount with the Settlement Administrator in twenty-four (24) equal installments of Thirty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents

(\$37,500.00). The first Settlement Installment shall be paid by no later than June 6, 2023, and will be deposited with the Settlement Administrator in an escrow account set up by it. The second through twenty-fourth Settlement Installment payments shall be due every thirty (30) days thereafter.

Within ten (10) calendar days following Defendant's deposit of the final Settlement Installment of Gross Settlement Amount and all employer-side taxes with the Settlement Administrator, the Settlement Administrator will calculate Settlement Award amounts and provide the same to counsel for the Parties for review and approval. Within seven (7) calendar days of approval by counsel for the Parties, the Settlement Administrator will prepare and mail Settlement Awards to participating Settlement Class members. Settlement Awards are expected to be disbursed in [insert estimated month and year].

Allocation and Taxes. For purposes of calculating applicable taxes and withholdings, each Settlement Award shall be allocated as follows: twenty percent (20%) as wages; and eighty percent (80%) as penalties and interest. The Settlement Administrator will be responsible for issuing to participating Settlement Class members IRS Forms W-2 for amounts deemed "wages" and IRS Forms 1099 for the amounts allocated as penalties and interest. Each Settlement Class member who receives a Settlement Award will be responsible for correctly characterizing the payment for tax purposes and for payment of any taxes owing on said amount. The Settlement Administrator, Defendant and its counsel, and Class Counsel cannot provide tax advice. Accordingly, Settlement Class members should consult with their tax advisors concerning the tax consequences and treatment of payments they receive under the Settlement.

Release. If the Court approves the Settlement, the Settlement Class, and each Settlement Class member who has not submitted a timely and valid Request for Exclusion, will fully and forever completely release and discharge Defendant, its past and present officers, directors, shareholders, managers, employees, agents, principals, heirs, representatives, accountants, auditors, consultants, and its respective successors and predecessors in interest, subsidiaries, affiliates, parents, and attorneys (collectively the "Released Parties"), from all claims, demands, rights, liabilities and causes of action that were pled or could have been pled based upon the facts alleged in the operative First Amended Complaint in the Action, that arose during the Class Period defined above with respect to the following claims: (a) failure to pay all overtime wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, miscalculating the regular rate of pay, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (b) failure to pay all minimum wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (c) failure to provide meal periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant meal periods, and failure to record meal periods; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant rest periods, or the failure to separately pay premiums for rest periods under the commission pay plan; (e) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses; (f) failure to timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment or failure to timely pay wages when due; (g) failure to issue accurate, itemized wage statements; (h) failure to provide paid sick leave or to pay for sick leave; and (i) all claims for unfair business practices that reasonably could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above (collectively, the "Released Class Claims"). The Class Members do not release any claims other than those set forth above, including without limitation claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violations of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period.

The time period of the Released Claims shall be the same time period as the Class Period.

PAGA Release and PAGA Employees. If the Court approves the Settlement, all PAGA Employees, including Plaintiffs (and also including those who opt-out from the Class portion of the Settlement), will release and forever discharge the Released Parties from all claims, demands, rights, liabilities and causes of action for civil penalties under California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 which were pled in the letters to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") dated May 28, 2021 and August 18, 2021 (**Exhibits A-B**) and the operative First Amended Complaint in the Action, or which could have been pled based upon the facts alleged in the operative First Amended Complaint in the Action that arose during the PAGA Period predicated on the following alleged violations: (a) failure to pay all overtime wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, miscalculating the regular rate of pay, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (b) failure to pay all minimum wages owed, including without limitation resulting from unlawful/improper rounding, and failing to pay for non-productive time under the commission pay plan; (c) failure to provide meal periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant meal periods, and failure to record meal periods; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest

periods, pay premium wages for non-compliant rest periods, or the failure to separately pay premiums for rest periods under the commission pay plan; (e) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses; (f) failure to timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment or failure to timely pay wages when due ; (g) failure to issue accurate, itemized wage statements; and (h) failure to provide paid sick leave or to pay for sick leave (collectively, “PAGA Released Claims”).

The time period of the PAGA Released Claim is August 18, 2020 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023 (“PAGA Period”).

The Parties acknowledge that under the release, the right of the LWDA to investigate the PAGA Released claim is not released, but the PAGA Released Claim does include any claims for penalties by a PAGA Employee as a result of any such LWDA investigation, and PAGA Employees are barred from their right to act as a private attorney general as to the PAGA Released Claims.

You cannot submit a Request for Exclusion from the PAGA Release.

The releases are null and void if Defendant fail to fully fund the Settlement. The releases identified herein shall become effective on the date on which Defendant fully funds the Settlement (“Effective Date of the Release”). Upon the Effective Date of the Release, all Class Members shall be deemed to have, and by operation of Judgment shall have, released, waived and relinquished the Released Claims.

Conditions of Settlement. The Settlement is conditioned upon the Court entering an order at or following the Final Approval Hearing finally approving the Settlement as fair, reasonable, adequate and in the best interests of the Settlement Class, and the entry of Judgment.

How can I claim money from the Settlement?

Do Nothing. If you do nothing, you will be entitled to your share of the Settlement based on the proportionate number of workweeks you worked during the Class Period (as explained above), and as stated in the accompanying Notice of Settlement Award. You also will be bound by the Settlement, including the release of claims stated above.

If your address is incorrect or has changed, you must notify the Settlement Administrator. It is your responsibility to ensure that the Settlement Administrator has your current address on file, or you may not receive important information or a settlement payment. The Settlement Administrator is: _____ (800) _____.

What other options do I have?

Dispute Information in Notice of Settlement Award. Your award is based on the proportionate number of pay periods you worked during the Class Period, and whether you have worked between August 18, 2017 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023. The information contained in Defendant’s records regarding all of these factors, along with your estimated Settlement Award, is listed on the accompanying Notice of Settlement Award. If you disagree with the information in your Notice of Settlement Award, you may submit a dispute, along with any supporting documentation, in accordance with the procedures stated in the Notice of Settlement Award. Any disputes, along with supporting documentation, must be postmarked no later than <<RESPONSE DEADLINE>>. Send disputes directly to the Settlement Administrator at <<INSERT ADMINISTRATOR CONTACT INFO>>.

DO NOT SEND ORIGINALS; DOCUMENTATION SENT TO THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR WILL NOT BE RETURNED OR PRESERVED.

The Parties and the Settlement Administrator will evaluate the evidence submitted and discuss in good faith how to resolve any disputes submitted by Settlement Class members. The Settlement Administrator’s decision regarding any dispute will be final.

Exclude Yourself from the Settlement. If you **do not** wish to take part in the Settlement, you may exclude yourself by sending to the Settlement Administrator a written “Request for Exclusion from the Class Action Settlement” letter or

card postmarked no later than <<RESPONSE DEADLINE>>, with your name, address, telephone number, last four digits of your social security number, your signature, and a statement indicating that you would like to be excluded from the Class Action Settlement. The Request for Exclusion should state:

“I WISH TO BE EXCLUDED FROM THE SETTLEMENT CLASS IN THE MARQUEZ V. ACCURATE DELIVERY LAWSUIT. I UNDERSTAND THAT IF I ASK TO BE EXCLUDED FROM THE SETTLEMENT CLASS, I WILL NOT RECEIVE ANY MONEY FROM THE SETTLEMENT OF THIS LAWSUIT.”

Send the Request for Exclusion directly to the Settlement Administrator at <<INSERT ADMINISTRATOR CONTACT INFO>>. Any person who files a timely Request for Exclusion from the Settlement shall, upon receipt by the Settlement Administrator, no longer be a Settlement Class member, shall be barred from participating in any portion of the Settlement, and shall receive no benefits from the Settlement.

If you submit a Request for Exclusion, you will only be excluded from the Released Claims. You cannot submit a Request for Exclusion from the PAGA Release. You will receive a proportionate share of the PAGA Payment regardless of whether you exclude yourself from the Settlement if you were employed between August 18, 2020 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023.

Do not submit both a Dispute and a Request for Exclusion. If you do, the Request for Exclusion will be invalid, you will be included in the Settlement Class, and you will be bound by the terms of the Settlement.

Objecting to the Settlement. You also have the right to object to the terms of the Settlement. However, if the Court rejects your objection, you will still be bound by the terms of the Settlement. If you wish to object to the Settlement, or any portion of it, you may mail a written objection to the Settlement Administrator. Your written objection must include your name, address, as well as contact information for any attorney representing you regarding your objection, the case name and number, each specific reason in support of your objection, and any legal or factual support for each objection together with any evidence in support of your objection. Written objections must be postmarked on or before <<RESPONSE DEADLINE>>. Send written objections directly to the Settlement Administrator at <<INSERT ADMINISTRATOR CONTACT INFO>>.

If you choose to object to the Settlement, you may also appear at the Final Approval Hearing scheduled for <<FINAL APPROVAL HEARING DATE/TIME>> in Department S-26 of the San Bernardino County Superior Court, located at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, California 92415. You have the right to appear either remotely, in person or through your own attorney at this hearing. Any attorney who intends to represent an individual objecting to the Settlement must file a notice of appearance with the Court and serve counsel for all parties on or before <<RESPONSE DEADLINE>>. All objections or other correspondence must state the name and number of the case (*Willie Marquez and Ahdy Mikhael v. Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc.* San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2125337).

If you object to the Settlement, you will remain a member of the Settlement Class, and if the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by the terms of the Settlement in the same way as Settlement Class members who do not object.

What is the next step?

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on the adequacy, reasonableness, and fairness of the Settlement on <<FINAL APPROVAL HEARING DATE/TIME>>, in Department S-26 of the San Bernardino County Superior Court, located at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, California 92415. The Court also will be asked to rule on Class Counsel’s request for attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of documented costs and expenses and the Service Award to the Class Representative. The Final Approval Hearing may be postponed without further notice to Settlement Class members. **You are not required to attend the Final Approval Hearing, although any Settlement Class member is welcome to attend the hearing.**

Any changes to date, time, or location of the Final Approval Hearing will be posted on the Settlement Administrator’s website (<http://.com>). The Court’s final judgment will also be posted on the Settlement Administrator’s website.

How can I get additional information?

This Notice is only a summary of the Lawsuit and the Settlement. For more information, you may inspect the Court's files and the Settlement Agreement at the Office of the Clerk of the San Bernardino County Superior Court, located at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, California 92415. You may get more details by examining the Court's file on the Court Access website for the California Superior Court for the County of San Bernardino (<https://cap.sb-court.org/login>) and entering the Case No. CIVSB2125337. You may also contact Class Counsel using the contact information listed above for more information.

**PLEASE DO NOT CALL OR WRITE THE COURT, DEFENDANT OR ITS ATTORNEYS FOR INFORMATION
ABOUT THIS SETTLEMENT OR THE SETTLEMENT PROCESS**

REMINDER AS TO TIME LIMITS

The deadline for submitting any Disputes, Requests for Exclusion, or Objections is <<RESPONSE DEADLINE>>. These deadlines will be strictly enforced.

BY ORDER OF THE COURT ENTERED ON <<PRELIM APPROVAL DATE>>.

NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT AWARD

Willie Marquez and Ahdy Mikhael , on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

v. Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc.

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO. CIVSB2125337

Please complete, sign, date and return this form to <<ADMINISTRATOR CONTACT INFO>> **ONLY IF** (1) your personal contact information has changed, and/or (2) you wish to dispute any of the items listed in Section (III), below. It is your responsibility to keep a current address on file with the Settlement Administrator.

(I) Please type or print your name:

(First, Middle, Last)

(II) Please type or print the following identifying information if your contact information has changed:

Former Names (if any)

New Street Address

City

State

Zip Code

(III) Information Used to Calculate Your Individual Settlement Award:

According to the records of Accurate Delivery System, Inc. ("Defendant"):

- (a) You were employed by Defendant and worked a total of [] workweeks between August 18, 2017 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023.
- (b) You were employed by Defendant and worked a total of [] pay periods between August 18, 2020 and the earlier of the date of preliminary approval or June 7, 2023.
- (c)

Based on the above, your Individual Settlement Award is estimated to be \$ [].

(IV) If you disagree with item (a) in Section (III) above, please explain why in the space provided below and include copies of any supporting evidence or documentation with this form:

If you dispute the above information from Defendant's records, Defendant's records will control unless you are able to provide documentation that establishes that Defendant's records are mistaken. If there is a dispute about whether Defendant's information or yours is accurate, and the dispute cannot be resolved informally, the dispute will be resolved by the Parties and the Settlement Administrator as described in the "Notice of Pendency of Class Action and Proposed Settlement" that accompanies this Form. Any unresolved disputes will be submitted to the Court for a final determination.

**ANY DISPUTES, ALONG WITH ANY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION, MUST BE POSTMARKED
NO LATER THAN <<RESPONSE DEADLINE>>**

EXHIBIT #2

Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP

2255 Calle Clara, La Jolla, California 92037

Tel: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (885) 551-1232

FIRM RESUME

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

ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES

Norman B. Blumenthal

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

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

Admitted: 1973, Illinois; 1976, California

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

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

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

Summer Intern (1971) with Harvard Voluntary Defenders

Kyle R. Nordrehaug

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

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

Admitted: 1999, California

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

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

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

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

Aparajit Bhowmik

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

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

Admitted: 2006, California

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

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

Awards: Rising Star 2015

Nicholas J. De Blouw

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

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

Admitted: 2011, California

Educated: Wayne State University (B.A. 2008); California Western School of Law (J.D. 2011)

Piya Mukherjee

Associate Attorney

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

Admitted: 2010, California

Educated: University of California, San Diego (B.S. 2006); University of Southern California, Gould School of Law (J.D. 2010)

Victoria Rivapalacio

Associate Attorney

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

Admitted: 2011, California

Educated: University of California at San Diego (B.A., 2003); George Washington University Law School (J.D. 2010)

Ricardo Ehmman

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2018, California; 2004, Nevada

Educated: University of California, San Diego (B.A. 1998); Loyola Law School (J.D. 2001)

Jeffrey S. Herman

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2011, California; 2016 Arizona

Educated: University of Michigan (B.A. 2008); California Western School of Law (J.D. 2011)

Charlotte James

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2016, California

Educated: San Diego State University; California Western School of Law

Christine Levu

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2012, California

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

Andrew Ronan

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2016, California

Educated: Arizona State University; University of San Diego School of Law

Scott Blumenthal

Associate Attorney

Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions

Admitted: 2020, New Mexico

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

REPORTED CASES

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

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

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

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

In re Tobacco Cases II, 41 Cal. 4th 1257 (2007); Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court, 24 Cal. 4th 906 (2001); Rocker v. KPMG LLP, 148 P.3d 703; 122 Nev. 1185 (2006); PCO, Inc. v. Christensen, Miller, Fink, Jacobs, Glaser, Weil & Shapiro, LLP, 150 Cal. App. 4th 384 (2007); Hall v. County of Los Angeles, 148 Cal. App. 4th 318 (2007); Coshov v. City of Escondido, 132 Cal. App. 4th 687 (2005); Daniels v. Philip Morris, 18 F.Supp 2d 1110 (S.D. Cal.1998); Gibson v. World Savings & Loan Asso., 103 Cal. App. 4th 1291 (2003); Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles, 75 Cal. App. 4th 445 (1999); Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles, 100 Cal.App. 4th 431 (2002); Norwest Mortgage, Inc. v. Superior Court, 72 Cal.App.4th 214 (1999); Hildago v. Diversified Transp. Sya, 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 3207 (9th Cir. 1998); Kensington Capital Mgal. v. Oakley, Inc., 1999 U.S. Dist LEXIS 385; Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P90, 411 (1999 C.D. Cal.); Lister v. Oakley, Inc., 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 384; Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P90,409 (C.D. Cal. 1999); Olszewski v. Scripps Health, 30 Cal. 4th 798 (2003); Steroid Hormone Product Cases, 181 Cal. App. 4th 145 (2010); Owen v. Macy's, Inc., 175 Cal. App. 4th 462 (2009); Taiheiyo Cement Corp. v. Superior Court, 117 Cal. App. 4th 380 (2004); Taiheiyo Cement Corp. v. Superior Court, 105 Cal.App. 4th 398 (2003); McMeans v. Scripps Health, Inc., 100 Cal. App. 4th 507 (2002); Ramos v. Countrywide Home Loans, 82 Cal.App. 4th 615 (2000); Tevssier v. City of San Diego, 81 Cal.App. 4th 685 (2000); Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court, 70 Cal. App. 4th 299 (1999); Silvas v. E*Trade Mortg. Corp., 514 F.3d 1001 (9th Cir. 2008); Silvas v. E*Trade Mortg. Corp., 421 F. Supp. 2d 1315 (S.D. Cal. 2006); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26544 (S.D. Cal. 2009); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 251 F.R.D. 514 (S.D. Cal. 2008); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 247 F.R.D. 598 (S.D. Cal. 2007); Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27365 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Wise v. Cubic Def. Applications, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11225 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Gabisan v. Pelican Prods., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1391

(S.D. Cal. 2009); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 630 F. Supp. 2d 1222 (S.D. Cal. 2009); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102380 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Louie v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Weltman v. Ortho Mattress, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20521 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Weltman v. Ortho Mattress, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60344 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Curry v. CTB McGraw-Hill, LLC, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5920; 97 A.F.T.R.2d (RIA) 1888; 37 Employee Benefits Cas. (BNA) 2390 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Reynov v. ADP Claims Servs. Group, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94332 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 248 (9th Cir. 2010); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38889 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 57766 (S.D. Cal. 2007); Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers, LLC, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29503 (D. Nev. 2009); Picus v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 256 F.R.D. 651 (D. Nev. 2009); Tull v. Stewart Title of Cal., Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14171 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Keshishzadeh v. Gallagher, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 46805 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Keshishzadeh v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 116380 (S.D. Cal. 2010); In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL Docket No. 1850 (All Cases), 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94603 (D.N.J. 2008); In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig., 629 F.3d 333 (3rd Cir. 2010); Puentes v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc., 160 Cal. App. 4th 638 (2008); Rezec v. Sony Pictures Entertainment, Inc., 116 Cal. App. 4th 135 (2004); Badillo v. Am. Tobacco Co., 202 F.R.D. 261 (D. Nev. 2001); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin., 2010 U.S. App. Lexis 23025 (9th Cir. 2010); Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 36650 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Rix v. Lockheed Martin Corp., 2011 U.S. Dist Lexis 25422 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Weitzke v. Costar Realty Info., Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist Lexis 20605 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Goodman v. Platinum Condo.Dev., LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36044 (D. Nev. 2011); Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers, LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14502 (D. Nev. 2011); Smith v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 117869 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Dobrosky v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., LLC, No. EDCV 13-0646 JGB (SPx), 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106345 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2014); Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC - Class Certification Granted, Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC, No. EDCV 16-1133 JGB (KKx), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73656 (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2017); Nelson v. Avon Products, Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court for The Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02276-BLF, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51104 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2015); Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works Inc., Class Certification Granted, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23179 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2017); Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Summary Judgment *Sua Sponte* Granted for Plaintiff, Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Inc., 870 F. Supp. 2d 856 (C.D. Cal. 2012)

CLASS ACTION & REPRESENTATIVE CASES

4G Wireless Wage Cases, Orange County Superior Court, JCCP No. 4736; Classic Party Rentals Wage & Hour Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP No. 4672; Abu-Arafeh v. Norco Delivery Service, Inc., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-540601; Aburto v. Verizon, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 11-cv-0088; Adkins v. Washington Mutual Bank, Class Certification Granted, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC819546; Agah v. CompUSA, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SA CV05-1087 DOC (Anx); Akers v. The San Diego Union Tribune, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2010-00088571; Altman v. SolarCity Corporation, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00023450-CU-OE-CTL; Aquino v. Macy's West Stores, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00395420; Baker v. Advanced Disability Management, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00160711; Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 07 cv 0938; Bates v. Verengo, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00619985-CU-OE-CXC; Battle v. Charming Charlie Inc., San Diego

County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00005608; Behar v. Union Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00317275; Bell v. John Stewart Company, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG14728792; Bennett v. Custom Built Personal Training Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. M127596; Bermant v. Bank of America, Investment Services, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court, Civil Action No. BC342505; Bethley v. Raytheon Company, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV10-01741; Betorina v. Randstad US, L.P., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:15-cv-03646-MEJ; Beverage v. Edcoa Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 2013-00138279; Bova v. Washington Mutual Bank / JP Morgan Chase, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 07-cv-2410; Bowden v. Sunset Parking Services, LLC & LAZ Parking California, LLC - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101751-CU-OE-CTL; Briseno v. American Savings Bank, Class Certification Granted, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 774773; Brueske v. Welk Resorts, San Diego Superior Court, Case No 37-2010-00086460; Bueche v. Fidelity National Management Services, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-01114; Bunch v. Pinnacle Travel Services, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC552048; Butler v. Stericycle, Inc & Appletree Answering Services of California, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00180282; Cabral v. Creative Communication Tech., Class Certification Granted, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC402239; Cardoza v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 4:15-cv-01634-DMR; Castro v. Vivint Solar, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00031385-CU-OE-CTL; Cavazos v. Heartland Automotive Services, Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. PSC 1401759; Cohen v. Bosch Tool, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIC 853562; Comstock v. Washington Mutual Bank - Class Certification Granted, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC820803; Conley v. Norwest, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. N73741; Connell v. Sun Microsystems, Alameda Superior Court, Case No. RG06252310; Corrente v. Luxe Valet, Inc., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-15-545961; Cruz v. Redfin Corporation, U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-05234-THE; Culley v. Lincare Inc. & Alpha Respiratory Inc., U.S. District Court eastern District of California, Case No. 2:15-cv-00081-GEB-CMK; Cunningham v. Leslie's Poolmart, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02122-CAS; Curry v. California Testing Bureau/McGraw Hill, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-05-4003 JW; Daniels, et al. v. Philip Morris,(In Re Tobacco Cases II) – Class Certification Granted, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4042; Davis v. Genex Holdings Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-13-cv-240830; Davis v. Clear Connection, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00035173-CU-OE-CTL; Day v. WDC Exploration, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00433770; Dedrick v. Hollandia Diary, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00004311-Cu-OE-CTL; Delmare v. Sungard Higher Education - Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 07-cv-1801; Del Rio v. Tumi Stores, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00022008-CU-OE-CTL; Dewane v. Prudential, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SA CV 05-1031; Diesel v. Wells Fargo Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00441368; Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-2745; Dobrosky v. Arthur J. Gallagher Service Company, LLC, Class certification Granted, No. EDCV 13-0646 JGB (Spx); Dodds v. Zaven Tootikian, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC494402; Drumheller v. Radioshack Corporation, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV11-355; Enger v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1670; Escobar v. Silicon Valley Security & Patrol, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv272514; Fierro v. Chase Manhattan - Class Certification Granted, Settled San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIN033490; Figueroa v. Circle K Stores, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101193-CU-OE-CTL; Finch v. Lamps Plus, (Lamps Plus Credit Transaction Cases), San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4532; Fletcher v. Verizon, U.S. District Court, Southern

District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1736; Francisco v. Diebold, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1889; Friend v. Wellpoint, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC345147; Frudakis v. Merck Sharp & Dohme, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. SACV 11-00146; Fulcher v. Olan Mills, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-cv-1821; Gabisan v. Pelican Products, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08 cv 1361; Galindo v. Sunrun Installation Services Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00008350-CU-OE-CTL; Gallagher v. Legacy Partners Commercial, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-221688; Ghattas v. Footlocker Retail, Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. CV 13-0001678 PA; Gibson v. World Savings, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 762321; Goerzen v. Interstate Realty Management, Co., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 679545; Gomez v. Enterprise Rent-A-Car, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:10-cv-02373; Gordon v. Wells Fargo Bank, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:11-cv-00090; Grabowski v. CH Robinson, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 10-cv-1658; Gross v. ACS Compiq Corporation, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00587846-CU-OE-CXC; Gripenstraw v. Buffalo Wild Wings, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 12-CV-00233; Gruender v. First American Title, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 06 CC 00197; Guillen v. Univision Television Group, Inc. & Univision Management Co., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-526445; Gujjar v. Consultancy Services Limited, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00365905; Gutierrez v. Five Guys Operations, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00086185-CU-OE-CTL; Handler v. Oppenheimer, Los Angeles Superior Court, Civil Action No. BC343542; Harley v. Tavistock Freebirds, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00173010; Harrington v. Corinthian Colleges – Class Certification Granted, Orange Superior Court; United States Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware; Harvey v. PQ Operations, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497964; Henshaw v. Home Depot U.S.A., United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV10-01392; Heithold v. United Education Institute, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00623416-CU-OE-CXC; Hibler v. Coca Cola Bottling, Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 11cv0298; Hildebrandt v. TWC Administration LLC & Time Warner NY Cable, LLC, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. ED-cv-13-02276-JGB; Hopkins v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Los Angeles, United states District Court, Central District of California; U.S. Court of Appeals 9th Circuit; Howard v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC586369; Hughes v. Parexel International, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC485950; Hurley v. Comcast of California/Colorado/Texas/Washington, Inc., Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-253801; Irving v. Solarcity Corporation, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV525975; Jacobs v. Nu Horizons - Settled Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 111cv194797; Jefferson v. Bottling Group LLC (Pepsi) - Class Certification Granted, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-0018010; Jones v. E*Trade Mortgage, U.S. District Court, Southern District California Case No. 02-CV-1123 L (JAH); Kennedy v. Natural Balance - Dismissal Reversed on Appeal, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2007-00066201; Keshishzadeh v. Arthur J. Gallagher Service Co., U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0168; Kinney v. AIG Domestic Claims / Chartis, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 8:10-cv-00399; Kizer v. Tristar Risk Management, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00707394-CU-OE-CXC; Kleinberg v. Reeve Trucking Company, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00001601-CU-OE-CTL; Kove v. Old Republic Title, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09477437; Krellcom v. Medley Communications, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00050245-CU-OE-CTL; Ladd v. Extreme Recovery, LP, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC11-02790; Langille v. EMC, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0168; Lawson v. Marquee Staffing, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00103717-

CU-OE-CTL; Lazar v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv-273289; Lemmons v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00125488; Levine v. Groeniger, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09476193; Linder v. OCWEN (In re Ocwen Federal Bank FSB Servicing Litig.) U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. 07cv501, U.S. District Court, Northern Dist. Illinois, Case No. MDL 1604; Litton v. Diebold, Incorporated, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV524776; Lohn v. Sodexo, Inc. & SDH Services West, LLC, U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 2:15-CV-05409; Lopez v. K-Mart, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. BC351983; Louie / Stringer v. Kaiser, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-0795; Lucero v. Sears, U.S. District Court Southern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-01620-AJB; Lucero v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00075933-CU-OE-CTL; Magallanes v. TSA Stores, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-15-cv-283586; Magana v. El Pollo Loco, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00613901-CU-OE-CXC; Maitland v. Marriott, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. SACV 10-00374; Mann v. NEC Electronics America, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 109CV132089; Martinez v. Hydro-Scape Products, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00029157-CU-OE-CTL; Mathies v. Union Bank - Class Certification Granted, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-10-498077; McDermott v. Catalina Restaurant Group Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00574113-CU-OE-CXC; McPhail v. First Command, United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 05CV0179 IEG (JMA); Medina v. Universal Protection Service, LP, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. BC572848; Meierdiercks v. 8x8, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 110CV162413; Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court Eastern District of California, Case No. 16-1133 JGB (Kkx); Meyer v. Thinktank Learning, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-15-cv-282698; Morales v. Wells Fargo Insurance Services USA, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:13-cv-03867-EDL; Morse v. Marie Callender Pie Shop, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 09-cv-1305; Moynihan v. Escalante Golf, Inc. & Troon Golf, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00083250-CU-OE-CTL; Muntz v. Lowe's HIW, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC880932; Najarian v. Macy's West Stores, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00418401; Nelson v. Avon Products, Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court for The Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02276-BLF; Nguyen v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 05 CC 00116; Ochoa v. Eisai, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 3:11-cv-01349; Ogans v. Nationwide Credit, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00121054; Ohayon v. Hertz, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-1662; Olvera v. El Pollo Loco, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00707367-CU-OE-CXC; Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 14-cv-02113-MCE; Ortega v. Prime Healthcare Paradise Valley, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00011240-CU-OE-CTL; Patel v. Nike Retail Services, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-04781-RS; Patelski v. The Boeing Company, United States District Court, Southern District of New York; transferred to United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri; Pearlman v. Bank of America, San Diego Superior Court; Perry v. AT&T, U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 11-cv 01488; Picus v. Wal-Mart Stores, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:07-CV-00682; Pittard v. Salus Homecare, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08 cv 1398; Port v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2007-00067538; Postema v. Lawyers Title Ins. Corp., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00418901; Pratt v. Verizon, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00430447; Proctor v. Ameriquest, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 06CC00108; Ramirez v. Estenson Logistics, LLC, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2015-00803197-CU-OE-CXC; Ray

v. Lawyers Title, Fidelity National, Commonwealth Land Title, Chicago Title, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00359306; Renazco v. Unisys Technical Services, L.L.C., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-539667; Reynolds v. Marlboro/Philip Morris U.S.A., United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 08-55114, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 05 CV 1876 JAH; Rezec v. Sony, San Diego Superior Court; Rix v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-2063; Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Summary Judgment *Sua Sponte* Granted for Plaintiff, *Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Inc.*, 870 F. Supp. 2d 856 (C.D. Cal. 2012); Ritchie v. Mauran Ambulance Services, Inc., Los Angeles County, Case No. BC491206; Rivers v. Veolia Transportation Services, Class Certification Granted, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV 255350; Roeh v. JK Hill, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00089046; Rodriguez v. Protransport-1, LLC, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-522733; Romero v. Central Payment Co., LLC, Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV 1106277; Salas v. Evolution Hospitality, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00083240-CU-OE-CTL; Salem v. Alliance Human Services, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. CIVRS1401129; Sanchez v. Beena Beauty Holding, Inc. d/b/a Planet Beauty, Los Angeles County Superior Court, BC566065; Santone v. AT&T – Settled United States District Court, Southern District of Alabama; Santos v. Sleep Train (Sleep Train Wage and Hour Cases), Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00214586, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4553; Saravia v. O.C. Communciations, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00180734; Sawyer v. Vivint, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Case No. 1:14-cv-08959; Sayaman v. Baxter Healthcare, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 10-1040; Schuler v. Ecolab, Inc., U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:10-cv-02255; Schulz v. Qualxserv, LLC / Worldwide Techservices - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0017; Serrato v. Sociedad Textil Lonia, Corp., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101195-CU-OE-CTL; Shrivastara v. Fry's Electronics, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 111cv192189; Sierra v. Oakley Sales Corp., Orange County Superior Court, U.S. District Court Central District of California; U.S. Court of Appeals 9th Circuit; Sirota v. Swing-N-Slide, Wisconsin District Court, County of Rock Wisconsin, Case No. 95CV726J; Small v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00099011-CU-OE-CTL; Smith v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 08-cv-02353; Smith v. Fedex Ground Package system, Inc., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG14734322; Sones v. World Savings / Wachovia; U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 3:08-cv-04811; Spradlin v. Trump, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:08-cv-01428; Steele v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 07-5743; Steffan v. Fry's Electronics, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-13-CV-254011; Steroid Hormone Product Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, JCCP4363; Strauss v. Bayer Corporation, United States District Court, District of Minnesota; Sustersic v. International Paper Co., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00331538; Sutton v. Seasons Hospice & Palliative Care of California, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC590870; Swartout v. First Alarm Security & Patrol, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-231989; Talamantez v. The Wellpoint Companies, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 12-cv-08058; Tan v. California State Automobile Assn. - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. 07cv1011, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00231219; Tauber v. Alaska Airlines, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court; Thai v. Staff Assistance, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC567943; Thomas v. Stanford Health Care d/b/a Stanford University Medical Center, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv-273362; Thomas-Byass v. Michael Kors Stores (California), Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 5:15-cv-00369-JGB; Trujillo v. LivHome, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00100372, San Diego

County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4570; Tull v. Stewart Title, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-CV-1095; Turner v. C.R. England, U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 5:14-cv-02207-PSG; Turner v. Ampac Fine Chemicals, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00176993; Valadez v. Schering-Plough, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 10-CV-2595; Van Gorp v. Ameriquest Mortgage/Deutsche Bank, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV05-907 CJC (Anx); Varela v. The Walking Company, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC562520; Veloz v. Ross Dress For Less, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC485949; Vogel v. Price-Simms, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 114CV261268; Vrab v. DNC Parks & Resorts at Tenaya, Inc., Mariposa County Superior Court, Case No. 0010225; Vultaggio-Kish v. Golden State Lumber, Inc., San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV 51661; Wadhwa v. Escrow Plus, Los Angeles Superior Court; Waldhart v. Mastec North Amercia, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1419318; Walker v. Brink's Global Services USA, Inc. & Brinks Incorporated, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC564369; Walsh v. Apple, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 08-04918; Weinman v. Midbar Condo Development (Las Vegas One), U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:08-cv-00684; Weltman v. Ortho Mattress - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-0840, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00327802; West v. Jerome's Furniture Warehouse, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2013-00147707-CU-OE-GDS; Wheat v. Jerome's Furniture Warehouse, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00094419-CU-OE-CTL; Wietzke v. Costar Realty, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 09-cv-2743; Williams v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 3:09-cv-01669; Wilson v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 8:14-cv-1021-FMO; Winston v. Lemore Transportation, Inc., Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C-15-00897; Wise v. Cubic, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-2315; Witman v. Level 3 Communications, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00091649-CU-OE-CTL; Yam v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 10-cv-05225-SBA; Zurlo v. Mission Linen, U.S. District Court, Central District, Case No. 08cv1326; Baxt v. Scor U.S., Delaware Court of Chancery; Bronson v. Blech Securities - Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York; Castro & Cardwell v. B & H Education, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC456198; Dibella v. Olympic Financial, U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota; Doyle v. Lorna Jane USA, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC526837; Estrella v. B-Per Electronic, Inc. & My Wireless, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00048951-CU-OE-CTL; Ferrari v. Read-Rite, U. S. District Court, Northern District of California; Forever 21 Wage and Hour Cases - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, JCC Proceeding No. 4745; Hart v. United States Tobacco Co., Los Angeles Superior Court; In re Bank of America Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litigation, U.S. District Court, District of Kansas, Case No. MDL 2138; In re Walgreen Co. Wage and Hour Litigation, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 11-cv-07664; Jackson v. Fresh & Easy Neighborhood Market Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497964; U.S. Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware Case No. 13-12569 (KJC); Jordan/Ramos v. DMV -Sacramento County Superior Court; Kensington Capital v. Oakley, U. S. District Court, Southern District of California; Kensington Capital v. Vesta, U. S. District Court, Northern District of Alabama; Lopez v. Tire centers, LLC, U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:13-cv-05444-JCS; Miller v. Western Athletic Clubs, LLC, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-228670; Moffett v. WIS International, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00099909-CU-OE-CTL; Perez v. Urban Outfitters, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02628-JSW; Ridgewood Capital Management v. Gensia, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, #CV-92-1500H; Sandoval v. Redfin Corporation, U.S. District Court Northern District, Case No. 3:14-cv-04444-SC; Shurman v. Scimed, State of Minnesota District Court, Fourth District,

#94-17640; Sioson v. AMP Holding, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00663825; Slatton v. G.E. Capital Mortgage Services, Camden County Superior Court, New Jersey, #CAML0256198; Somkin v. Molten Metal, U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, #9710325PBS; Sparks v AT&T, Illinois District Court - Madison County; Sullivan v. Lyon Management Group, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00649432-CU-BT-CXC; Herencia v. Alexander's Steakhouse, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550551; Reinhardt v. Beverly Fabrics, Inc. – Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-257217; DeBettencourt v. Interstate realty Management Company – San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2015-0011942; Torres v. Bhandal Bros, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV01555; Rodriguez v. El Toro Medical Investors Limited Partnership – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00059-JLS-KES; Velez v. Timec Specialty Services, Inc. & Transfield Services – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC614318; Henry v. Central Freight Lines, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00280-JAM-EFB; Taylor v. TIC – The Industrial Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00186-VAP(SPX); Harvey v. Sears, Roebuck And Co. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00207556; Tapia v. Panda Express, LLC et al. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, JCCP No. 4919; Severson v. Lowe's HIW, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-00189508; Bendon v. DTG Operations, Inc. - U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00861-FMO-AGR; Talavera v. ACS Dataline, LP – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC617159; McHenry v. Prologix Distribution Services (West), LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC608948; Stone v. Prologistics Distribution, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, JCCP No 4881; Easton v. Handy Technologies, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00004419-CU-OE-CTL; Singh v. Total Renal Care, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550847; Conners v. Rag Traders Melrose, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC591413; Saporito v. Space Explorations Technologies Corporation, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC554258; Calhoun v. Celadon Trucking Services, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-01351-PSG-FFM; Conners v. Mission Valley Kilt, LLC - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00036888-CU-OE-CTL; Shibley v. New Prime, Inc. - U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 17-CV-00321-DOC; Lawrenz v. Blacktalon Enterprises, Inc. - Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-258205; Jamison v. Fitness 19 CA 121, LLC - Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS046697; Brooks v. Archer Trucking, Inc. – Mendocino County Superior Court, Case No. SCUK-CVG-16-67106; Montgomery v. New Prime, Inc. - San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1611884; Mills v. Core-Mark International, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, case No. 37-2016-00009669-CU-OE-CTL; Lopez v. Networked Insurance Agents, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00843587-CU-OE-CXC; Yberri v. Agent Provocateur, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC620413; Woodard v. BKD Twenty-One Management Company, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00009682-CU-OE-CTL; Gallagher v. H.H. Restaurant, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00031247-CU-OE-CTL; San Nicolas v. West Covina Corporate Fitness, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC16304; Summerlin v. Maplebear Inc., d/b/a Instacart – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 603030; Padilla v. Sutter West Bay Hospitals – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV538977; Quagliariello v. Victory Entertainment, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC620273; Mohammad v. Tee It Up LLC – Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C16-01188; Pucilowski v. Esurance Insurance Services, Inc. – Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0038790; Arias v. Alamitos Enterprises, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00865183-CU-OE-CXC; Orzano v. Hazelwood Enterprises, Inc. - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00029231-CU-OE-CTL; Tejero v. Firstmed Ambulance Services, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00885355-CU-OE-CXC; Artis v. T-W Transport, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00013010-CU-OE-CTL; Searles v.

Navajo Express, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1613846; Lara v. Commercial Protective Service, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC648921; Picos v. Culinary of California, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4892; Samaniego v. A&I Transport, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV01894; Bailey v. Romanoff Floor Covering, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-00685-TLN-CMK; Aguirre v. Bitech, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-002022; Phillips v. DI Overnite LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00016800-CU-OE-CTL; Jacob v. Pride Transport, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV1337; Bennett v. Heartland Express, Inc. of Iowa – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00015056-CU-OE-CTL; Stapf v. Mercer Health & Benefits Administration LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC643007; Armstrong v. Ruan Transport Corporation – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1605897; Geiger v. Floyd's 99-California LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00874943-CU-OE-CXC; Mondrian v. Trius Trucking, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 16CECG01501; Johnson v. Fedex Office and Print Services, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG17856291; Rios v. Pacific Western Bank – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00038083; Sanders v. Old Dominion Freight Lines, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00030725-CU-OE-CTL; Taylor v. Gardner Trucking, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1614280; Couture v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, case No. 16-CV-02202-VC; Bertuol v. AHMC Anaheim Regional Medical Center LP – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00899024-CO-OE-CXC; Espinoza v. Prime Communications of California, LLC – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 16CIV01563; Archuletta v. Tidy Services, Inc. – Orange County Superior court, Case No. 30-2016-008611892-CU-OE-CXC; Puccini v. Earthbound Farm, LLC – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV308643; Vikram v. First Student Management, LLC – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-04656-KAW; Blair v. Ashley Distribution Services, LTD. – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 17-CV-01427-JAK-SP; Richardson v. Service Staffing, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00899039-CU-OE-CXC; Coffin v. Certified Freight Logistics, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00036523-CU-OE-CTL; Encarnacion v. S.A.S. Services Group, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00026726-CU-OE-CTL; Vasquez v. Golden State Overnight Delivery Service, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG17862924; Karr v. Tristar Managed Care, Inc. – Contra Costa Superior Court, case No. MSC17-00650; Gouveia v. Central Cal Transportation – San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2017-0001765; Miranda v. Genex Services, LLC – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-01438-JD; Spears v. Health Net of California, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00210560; Martinez v. Geil Enterprises, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG01879; McComack v. Marriott Ownership Resorts, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 17CV1663 BEN WVG; Velasco v. Lemonade Restaurant Group, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC672235; Smith v. Personnel Services, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case NO. 17-CV-03594-SK; Gabriel v. Kuni SDA, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-000251191-CU-OE-CTL; Miller v. Mattress Firm, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV313148; Provost v. Yourmechanic, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00024056-CU-OE-CTL; Zirpolo v. UAG Stevens Creek II, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV313457; Salazar v. Aids Healthcare Foundation – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00033482-CU-OE-CTL; Knipe v. Amazon.com, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00029426-CU-OE-CTL; Erwin v. Caremeridian, LLC – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG03048; Davis v. Cox Communications California, LLC – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00989-BAS-BLM; Lara v. RMI International, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC597695; Harper v. C.R. England, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Utah Central

Division, Case No. 16-CV-00906-DB; Mrazik v. C.H. Robinson Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 12-CV-02067-CAS-PLA; Horn v. Rise Medical Staffing, LLC – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:17-cv-01967-MCE-KJN; Pasallo v. GSG Protective Services CA Inc. – San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00037611-CU-OE-CTL; Smith v. Pacific Personnel Services, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-cv-03594-SK; Terrado v. Accredited Debt Relief, LLC – San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00014181-CU-OE-CTL; Escobedo v. Pacific Western Bank – Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC682686; Wade v. Automobile Club of Southern California – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00960268-CU-OE-CXC; Montano v. American Automobile Association of Northern California – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. CIVMSC18-01539; Perez v. Summit Interconnect, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00995403-CU-OE-CXC; Wolleson v. Gosch Imports, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC170356; Banuelos v. Ortho Mattress, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01161304-CU-OE-CXC; Castellanos v. Miller Automotive Group, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC699211; Tressler v. Spoonful Management, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC71940; Delph v. Employee Retention Services, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00007885; Romero v. May Trucking Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 5:17-cv-02166-JGB-SHK; Miranda v. Genex Services, LLC – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1700779; Moore v. Zirx Transportation Services, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566655; Sottile v. Motion Recruitment Partners – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV321677; Shahbazian v. Fast Auto Loans, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:18-cv-03076-ODW-KS; Salazar v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC702468; Conti v. L’Oreal USA S/D, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Fresno, Case No. 1:19-CV-00769-LJO-SKO; Mercado v. Security Industry Specialists, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV320059; Vikili v. Dignity Health – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-569456; Bagby v. Swissport SA, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC691058; Henry v. Motion Entertainment Group, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC18565643; Dandoy v. West Coast Convenience, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20051121; Lanuza v. AccentCare, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-565521; Thomas v. Easy Driving School, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00047639-CU-OE-CTL; Erickson v. Erickson – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC18-00307; Martin v. Menzies Aviation (USA) Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566072; Mortimer v. Healthsouth Bakersfield Rehabilitation Hospital, LLC – Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-102761; Alcaraz v. Red Lion Hotels Corporation – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-570310; Calhoun v. Total Transportation and Distribution, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00058681-CU-OE-CTL; Rataul v. Overton Security Services, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG18891882; Beltran v. Compass Bank – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00024475-CU-OE-CTL; Kirshner v. Touchstone Golf, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00028865-CU-OE-CTL; Pizarro v. The Home Depot, Inc. – U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia-Atlanta Division; Hatanaka v. Restore Rehabilitation, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00034780-CU-OE-CTL; Faria v. Carriage Funeral Holdings, Inc. – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC18-00606; Ontiveros v. Baker Concrete Construction, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV328679; Morales v. Redlands Automotive Services, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1807525; Ramirez v. Carefusion Resources, LLC – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California; Amster v. Starbucks Corporation – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1922016; Kutzman v. Derrel’s Mini Storage, Inc. – U.S. District, Eastern District of California, Case No. 1:18-cv-00755-AWI-JLT; Marks v. Universal Propulsion Company, Inc. – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS051608; Martinez v. Geil Enterprises,

Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG01480; Teniente v. Cirrus Asset Management, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV16302; Blackshear v. California Fine Wine & Spirits LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2018-00245842; Warnick v. Golden Gate America West LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC714176; Bennett v. Dnata Aviation USA, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566911; George v. PF Stockton Fitness LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00261113-CU-OE-GDS; Oshana v. Farmers and Merchants Bank of Central California – Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-19-003427; Vasquez v. Packaging Corporation of America, – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:19-cv-01935-PSG-PLA; Palomino v. Zara USA Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00992682-CU-OE-CXC; Simmons v. Joe & The Juice LA, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court; Pacia v. CIM Group, L.P. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC709666; Flores v. Plastic Express – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC71971; Madera v. William Warren Properties, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01055704-CU-OE-CXC; Hernandez v. Quality Custom Distribution – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-01010611-CU-OE-CXC; Arango v. Schlumberger Technology Corporation – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01056839-CU-OE-CXC; Dandoy v. West Coast Convenience, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20051121; Ramirez v. J E H Enterprises, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-19-574691; Sullen v. First Service Residential California, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-19-575131; Valentino v. East Bay Tire Co. – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS053067; Murphy v. Rockler Retail Group, Inc. – Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00251220; Shahbazian v. Onewest Bank – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV23722; Bruemmer v. Tempur Retail Stores LLC – Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV1803646; Antonios v. Interface Rehab, Inc. – Orange County Superior, Case No. 30-2019-01067547-CU-OE-CXC; Tavallodi v. DC Auto, Inc. – San Bernardino, Case No. CIVDS1833598; Miranda v. The Lloyd Pest Control Co. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00052510-CU-OE-CTL; Soenardi v. Magnussen Imports, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV340003; Thai v. Team Industrial Services, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV21953; Castillo v. A.J. Kirkwood & Associates, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV04435; Moss v. Jabil Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20050536; Billosillo, Jr. v. Crown Energy Services, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00058254-CU-OE-CTL; Tarkington v. Freetime, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00011473-CU-OE-CTL; McIntyre v. J.J.R. Enterprises, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00251220; Bucur v. Pharmaca Integrative Pharmacy, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00009409-CU-OE-CTL; Batin v. McGee Air Services, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV347733; Terry v. McGee Air Services, Inc. – King County Superior Court of Washington, Case No. 19-2-3321-5 KNT; Weiss v. Niznik Behavioral Health Resources, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00039441-CU-OE-CTL; Cavada v. Inter-Continental Hotels Group, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:19-cv-01675-GPC-AHG; Lesevici v. Spectraforce Technologies, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 5:19-cv-03126-LHK; Mutchler v. Circle K Stores, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00016331-CU-OE-CTL; Azima v. CSI Medical Group, – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV345450; Porras v. Baypointe Enterprises, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV31015; Mitchell v. Mack Trucking, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1928334; Watts v. T.R.L. Systems, Incorporated – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01102457-CU-OE-CXC; Price v. DMSD Restaurants Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00024062-CU-OE-CTL; Jacobs v. Nortek Security & Control LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-0019735-CU-OE-CTL; Gonzalez v. Hub International Midwest – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1900463; Cisneros v. Bluepearl California, Inc. – San Mateo Superior Court, Case No. 19-

CIV-05707; Garcia v. Gallagher Basset Services – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2004140; Callow v. Adventist Health System/West – Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0043607; Dominguez v. Kimco Facility Services, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV37592; Searles v. Robert Heath Trucking, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCY30808; Rangel v. Pioneer Hi-Bred international, Inc. – Yolo County Superior Court, Case No. CV-19-1797; Ivon v. Sinclair Television of California, Humboldt County Superior Court, Case No. DR190699; Williams v. Henkels & McCoy, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2003888; Cano v. Larry Green Chrysler Jeep Dodge, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. BLC1900184; Lopez v. Cepheid – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV358827; Hernandez v. Quick Dispense, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV29405; Lopez v. Lacoste USA, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1914626; Duhe v. Hospital Couriers Nevada, LLC – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC19-01377; Law v. Sequoia Equities, Incorporated – Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C19-01925; Dvorak v. Rockwell Collins, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00064397-CU-OE-CTL; Noguera v. Metal Container Corporation – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2003235; Leon v. Miller Event Management, Inc. – San Luis Obispo Superior Court, Case No. 19CV-0435; Leon v. Miller Event Management, Inc. – San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV-0435, Camacho-Bias v. Serve U Brands Inc. – Butte County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV00603; La Pietra v. Entertainment Partners Services, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV39529; Celis v. Theatre Box - San Diego, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. ____; Ignacio v. Laboratory Corporation of America – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:19-cv-06079-AB-RAO; Kovnas v. Cahill Contractors LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19037852; Hersh v. Mrs. Gooch's Natural Food – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV10444; Miller v. The Permanente Medical Group – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19045904; Vasquez v. Autoalert, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01114549-CU-OE-CXC; Cavanaugh v. Morton Golf, LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00270176; Coley v. Monroe Operations, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20063188; Ramirez v. Sierra Aluminum Company – U.S. District Court, California Central District Court, Case No. 5:20-cv-00417-JGB-KK; Marrero v. Stat Med, P.C. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG19043214; Enriquez v. Solari Enterprises, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV11129; Craig v. Hometown Heart – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-582454; Lopez v. Hy0Lang Electric California, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00012543-CU-OE-CTL; Heuklom v. Clara Medical Group, P.C. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-585918; Dominguez v. Lifesafer of Northern California – Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV002586; Kiseleva v. Totalmed Staffing Inc. – U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Case No. 5:19-cv-06480; Vires v. Sweetgreen, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV365918; Kim v. Wireless Vision, LLC – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2000074; Senoren v. Air Canada Corporation – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV13942; Clark v. Quest Diagnostics Incorporated – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2018707; Green v. Shipt, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV01001; Respass v. The Scion Group LLC – Sacramento County Superior County, Case No. 34-2020-00285265; Jackson v. Decathlon USA LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG2003024; Avacena v. FTG Aerospace Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV28767; Perez v. Butler America, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV20218; Christensen v. Carter's Retail, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01138792-CU-OE-CXC; Astudillo v. Torrance Health Association, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV18424; Hansen v. Holiday Al Management Sub LLC – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. CIVMSC20-00779; Almahdi v. Vitamin Shoppe Industries Inc – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV365150; Krisinda v. Loyal Source Government Services LLC – U.S. District Court, California

Southern District, Case No. 3:20-cv-879-LAB-NLS; Ettegui v. WB Studio Enterprises Inc – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:20-CV-08053-MCS (MAAx); Fernandez v. Nuvision Federal Credit Union – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01161691-CU-OE-CJC; Aviles v. UPS Supply Chain Solutions, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2000727; Alcocer v. DSV Solutions, LLC – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2010345; Wilson v. Wholesome Harvest Baking, LLC – U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Case No. 4:20-cv-05186-YGR; Gregory v. Verio Healthcare, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV37254; Rose v. Impact Group, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01141107-CU-OE-CXC; Monasterio v. Citibank, N.A. – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 20-CIV-03650; Martinez-Lopez v. Medamerica, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00034393-CU-OE-CTL; Cox v. PRB Management, LLC – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS055514; Nash v. K. Hovnanian Companies, LLC – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2003319; Kyler v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00015828-CU-OE-CTL; Roberts v. Solantic Corporation – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV41117; Price v. Mistras Group, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV22485; Macias v. ABM Electrical & Lighting Solutions, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00024997-CU-OE-CTL; Basu-Kesselman v. Garuda Labs, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-585229; Armstrong v. Prometric LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV29967; Ashlock v. Advantis Medical Staffing, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00022305-CU-OE-CTL; Wilson v. WXI Global Solutions, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV25007; Gandhale v. Select Rehabilitation, LLC – Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV002240; Starvoice v. G4S Secure Solutions (USA) Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00029421-CU-OE-CTL; Mbise v. Axlehire, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20067350; Points v. C&J Services, Inc. – Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-20-102483; Marshall v. PHI Air Medical, LLC – Lassen County Superior Court, Case No. 62973; Jauregui v. Cytotec Engineered Materials, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01164932-CU-OE-CXC

EXHIBIT #3

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG
BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CA 92037
(858) 551-1223

OCTOBER 31, 2023

WILLIA MARQUEZ

RE: ACCURATE DELIVERY SYSTEMS
FILE NUMBER: CA2271.001

ATTORNEY FEES

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
03/01/21	SB	BEGIN INITIAL REVIEW OF EMPLOYMENT FILE, PREPARE CASE ANALYSIS, ADVISE ND	2.80	450	1,260.00
03/15/21	SB	REVIEW CASE FILE, PREPARE INITIAL CASE ANALYSIS, ADVISE ND	2.40	450	1,080.00
04/15/21	ND	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORIGINAL INTAKE NOTES. LEGAL RESEARCH REGARDING RELATED LITIGATION IN STATE AND FEDERAL COURT. RESEARCH DEFENDANT'S BUSINESS OPERATIONS IN CALIFORNIA. CONFERENCE WITH PLAINTIFF.	3.50	850	2,975.00
04/18/21	ND	REVIEW EMAILS AND DOCS FROM PLAINTIFF REGARDING WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION CLAIMS AND OFF THE CLOCK WORK TASKS. LEGAL RESEARCH REGARDING THE SAME. CONFERENCE WITH PLAINTIFF TO DISCUSS.	3.90	850	3,315.00
04/29/21	ND	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ENTIRE EMPLOYMENT FILE FOR LEGAL CLAIMS. ANALYZE ALL PAY STATEMENTS FOR 226(A) AND OVERTIME VIOLATIONS. LEGAL RESEARCH REGARDING RECENT WAGE STATEMENT DECISIONS. CONFERENCE WITH PLAINTIFF TO OBTAIN FACTS FOR COMPLAINT.	4.30	850	3,655.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
05/05/21	ND	REVIEW FACTS AND LAW. DRAFT COMPLAINT	4.70	850	3,995.00
05/08/21	ND	REVIEW AND ANALYZE EMPLOYMENT FILE OF ADDITIONAL REP MARQUEZ. CONFERENCE WITH PLAINTIFF MARQUEZ REGARDING CLAIMS AND PROCESS OF LAWSUIT. REVISE COMPLAINT TO ADD PLAINTIFF.	4.30	850	3,655.00
05/22/21	ND	DRAFT COMPLAINT. CONFERENCE WITH PLAINTIFF TO DISCUSS COMPLAINT. ANALYZE MEAL AND REST BREAK CLAIMS.	4.40	850	3,740.00
05/26/21	ND	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PAY STUBS AND COMPLAINT. DRAFT PAGA NOTICE. UPLOAD PAGA NOTICE TO LWDA WEBSITE.	1.90	850	1,615.00
06/01/21	ND	DRAFT INTERNAL CASE NOTES MEMO DETAILING FACTS AND LAW.	2.00	850	1,700.00
07/08/21	ND	DRAFT JPA. DISCUSS CASE WITH COUNSEL. SEND JPA TO TWO PLAINTIFFS FOR SIGNATURES. FOLLOW UP TO EXPLAIN SIGNATURES AND STATUS UPDATE.	1.80	850	1,530.00
08/16/21	SB	REVIEW COMPLAINT FOR FILING, ANALYZE, ADVISE ND	2.40	450	1,080.00
08/19/21	SB	REVISE COMPLAINT FOR FILING, ADVISE ND	2.80	450	1,260.00
08/23/21	RE	REVIEW CASE NOTES/DAMAGE ANALYSIS	0.50	675	337.50
08/23/21	RE	REVIEW EMPLOYMENT FILE DOCUMENTS/1198.5 RESPONSE	3.00	675	2,025.00
08/26/21	RE	REVIEW & EDIT CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; FINALIZE DRAFT FOR NEXT DAY FILING.	3.00	675	2,025.00
08/27/21	RE	DRAFT PAGA ONLY REPRESENTATIVE ACTION	4.00	675	2,700.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
		COMPLAINT			
08/27/21	RE	DRAFT SUMMONS, CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET & CERTIFICATE OF ASSIGNMENT RE CLASS ACTION	0.50	675	337.50
08/27/21	RE	DRAFT SUMMONS, CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET & CERTIFICATE OF ASSIGNMENT RE PAGA ONLY ACTION	0.50	675	337.50
08/27/21	ND	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PAGA NOTICE. REVIEW AND REVISE PAGA ONLY COMPLAINT	1.80	850	1,530.00
08/30/21	RE	FINALIZE CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT PACKAGE; FILE IN SB SUP CT.	0.75	675	506.25
08/30/21	RE	FINALIZE PAGA ONLY ACTION COMPLAINT PACKAGE; FILE IN SB SUP CT.	0.60	675	405.00
10/06/21	RE	CHECK DOCKET; REVIEW ALL COURT-RETURNED CONFORMED DOCUMENTS; MEMO TO FIRM RE JUDICIAL/DEPARTMENT ASSIGNMENT AND STATUS OF INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE RE CLASS	0.50	675	337.50
10/06/21	RE	REVIEW DOCKET; REVIEW ALL COURT-RETURNED CONFORMED DOCUMENTS; REVIEW INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER; MEMO TO FIRM RE JUDICIAL/DEPARTMENT ASSIGNMENT AND STATUS OF INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE RE PAGA ACTION	0.60	675	405.00
10/06/21	RE	PROVIDE NOTICE TO LWDA OF PAGA FILING; UPLOAD PAGA ONLY COMPLAINT TO LWDA WEBSITE; SAVE CONFIRMATION FOR FUTURE VERIFICATION OF NOTICE OF FILING COMPLAINT WITH PAGA CLAIM TO LWDA	0.40	675	270.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
10/06/21	RE	PREPARE INITIAL DOCUMENTS FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS; DRAFT NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT; SEND TO DEFENSE COUNSEL AND INSTRUCT STAFF TO FORWARD HARD COPIES TO D/C RE CLASS ACTION	0.70	675	472.50
10/06/21	RE	PREPARE INITIAL DOCUMENTS FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS; DRAFT NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT; SEND TO DEFENSE COUNSEL AND INSTRUCT STAFF TO FORWARD HARD COPIES TO D/C RE PAGA ACTION	0.70	675	472.50
10/14/21	AR	REVIEW PLEADINGS FOR STATUS; MULTIPLE CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING SERVICE; REVIEW DOCKET.	0.60	550	330.00
10/25/21	RE	[CLASS] DRAFT POS-010 FORM; ATTACH NOTICE & ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT; FILE POS OF SUMMONS; MEMO TO FIRM RE DISCOVERY ISSUE	0.50	675	337.50
10/25/21	RE	[PAGA] DRAFT POS-010 FORM; ATTACH NOTICE & ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT; FILE POS OF SUMMONS; MEMO TO FIRM RE DISCOVERY ISSUE	0.50	675	337.50
11/02/21	CL	TELEPHONE CALL WITH S. LIDMAN RE: GARCIA ACTION AND POSSIBLE CONSOLIDATION OF COMPLAINTS.	0.30	750	225.00
11/04/21	CL	EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: TELEPHONE CALL WITH OPC REGARDING	0.20	750	150.00
11/19/21	CL	EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: MEET AND CONFER RE: THIRD RELATED PAGA MATTER.	0.40	750	300.00
11/23/21	CL	EMAIL TO/FROM S. LIDMAN RE: AMENDED COMPLAINT, CMCS AND MEDIATION.	0.40	750	300.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
12/14/21	CL	[CLASS] DRAFT JOINT STATUS REPORT; REVIEW AND ANALYZE INITIAL SCHEDULING ORDER.	1.20	750	900.00
12/14/21	CL	[PAGA] DRAFT JOINT STATUS REPORT; REVIEW AND ANALYZE INITIAL SCHEDULING ORDER.	0.70	750	525.00
12/14/21	CL	MULTIPLE EMAILS FROM/TO S. LIDMAN RE: REVISIONS TO JOINT STATUS REPORT; EMAIL TO S. PARK RE: JOINT STATUS REPORT AND REVISIONS.	0.40	750	300.00
12/15/21	CL	[CLASS] DRAFT BELAIRE-WEST AND PROTECTIVE ORDER; EMAIL TO S. PARK RE: REVISIONS TO JOINT CMS; REVIEW AND ANALYZE REVISIONS TO JOINT CMS.	0.80	750	600.00
12/15/21	CL	[PAGA] DRAFT BELAIRE-WEST AND PROTECTIVE ORDER; EMAIL TO S. PARK RE: REVISIONS TO JOINT CMS; REVIEW AND ANALYZE REVISIONS TO JOINT CMS.	0.60	750	450.00
12/15/21	CL	[CLASS] EMAIL TO/FROM S. LIDMAN RE: AGREEMENT REGARDING SOL GOING BACK TWO WEEKS.	0.30	750	225.00
12/15/21	CL	[GARCIA] RECEIPT AND REVIEW JOINT CMS FOR GARCIA ACTION; EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: SAME.	0.30	750	225.00
12/16/21	CL	EMAIL TO S. PARK RE: JOINT CMS IN BOTH PAGA AND CLASS ACTION AND REQUEST FOR REVISIONS AND TELEPHONE MEET AND CONFER; EMAIL FROM S. PARK RE: TELEPHONE CALL TO MEET AND CONFER.	0.40	750	300.00
12/17/21	CL	[GARCIA ACTION] EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: GARCIA ELECTRONIC SERVICE AGREEMENT.	0.20	750	150.00
12/17/21	CL	EMAIL FROM S. PARK RE: APPROVAL OF JOINT CMS IN PAGA AND CLASS	0.20	750	150.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
		ACTION.			
12/17/21	CL	EMAIL FROM H. KORDAB RE: APPROVAL OF JOINT CMS IN PAGA AND CLASS ACTION.	0.20	750	150.00
12/17/21	CL	[CLASS] REVISE AND FINALIZE JOINT CMS.	0.90	750	675.00
12/17/21	CL	[PAGA] REVISE AND FINALIZE JOINT CMS.	0.80	750	600.00
12/17/21	CL	EMAIL FROM/TO S. PARK RE: REVISION FROM FILE&SERVEXPRESS TO CASEANYWHERE.	0.30	750	225.00
12/20/21	CL	[MARQUEZ] EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN TO S. PARK RE: REVISIONS TO JOINT CMS.	0.20	750	150.00
12/23/21	CL	[PAGA] EMAIL FROM COURTCALL RE: CONFIRMATION IN PREPARATION FOR HEARING.	0.20	750	150.00
12/28/21	CL	[CLASS/PAGA] ATTEND CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE; DRAFT MEMORANDUM TO FILE RE: COURT'S ORDER; EMAIL TO S. LIDMAN RE: SAME.	1.40	750	1,050.00
01/04/22	CL	[MARQUEZ] EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN TO S. PARK RE: CONTINUING OF CMC.	0.20	750	150.00
01/06/22	CL	EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT AND STIPULATION.	0.20	750	150.00
01/07/22	AR	RECEIVE AND COMPARE DRAFT COMPLAINT TO CLAIMS IN OPERATIVE COMPLAINT; DRAFT SUMMARY.	1.00	550	550.00
01/10/22	AR	REVIEW STIPULATION AND AMENDED COMPLAINT; TELECONFERENCE WITH CTL REGARDING FILING OF CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT.	0.70	550	385.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
01/10/22	CL	EMAILS TO/FROM S. LIDMAN RE: CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT OF 3 CLAIMS MARQUEZ AND GARCIA.	0.30	750	225.00
01/10/22	CL	FINALIZE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT; DISCUSS WITH NORM RE: SAME.	0.50	750	375.00
01/19/22	CL	EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: UPDATED PROOF OF SERVICE AND E-SERVICE AGREEMENT.	0.20	750	150.00
01/21/22	CL	EMAIL FROM CASE ANYWHERE RE: CONFIRMATION OF REGISTRATION; RECEIPT AND REVIEW SERVICE INITIATION MEMO FROM CASE ANYWHERE.	0.30	750	225.00
02/14/22	CL	EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND CONFERENCE CALL.	0.30	750	225.00
02/16/22	CL	TELEPHONE CALL WITH S. LIDMAN RE: DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED AND BELAIRE-WEST NOTICE.	0.30	750	225.00
02/24/22	CL	REVISE BELAIRE-WEST NOTICE; EMAIL TO/FROM S. LIDMAN RE: SAME; TELEPHONE CALL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED AND CLASS DEFINITION; REVISE BELAIRE-WEST NOTICE VERSION 3.	0.80	750	600.00
02/24/22	CL	FINALIZE BELAIRE-WEST NOTICE; EMAIL TO M. KORDABLA RE: PROPOSED BELAIRE-WEST NOTICE AND UPDATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE AGREEMENT; EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: APPROVAL AND FINAL OF BELAIRE-WEST NOTICE.	0.50	750	375.00
02/25/22	CL	EMAIL FROM S. LIDMAN RE: DRAFT PROPOUNDED DISCOVERY.	0.20	750	150.00
03/01/22	CL	REVISE REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION, ONE, SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES, SET ONE, EMPLOYMENT	1.40	750	1,050.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
		INTERROGATORIES, SET ONE (GENERAL AND EMPLOYMENT); EMAIL TO S. LIDMAN RE: SAME.			
03/01/22	CL	EMAIL FROM/TO S. PARK RE: EXTENSION TO RESPOND TO BELAIRE-WEST NOTICE GIVEN DEATH IN THE FAMILY.	0.30	750	225.00
03/08/22	CL	RECEIPT AND REVIEW BELAIRE-WEST REVISIONS; EMAIL FROM S. PARK RE: REDLINES.	0.20	750	150.00
03/09/22	CL	EMAIL TO S. PARK REQUESTING REDLINES TO BELAIRE-WEST REVISION.	0.20	750	150.00
03/13/22 17	VR	REVIEW & REVISE BELAIRE NOTICE; REVIEW CASE NOTES AND COMPLAINT; CORRESPONDENCE TO CO-COUNSEL	1.00	750	750.00
03/14/22 17	VR	REVIEW & REVISE BELAIRE NOTICE; CORRESPONDENCE TO CO-COUNSEL; FOLLOW UP	1.50	750	1,125.00
03/28/22 15	VR	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PARTIES; REVIEW DISCOVERY RESPONSES AND STATUS OF DISCOVERY; ADVISE AGR	0.50	750	375.00
03/28/22	AR	RECEIVE AND REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE FROM OPPOSING COUNSEL; DRAFT FOLLOW UP CORRESPONDENCE.	0.50	550	275.00
04/05/22	AR	RECEIVE AND REVIEW PROPOSED MAILING DOCUMENTS FROM ILYM REGARDING BELAIRE-WEST NOTICE; DRAFT FOLLOW UP CORRESPONDENCE.	0.80	550	440.00
04/13/22	AR	MULTIPLE CORRESPONDENCE WITH CO-COUNSEL REGARDING DISCOVERY; REVIEW COMPLAINT FOR RELATED CASE AND DRAFT SUMMARY CORRESPONDENCE.	1.30	550	715.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
04/14/22	AR	REVIEW PRIOR DISCOVERY REQUESTS; MULTIPLE CORRESPONDENCE WITH CO-COUNSEL AND OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING EXTENSION.	0.50	550	275.00
05/05/22	AR	REVIEW FILE AND ORDERS FOR STATUS; CONFIRM FILING OF FAC; DRAFT REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL OF PAGA ACTION AND PROOF OF SERVICE; SUBMIT FOR FILING.	1.20	550	660.00
05/14/22 15	VR	REVIEW CLASS LIST PRODUCTION; REVIEW DOCUMENT PRODUCTION; FOLLOW UP	0.50	750	375.00
05/16/22	AR	RECEIVE AND REVIEW CLASS LIST; DRAFT FOLLOW UP CORRESPONDENCE WITH CO-COUNSEL.	0.60	550	330.00
05/16/22	AR	RECEIVE AND REVIEW DRAFT NOTICE TO CLASS MEMBERS; DRAFT FOLLOW UP CORRESPONDENCE WITH VR AND CO-COUNSEL.	0.60	550	330.00
05/26/22	AR	REVIEW AND OUTLINE DISCOVERY RESPONSES; CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING MEET AND CONFER ISSUES WITH CO-COUNSEL.	1.60	550	880.00
06/13/22	AR	REVIEW FILE AND DOCKET FOR STATUS IN ADVANCE OF DRAFTING JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT; DRAFT SUMMARY.	0.70	550	385.00
06/13/22	AR	REVIEW FILE AND DOCKET FOR STATUS OF DISMISSAL IN PAGA ACTION; DRAFT FOLLOW UP CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING DISMISSAL.	0.50	550	275.00
06/13/22	AR	MULTIPLE CORRESPONDENCE WITH CO-COUNSEL REGARDING JOINT STATEMENT.	0.50	550	275.00
06/14/22	AR	REVIEW FILE AND DOCKET FOR STATUS; DRAFT OSC STATEMENT RE	1.00	550	550.00

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ATTY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
		DISMISSAL.			
06/14/22	AR	REVIEW FILE FOR STATUS; DRAFT JOINT STATEMENT IN CLASS ACTION AND CIRCULATE TO CO-COUNSEL.	1.20	550	660.00
06/14/22	AR	REVIEW AND OUTLINE DRAFT MEET AND CONFER LETTER; CORRESPONDENCE WITH CO-COUNSEL REGARDING THE SAME.	0.80	550	440.00

TOTAL BILLED HOURS

ANDREW RONAN	14.10 hr @ 550.00	\$ 7,755.00
CHRISTINE LEVU	16.30 hr @ 750.00	\$ 12,225.00
NICK DEBLOUW	32.60 hr @ 850.00	\$ 27,710.00
RICO EHMANN	16.75 hr @ 675.00	\$ 11,306.25
SCOTT BLUMENTHAL	10.40 hr @ 450.00	\$ 4,680.00
VICTORIA RIVAPALACIO	3.50 hr @ 750.00	\$ 2,625.00

TOTAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

93.65

\$ 66,301.25

COSTS ADVANCED

05/28/21	PAGA FILING FEE	75.00
08/27/21	ONELEGAL/FILING FEE	12.35
10/07/21	COURT COSTS/PULLING DOCS FROM DOCKET	1.50
10/07/21	COURT COSTS/PULLING DOCS FROM DOCKET	3.50
10/07/21	COURT COSTS/PULLING DOCS FROM DOCKET	6.50
10/07/21	COURT COSTS/PULLING DOCS FROM DOCKET	22.00
10/12/21	FILING FEE/ONELEGAL FEE	1,567.41
10/13/21	FILING FEE/ONELEGAL FEE	1,603.45
11/24/21	ONE LEGAL FEE/FILING FEE	108.87
11/24/21	ONE LEGAL FEE/FILING FEE	108.87
12/22/21	[PAGA] ONE LEGAL E-FILING - CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT.	69.49

<u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
12/29/21	COURTCALL APPEARANCE - CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE.	94.00
01/20/22	ONE LEGAL E-FILING; FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT.	162.15
04/10/22	CASE ANYWHERE	105.30
05/05/22	DOCUMENT RETRIEVAL FEE.	<u>33.50</u>
	TOTAL COSTS ADVANCED	<u>\$ 3,973.89</u>
TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES		<u>\$ 70,275.14</u>

EXHIBIT #4

Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik DeBlouw LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CA - California 92037-3107

INVOICE

Invoice # 4
Date: 11/01/2023
Due On: 12/01/2023

Willie Marquez
2250 Treehouse Lane #101
Corona, CA 92879

CA2271

Accurate Delivery Systems

Services

Type	Date	Notes	Quantity	Rate	Total
Service	06/15/2022	Revise, finalize, file and serve joint statement; correspondence with opposing counsel regarding the same.	1.00	\$550.00	\$550.00
Service	06/15/2022	Revise, finalize, file and serve OSC statement.	0.80	\$550.00	\$440.00
Service	06/20/2022	Multiple correspondence with co-counsel and opposing counsel regarding meet and confer call.	0.50	\$550.00	\$275.00
Service	06/22/2022	Review file in advance of meet and confer call; draft summary.	0.80	\$550.00	\$440.00
Service	06/22/2022	Attend meet and confer call; follow up call with co-counsel; draft follow up correspondence.	0.60	\$550.00	\$330.00
Service	06/23/2022	Follow up correspondence with co-counsel regarding motion to compel timeline; draft follow up correspondence.	0.60	\$550.00	\$330.00
Service	06/24/2022	Review joint statement and docket regarding appearance; draft follow up correspondence.	0.80	\$550.00	\$440.00
Service	06/27/2022	Review and Analyze: CMC statement, court's orders, and docket; review correspondence between parties; review report re CMC; advise AGR	0.60	\$750.00	\$450.00
Service	06/27/2022	Correspondence with co-counsel regarding CMC.	0.30	\$550.00	\$165.00
Service	06/27/2022	Review file and docket for status of OSC hearing; draft	0.70	\$550.00	\$385.00

		follow up correspondence.			
Service	06/27/2022	Prepare for and attend CMC/OSC hearings; draft and circulate summary.	1.50	\$550.00	\$825.00
Service	07/07/2022	Multiple correspondence with co-counsel regarding mediation data request; draft follow up correspondence.	0.50	\$550.00	\$275.00
Service	07/07/2022	Review and extract relevant Defendant documents; develop exhibit book.	2.80	\$550.00	\$1,540.00
Service	07/07/2022	Review and extract relevant Plaintiff documents; develop exhibit book.	1.60	\$550.00	\$880.00
Service	07/07/2022	Receive and review notice from Court regarding dismissal; draft follow up correspondence.	0.60	\$550.00	\$330.00
Service	08/02/2022	Review and outline pleadings; draft mediation data request; submit to AB for review.	1.00	\$550.00	\$550.00
Service	08/03/2022	Receive and review revisions from co-counsel to mediation data request; draft follow up correspondence.	0.40	\$550.00	\$220.00
Service	08/03/2022	Revise, finalize and send mediation data request to opposing counsel.	0.80	\$550.00	\$440.00
Service	08/23/2022	Review mediation confirmation letter. Prep for mediation.	2.00	\$895.00	\$1,790.00
Service	09/15/2022	Review file and prior correspondence regarding status of motion to compel deadline; draft and circulate summary; follow up correspondence with CJ regarding the same.	0.70	\$550.00	\$385.00
Service	09/15/2022	Receipt and Review of Correspondence: review correspondence between the parties; review discovery and deadlines; advise CTL	0.60	\$750.00	\$450.00
Service	09/20/2022	Review and Revise: review and revise CMC statement; correspondence to Defendant	0.70	\$750.00	\$525.00
Service	12/08/2022	Receive and review stipulation; revise and submit for filing.	0.60	\$550.00	\$330.00
Service	12/12/2022	Review docket for status of filing of stipulation to continue CMC; draft follow up correspondence.	0.50	\$550.00	\$275.00
Service	12/19/2022	Retrieve and review order; follow up correspondence regarding CMC.	0.40	\$550.00	\$220.00
Service	01/11/2023	Review case file and piece rate pay information. Legal research regarding piece rate claims in California and minimum wage pay. Status update to two Plaintiffs.	0.80	\$850.00	\$680.00
Service	01/24/2023	Receive and review response and documents from opposing counsel; correspondence with co-counsel regarding the same.	0.80	\$550.00	\$440.00

Service	01/31/2023	Multiple correspondence with co-counsel regarding mediation data; follow up with AB regarding the same.	0.50	\$550.00	\$275.00
Service	02/02/2023	Review file, organize and Bates stamp 1198.5 docs, update FC	1.00	\$250.00	\$250.00
Service	02/03/2023	Review case file to determine calendared dates	0.25	\$250.00	\$62.50
Service	02/09/2023	Review and analyze data produced for mediation purposes. Analyze discovery to date. Analyze court docket and case file and prepare for mediation.	4.50	\$850.00	\$3,825.00
Service	02/17/2023	Legal research regarding previous settlements with similar claims and workweeks for mediation valuation. Review and revise mediation brief. Prepare for mediation.	5.30	\$850.00	\$4,505.00
Service	02/23/2023	Receive and review draft mediation brief; draft follow up correspondence.	1.00	\$550.00	\$550.00
Service	02/28/2023	Speak with client in advance of mediation, analyze claims, advise AJB	2.60	\$450.00	\$1,170.00
Service	03/02/2023	Add individual claims to case notes, calculate individual damages, advise AJB	2.80	\$450.00	\$1,260.00
Service	03/03/2023	Review timeline and prepare update for mediation data.	0.40	\$550.00	\$220.00
Service	03/03/2023	Prepare for mediation, review and analyze mediation brief, advise AJB	2.80	\$450.00	\$1,260.00
Service	03/06/2023	Email to Cherkassky re: request for plaintiffs' email information.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	03/06/2023	Multiple correspondence regarding mediation; review Defendant's brief.	1.00	\$550.00	\$550.00
Service	03/07/2023	Attend mediation	8.00	\$450.00	\$3,600.00
Service	03/07/2023	Prep and appear for mediation.	4.00	\$895.00	\$3,580.00
Service	03/07/2023	Email case manager re correct email address for Mikhael	0.20	\$250.00	\$50.00
Service	03/07/2023	Call cls re sign confidentiality agreement, Marquez OK, Mikhael didn't answer, left a vm	0.50	\$250.00	\$125.00
Service	03/08/2023	Review and analyze mediation notes. Review MOU terms. Send to two Plaintiffs for signatures. Conference with Plaintiffs to go over questions and process of settlement.	1.40	\$850.00	\$1,190.00
Service	03/09/2023	Email CVL regarding current status of case and to ask if there are new docs, depositions, that I should see before starting calls.	0.17	\$250.00	\$41.67
Service	03/14/2023	Review and analyze MOU for purposes of remand or amending prior to final approval.	0.50	\$750.00	\$375.00

Service	03/14/2023	Review status; respond to CL questions; review emails and signed MOU	0.50	\$950.00	\$475.00
Service	03/14/2023	Email to/from K. Hernandez re: request for estimate of class administration.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	03/14/2023	Text Client Mikhael re we got signed doc	0.20	\$250.00	\$50.00
Service	03/15/2023	Review and revise Long Form Settlement Agreement.	2.40	\$750.00	\$1,800.00
Service	03/15/2023	Email to S. Lidman re: class administration bid from ILYM.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	03/15/2023	Review and analyze class administration bid from ILYM; Email from K. Hernandez re: same.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	03/16/2023	Review complaint, Def docs, handbook, meal and rest policy, pay codes, etc	1.00	\$250.00	\$250.00
Service	03/16/2023	Review MOU, advise CL.	0.75	\$995.00	\$746.25
Service	03/20/2023	Review and revise draft Agreement; emails re Admin issue; review estimates	2.00	\$950.00	\$1,900.00
Service	03/20/2023	Update discovery chart re MOU signed on 3/14/23, CoCo handling settlement	0.20	\$250.00	\$50.00
Service	03/21/2023	Email to team about Sac practices	0.17	\$250.00	\$41.67
Service	03/22/2023	Email from/to S. Lidman re: Notice of Settlement and Stipulation to continue CMC.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	03/22/2023	Review and revise Joint Notice of Settlement and Stipulation to continue CMC.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	03/22/2023	Email to/from S. Park re: revisions to Joint Notice of Settlement and Stipulation to continue CMC.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	03/24/2023	Review and analyze Defendant's revisions to Long Form Settlement Agreement.	0.50	\$750.00	\$375.00
Service	03/27/2023	Receive and review joint statement; draft multiple correspondence with RH regarding the same.	0.50	\$550.00	\$275.00
Service	03/27/2023	Preparation of Joint Status Report; and contemporaneous comprehensive review of relevant file materials.	0.80	\$475.00	\$380.00
Service	03/28/2023	Multiple communications with counsel regarding Joint Status Report; revision and finalization of Report pursuant to communications; file and service of the same in accordance with local court rules.	1.90	\$475.00	\$902.50
Service	03/28/2023	Communications with Yadira De La Rosa regarding agreement relating to service of documents upon Accurate Delivery Systems.	0.10	\$475.00	\$47.50
Service	03/28/2023	Review and revise draft Class Notice; email co-counsel	0.80	\$950.00	\$760.00

		re issues			
Service	03/28/2023	Receipt, review, and analysis of Court's Order re Joint Notice of Settlement and Stipulation to Continue Case Management Conference, and determination as to further handling.	0.20	\$475.00	\$95.00
Service	03/28/2023	Teleconference with RH regarding joint statement and continuance; review docket and draft follow up correspondence.	0.50	\$550.00	\$275.00
Service	04/11/2023	Review draft motion; email s with co-counsel re motion; review revisions to draft motion	1.00	\$950.00	\$950.00
Service	04/11/2023	Review and analyze settlement agreement for conformity with MOU terms. Send to two plaintiffs for review and signatures. Follow up calls and emails to Plaintiffs to explain terms and obtain signatures.	1.50	\$850.00	\$1,275.00
Service	04/12/2023	Review final agreement; prepare signatures; email to counsel	0.40	\$950.00	\$380.00
Service	04/17/2023	Email form S. Lidman re: Garcia's signature to settlement agreement.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	04/17/2023	Email form S. Park re: Garcia's signature to settlement agreement.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	04/25/2023	review revised draft motion; draft declaration ISO motion; email co-counsel re final issues	1.00	\$950.00	\$950.00
Service	04/25/2023	Review file; draft declaration of Willie Marquez in support of preliminary approval/service award request; email to client re declaration draft	2.75	\$675.00	\$1,856.25
Service	04/25/2023	Review file; draft declaration of Ahdy Mikhael in support of preliminary approval/service award request; email to client re declaration draft	1.25	\$675.00	\$843.75
Service	04/27/2023	review and revise declaration; prepare final declaration email co-counsel	0.50	\$950.00	\$475.00
Service	04/28/2023	Telephone call S. Park re following up on Long Form Settlement Agreement.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	07/13/2023	Review tentative and discuss with co-counsel; prepare for hearing; appear for hearing; memo to file	1.00	\$950.00	\$950.00
Service	07/24/2023	Develop plan regarding pending CMC and CMC Statement by comprehensive review of relevant file materials, including pleadings, filings, settlement documents, and dockets on two related matters.	0.40	\$675.00	\$270.00
Service	07/26/2023	Review and analyze administration timeline; Email from K. Lee at Phoenix re: same.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	07/26/2023	Develop plan re pending deadline to file CMC statement by review of relevant file materials, Court	0.30	\$675.00	\$202.50

		docket, and correspondence with counsel.			
Service	08/02/2023	Email from K. Lee re: class dataset to administrator.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	08/10/2023	Email from K. Lee re: class information for administration.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	08/14/2023	Email from K. Lee re: Court Order re: Preliminary Approval.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	08/17/2023	Review Admin documents and respond	0.40	\$950.00	\$380.00
Service	09/12/2023	Review pay stubs exemplars for wage statement violations. Analyze pay codes for non-discretionary incentive pay. Review code of federal regulations for exclusions to overtime. Conference with two plaintiffs regarding facts and claims for mediation brief.	3.90	\$850.00	\$3,315.00
Service	09/22/2023	Email from K. Lee re: weekly report re administration.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	09/25/2023	Review and download order granting motion for preliminary approval.	0.40	\$750.00	\$300.00
Service	09/26/2023	Email to S. Lidman re: motion for final approval and motion for fees and costs.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	09/26/2023	Email from S. Lidman re: meet and confer re: preliminary approval and fee motions papers.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	10/20/2023	Email from K. Lee re: administrator report; review and analyze same.	0.30	\$750.00	\$225.00
Service	10/24/2023	Review and analyze docket and preliminary approval order in preparation for final approval and fees motion; Discuss with Kyle re: same.	0.40	\$750.00	\$300.00
Service	10/24/2023	Email to S. Lidman re: firm declaration for fees; Email to P. Haines re: firm declaration for fees.	0.20	\$750.00	\$150.00
Service	10/24/2023	Review questions from CL regarding procedure and status; review issues and advise CL; review emails with co-counsel and respond	0.40	\$950.00	\$380.00
Service	10/24/2023	Follow up with Co-Plaintiff re Fees declaration; confirm co-plaintiff responded via email	0.20	\$250.00	\$50.00
Service	10/24/2023	Emails from/to S. Lidman re: final approval motions and declarations; Receipt and review Hanes and Lidman declarations in support of motion for final approval.	0.50	\$750.00	\$375.00
Service	10/24/2023	Review status and documents; work on approval issues; draft final approval order; email co-counsel; review co-counsel declarations	2.50	\$950.00	\$2,375.00
Service	10/25/2023	Review draft Admin declaration; prepare pleading form; email Admin.	0.75	\$950.00	\$712.50
Service	10/27/2023	Draft Motion for Final Approval and Costs and Fees.	5.40	\$750.00	\$4,050.00

Service	10/27/2023	Work on approval issues; review billing and advise staff as to corrections; review and revise draft motion; email cp-counsel	2.50	\$950.00	\$2,375.00
Service	10/30/2023	Review and revise motion for final approval; email Defendant.	1.50	\$950.00	\$1,425.00
Service	10/30/2023	Send latest draft of MFA to CTL via email	0.20	\$250.00	\$50.00
Service	10/30/2023	Draft Declaration of K. Nordrehaug in support of motion for final approval and fees and costs.	3.60	\$750.00	\$2,700.00
Service	10/31/2023	Run costs in Clio and Tussman for MFA and Attorney's fees	0.40	\$250.00	\$100.00
Service	10/31/2023	Follow up with client via email re phone meeting with AGR, set up meeting for 11/01 at noon	0.40	\$250.00	\$100.00
Service	10/31/2023	Revise Declaration of Kyle Nordrehaug in support of final approval; Revise Motion for Final Approval.	0.80	\$750.00	\$600.00
Service	10/31/2023	Review and revise proposed order and motion	0.75	\$950.00	\$712.50
Service	11/01/2023	Review and revise declaration ISO motion; prepare final approval motion for final; file and serve motion.	2.50	\$950.00	\$2,375.00
Services Subtotal					\$79,699.59

Expenses

Type	Date	Notes	Quantity	Rate	Total
Expense	06/17/2022	OneLegal filing fee.	1.00	\$72.07	\$72.07
Expense	06/22/2022	OneLegal filing fee.	1.00	\$149.28	\$149.28
Expense	06/22/2022	OneLegal filing fee.	1.00	\$157.51	\$157.51
Expense	06/28/2022	CourtCall appearance fee.	1.00	\$94.00	\$94.00
Expense	06/28/2022	CourtCall appearance fee.	1.00	\$94.00	\$94.00
Expense	07/07/2022	Caseanywhere	1.00	\$141.00	\$141.00
Expense	08/23/2022	Mediation Fees - Frank Feder	1.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Expense	10/09/2022	Case Anywhere Fees	1.00	\$135.00	\$135.00
Expense	10/21/2022	Document retrieval fee.	1.00	\$2.00	\$2.00
Expense	10/31/2022	Document retrieval fee.	1.00	\$2.50	\$2.50
Expense	01/09/2023	Case Anywhere Fee	1.00	\$135.00	\$135.00
Expense	03/08/2023	Berger Consulting	1.00	\$825.00	\$825.00
Expense	04/16/2023	Case Anywhere Fees.	1.00	\$135.00	\$135.00

Expense	07/03/2023	Case Anywhere Fees.	1.00	\$135.00	\$135.00
Expense	10/05/2023	Case Anywhere Fee.	1.00	\$135.00	\$135.00
Expense	11/01/2023	Filing fee - motion	1.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Expenses Subtotal					\$7,272.36

Time Keeper	Quantity	Rate	Total
AJ Bhowmik	6.0	\$895.00	\$5,370.00
Norm Blumenthal	0.75	\$995.00	\$746.25
Scott Blumenthal	16.2	\$450.00	\$7,290.00
Nicholas De Blouw	17.4	\$850.00	\$14,790.00
Ricardo Ehmann	4.0	\$675.00	\$2,700.00
Randy Hy	0.7	\$675.00	\$472.50
Randy Hy	3.0	\$475.00	\$1,425.00
Christine LeVu	19.3	\$750.00	\$14,475.00
Kyle Nordrehaug	18.5	\$950.00	\$17,575.00
Victoria Rivapalacio	1.9	\$750.00	\$1,425.00
Andrew Ronan	22.2	\$550.00	\$12,210.00
Frederick Goldman	1.58	\$250.00	\$395.84
Adolfo Sanchez Contreras	3.3	\$250.00	\$825.00
Subtotal			\$86,971.95
Total			\$86,971.95

Detailed Statement of Account

Current Invoice

Invoice Number	Due On	Amount Due	Payments Received	Balance Due
4	12/01/2023	\$86,971.95	\$0.00	\$86,971.95
Outstanding Balance				\$86,971.95
Total Amount Outstanding				\$86,971.95

Please make all amounts payable to: Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik DeBlouw LLP

Please pay within 30 days.

EXHIBIT #5

LAFFEY MATRIX

[History](#)
[Case Law](#)
[See the Matrix](#)
[Contact us](#)
[Home](#)

			Years Out of Law School *				
Year	Adjustmt Factor**	Paralegal/ Law Clerk	1-3	4-7	8-10	11-19	20 +
6/01/22- 5/31/23	1.085091	\$225	\$413	\$508	\$733	\$829	\$997
6/01/21- 5/31/22	1.006053	\$208	\$381	\$468	\$676	\$764	\$919
6/01/20- 5/31/21	1.015894	\$206	\$378	\$465	\$672	\$759	\$914
6/01/19- 5/31/20	1.0049	\$203	\$372	\$458	\$661	\$747	\$899
6/01/18- 5/31/19	1.0350	\$202	\$371	\$455	\$658	\$742	\$894
6/01/17- 5/31/18	1.0463	\$196	\$359	\$440	\$636	\$717	\$864
6/01/16- 5/31/17	1.0369	\$187	\$343	\$421	\$608	\$685	\$826
6/01/15- 5/31/16	1.0089	\$180	\$331	\$406	\$586	\$661	\$796
6/01/14- 5/31/15	1.0235	\$179	\$328	\$402	\$581	\$655	\$789
6/01/13- 5/31/14	1.0244	\$175	\$320	\$393	\$567	\$640	\$771
6/01/12- 5/31/13	1.0258	\$170	\$312	\$383	\$554	\$625	\$753
6/01/11- 5/31/12	1.0352	\$166	\$305	\$374	\$540	\$609	\$734
6/01/10- 5/31/11	1.0337	\$161	\$294	\$361	\$522	\$589	\$709
6/01/09- 5/31/10	1.0220	\$155	\$285	\$349	\$505	\$569	\$686
6/01/08- 5/31/09	1.0399	\$152	\$279	\$342	\$494	\$557	\$671
6/01/07-5/31/08	1.0516	\$146	\$268	\$329	\$475	\$536	\$645
6/01/06-5/31/07	1.0256	\$139	\$255	\$313	\$452	\$509	\$614
6/1/05-5/31/06	1.0427	\$136	\$249	\$305	\$441	\$497	\$598
6/1/04-5/31/05	1.0455	\$130	\$239	\$293	\$423	\$476	\$574
6/1/03-6/1/04	1.0507	\$124	\$228	\$280	\$405	\$456	\$549
6/1/02-5/31/03	1.0727	\$118	\$217	\$267	\$385	\$434	\$522
6/1/01-5/31/02	1.0407	\$110	\$203	\$249	\$359	\$404	\$487
6/1/00-5/31/01	1.0529	\$106	\$195	\$239	\$345	\$388	\$468
6/1/99-5/31/00	1.0491	\$101	\$185	\$227	\$328	\$369	\$444
6/1/98-5/31/99	1.0439	\$96	\$176	\$216	\$312	\$352	\$424
6/1/97-5/31/98	1.0419	\$92	\$169	\$207	\$299	\$337	\$406
6/1/96-5/31/97	1.0396	\$88	\$162	\$198	\$287	\$323	\$389
6/1/95-5/31/96	1.032	\$85	\$155	\$191	\$276	\$311	\$375
6/1/94-5/31/95	1.0237	\$82	\$151	\$185	\$267	\$301	\$363

The methodology of calculation and benchmarking for this Updated Laffey Matrix has been approved in a number of cases. See, e.g., *DL v. District of Columbia*, 267 F.Supp.3d 55, 69 (D.D.C. 2017)

* $i_{\frac{1}{2}}$ Years Out of Law School $i_{\frac{1}{2}}$ is calculated from June 1 of each year, when most law students graduate. $i_{\frac{1}{2}}1-3$ " includes an attorney in his 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of practice, measured from date of graduation (June 1). $i_{\frac{1}{2}}4-7$ " applies to attorneys in their 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th years of practice. An attorney who graduated in May 1996 would be in tier $i_{\frac{1}{2}}1-3$ " from June 1, 1996 until May 31, 1999, would move into tier $i_{\frac{1}{2}}4-7$ " on June 1, 1999, and tier $i_{\frac{1}{2}}8-10$ " on June 1, 2003.

** The Adjustment Factor refers to the nation-wide Legal Services Component of the Consumer Price Index produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT #6

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (SBN 068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (SBN 205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (SBN 248066)

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858) 551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

[Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

WILLIE MARQUEZ and AHDY MIKHAEL,
on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all
persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ACCURATE DELIVERY SYSTEMS, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB2125337

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon.
David Cohn, Dept. S-26]*

**DECLARATION OF WILLIE
MARQUEZ IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Date: July 13, 2023

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept.: S-26

Complaint Filed: August 31, 2021

Trial Date: None Set

LIDMAN LAW, APC

Scott M. Lidman (SBN 199433)

slidman@lidmanlaw.com

Elizabeth Nguyen(SBN 238571)

enguyen@lidmanlaw.com

Milan Moore, Esq. (SBN 308095)

mmoore@lidmanlaw.com

2155 Campus Drive, Ste 150

El Segundo, CA 90245

Tel: 424-322-4772

Fax: 424-322-4775

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)

phaines@haineslawgroup.com

2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180

El Segundo, CA 90245

Tel: (424) 292-2350

Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1 I, Willie Marquez, declare as follows:

2 1. I am over the age of eighteen, a Plaintiff and a proposed Class Representative in the
3 above-entitled matter. I submit this declaration in support of the Motion for Preliminary
4 Approval of Class Action Settlement and in support of my application for a Class Representative
5 Service Award.
6

7 2. I have personal knowledge of all the facts stated herein. I could and would competently
8 testify under oath to these facts in court if requested to do so.

9 3. I worked as a delivery driver for Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. ("Accurate
10 Delivery Systems") in California from April of 2018 to September of 2020. I was classified by
11 Accurate Delivery Systems as a non-exempt employee during that time period.
12

13 4. I retained my attorneys who are experienced in both class action and PAGA
14 representative action litigation and claims against employers for violations of the California
15 Labor Code. I have no personal relationship or family ties to my attorneys or any officer of the
16 Court. I am not aware of having any actual or potential conflicts of interest with another class
17 member in this case nor am I aware of having any actual or potential conflicts of interest with
18 Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions, the settlement administrator. I am not aware of
19 any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely
20 affected by this settlement.
21

22 5. I decided to file this class action lawsuit and be a plaintiff/class representative because
23 I felt that my legal rights as an employee and others like me were violated. For example,
24 Accurate Delivery Systems failed to compensate me for all the time I worked, such as the time I
25 spent waiting for customers, fueling the delivery vans, washing the delivery vans, completing
26 paperwork and conducting pre- and post-shift inspections on the vans at the beginning and end of
27

1 shifts. Also, my meal periods were often late, short or missed entirely and I did not receive the
2 meal period premium payments I should have received for these violations. I also had to use my
3 personal cell phone for work-related purposes such as communicating with dispatch, customers
4 and supervisors. Accurate Delivery Systems, however, did not reimburse me for reasonable
5 cellular phone expenses I incurred for the benefit of the company.
6

7 6. This class action case was filed on August 31, 2021. Before the complaint was filed I
8 spoke to my attorneys several times and discussed how Accurate Delivery Systems implemented
9 its company policies and procedures. I also assisted my attorneys in their investigation into my
10 claims by providing them documents and answering their questions. I reviewed the complaint
11 before it was filed and after it was filed I was given access to an electronic file sharing program
12 that alerted me via email when important documents were filed so that I could review them and
13 keep up with the developments in the case which I understood was one of my duties as a class
14 representative. I would also contact my attorneys from time to time if I had any questions about
15 the case.
16

17 7. Even though this action is in the process of settling, I was and remain prepared to
18 perform all the duties of a class representative. I understand that as a class representative I have
19 assumed a fiduciary responsibility to prosecute this class action on behalf of the absent class
20 members. I have understood that as a fiduciary, I have a duty to prosecute this action for the
21 benefit of the class members and surrender any right to compromise the group action for an
22 individual gain.
23

24 8. I understood that being a plaintiff/class representative in this case meant that I
25 was seeking damages not only for myself but also other current and/or former delivery drivers
26 working for Accurate Delivery Systems in California. I felt that these individuals were not
27

aware of their labor law rights and even if they were they would probably be apprehensive about speaking up or even simply because of the time, effort and risk involved in filing a class action lawsuit.

9. I understood that being a part of this lawsuit involved risks. For example, my attorneys explained to me that if the case went to trial and we lost, I could be held responsible to pay for all or part of the attorney fees and costs paid by Accurate Delivery Systems to defend this lawsuit. Also, I knew there was a risk that future employers, if they ever found out about this lawsuit, could hold it against me or downgrade me as a potential hire. As a named Plaintiff in this case it would not be difficult for a future employer to become aware that I sued a former employer for labor law violations. Ultimately I decided these risks were worth it and decided to fight for my rights and the rights of others regardless of the risks, time and effort I spent on this case.

10. During the lawsuit I stayed in touch with my attorneys by phone and email. I also kept up to date on important developments by reviewing court filings that were made available to me electronically as I described above.

11. A mediation took place on March 7, 2023 with Lynn Frank, a well-respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. Following the all-day mediation session, the parties agreed to settle the action. I communicated with my attorneys regarding the terms of the settlement which was reached between the parties and understood that I was representing absent class members and therefore wanted the best possible result to be obtained for the class members and I believe a very positive result was in fact achieved via settlement. I reviewed and signed the Memorandum of Understanding on March 9, 2023 and when the final settlement papers were ready, I closely reviewed the Settlement Agreement which I signed on April 11,

1 2023.

2 12. I have been actively involved with this class action lawsuit performing the duties
3 described above. Although I did not keep time records, I was in regular contact with my
4 attorneys, reviewed court filings, and spent a significant amount of time on the issues presented
5 during the lawsuit and in the settlement process. I estimate that I spent approximately 40-50
6 hours working on this case up until this point. I believe I have been diligent and have done what
7 is expected of a named plaintiff and a proposed class representative to date, and will continue to
8 do so. I have and always will maintain the best interest of the class members.
9

10 13. My attorneys explained to me that the settlement process involves a two-step
11 review by the Court to determine whether the settlement is fair before approving the settlement.
12 I know this process also involves notifying all class members of the settlement terms and of their
13 rights to make a claim for their settlement share, to opt out of the settlement or to object to the
14 settlement.
15

16 14. I believe I did the right thing by filing this case on behalf of the class members who,
17 subject to court approval, are in line to receive monetary payments as a result of this case and
18 settlement. This is money they may never have ever gotten if I did not pursue this action on their
19 behalf. I feel significant personal satisfaction to know that I played a role in the class members
20 being entitled to monetary payments as a result of the filing of this lawsuit. I also believe that
21 the requested Class Representative Service Award of \$10,000 from the settlement is fair
22 compensation for the work I performed and the risks I undertook.
23

24 15. As part of the settlement it was necessary for me to sign a general release of all
25 claims I may have against Accurate Delivery Systems. I believe the Class Representative
26 Service Award I have requested provides me with some compensation for this agreed release.
27

16. I have not entered into any undisclosed agreements nor have I received any undisclosed compensation in this case. The only compensation I will receive is whatever amount the Court approves as a service award, as well as my share as a class member of the settlement fund.

17. In light of all the time and effort I have spent on this case, the risk I undertook by suing a former employer, the exposure to being responsible for paying Accurate Delivery Systems' costs in the event we did not win the case, the reputational risk that future employers may hold this lawsuit against me, the general release, and in light of the size of the settlement, I believe the request for \$10,000 as a Class Representative service award is fair and reasonable.

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

Executed on Apr 26, 2023, at Corona, CA.
(city, state)

Willie Marquez

Willie Marquez (Apr 26, 2023 18:00 PDT)

Willie Marquez

EXHIBIT #7

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

2 Norman B. Blumenthal (SBN 068687)

3 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (SBN 205975)

4 Aparajit Bhowmik (SBN 248066)

5 2255 Calle Clara

6 La Jolla, CA 92037

7 Telephone: (858) 551-1223

8 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

10 [Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page]

11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

12 **COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO**

13 WILLIE MARQUEZ and AHDY MIKHAEL,
14 on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all
15 persons similarly situated,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 ACCURATE DELIVERY SYSTEMS, INC., a
19 California Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
20 inclusive,

21 Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB2125337

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon.
David Cohn, Dept. S-26]*

**DECLARATION OF AHDY
MIKHAEL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Date: July 13, 2023

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept.: S-26

Complaint Filed: August 31, 2021

Trial Date: None Set

LIDMAN LAW, APC

Scott M. Lidman (SBN 199433)

slidman@lidmanlaw.com

Elizabeth Nguyen(SBN 238571)

enguyen@lidmanlaw.com

Milan Moore, Esq. (SBN 308095)

mmoore@lidmanlaw.com

2155 Campus Drive, Ste 150

El Segundo, CA 90245

Tel: 424-322-4772

Fax: 424-322-4775

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)

phaines@haineslawgroup.com

2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180

El Segundo, CA 90245

Tel: (424) 292-2350

Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1 I, Ahdy Mikhael declare as follows:

2 1. I am over the age of eighteen, a Plaintiff and a proposed Class Representative in the
3 above-entitled matter. I submit this declaration in support of the Motion for Preliminary
4 Approval of Class Action Settlement and in support of my application for a Class Representative
5 Service Award.
6

7 2. I have personal knowledge of all the facts stated herein. I could and would competently
8 testify under oath to these facts in court if requested to do so.

9 3. I worked as a delivery driver for Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. ("Accurate
10 Delivery Systems") in California from November of 2019 to March of 2020. I was classified by
11 Accurate Delivery Systems as a non-exempt employee during that time period.
12

13 4. I retained my attorneys who are experienced in both class action and PAGA
14 representative action litigation and claims against employers for violations of the California
15 Labor Code. I have no personal relationship or family ties to my attorneys or any officer of the
16 Court. I am not aware of having any actual or potential conflicts of interest with another class
17 member in this case nor am I aware of having any actual or potential conflicts of interest with
18 Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions, the settlement administrator. I am not aware of
19 any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely
20 affected by this settlement.
21

22 5. I decided to file this class action lawsuit and be a plaintiff/class representative because
23 I felt that my legal rights as an employee and others like me were violated. For example,
24 Accurate Delivery Systems failed to compensate me for all the time I worked, such as the time I
25 spent waiting for customers, fueling the delivery vans, washing the delivery vans, completing
26 paperwork and conducting pre- and post-shift inspections on the vans at the beginning and end of
27

1 shifts. Also, my meal periods were often late, short or missed entirely and I did not receive the
2 meal period premium payments I should have received for these violations. I also had to use my
3 personal cell phone for work-related purposes such as communicating with dispatch, customers
4 and supervisors. Accurate Delivery Systems, however, did not reimburse me for reasonable
5 cellular phone expenses I incurred for the benefit of the company.
6

7 6. This class action case was filed on August 31, 2021. Before the complaint was filed I
8 spoke to my attorneys several times and discussed how Accurate Delivery Systems implemented
9 its company policies and procedures. I also assisted my attorneys in their investigation into my
10 claims by providing them documents and answering their questions. I reviewed the complaint
11 before it was filed and after it was filed I was given access to an electronic file sharing program
12 that alerted me via email when important documents were filed so that I could review them and
13 keep up with the developments in the case which I understood was one of my duties as a class
14 representative. I would also contact my attorneys from time to time if I had any questions about
15 the case.
16

17 7. Even though this action is in the process of settling, I was and remain prepared to
18 perform all the duties of a class representative. I understand that as a class representative I have
19 assumed a fiduciary responsibility to prosecute this class action on behalf of the absent class
20 members. I have understood that as a fiduciary, I have a duty to prosecute this action for the
21 benefit of the class members and surrender any right to compromise the group action for an
22 individual gain.
23

24 8. I understood that being a plaintiff/class representative in this case meant that I
25 was seeking damages not only for myself but also other current and/or former delivery drivers
26 working for Accurate Delivery Systems in California. I felt that these individuals were not
27

aware of their labor law rights and even if they were they would probably be apprehensive about speaking up or even simply because of the time, effort and risk involved in filing a class action lawsuit.

9. I understood that being a part of this lawsuit involved risks. For example, my attorneys explained to me that if the case went to trial and we lost, I could be held responsible to pay for all or part of the attorney fees and costs paid by Accurate Delivery Systems to defend this lawsuit. Also, I knew there was a risk that future employers, if they ever found out about this lawsuit, could hold it against me or downgrade me as a potential hire. As a named Plaintiff in this case it would not be difficult for a future employer to become aware that I sued a former employer for labor law violations. Ultimately I decided these risks were worth it and decided to fight for my rights and the rights of others regardless of the risks, time and effort I spent on this case.

10. During the lawsuit I stayed in touch with my attorneys by phone and email. I also kept up to date on important developments by reviewing court filings that were made available to me electronically as I described above.

11. A mediation took place on March 7, 2023 with Lynn Frank, a well-respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. Following the all-day mediation session, the parties agreed to settle the action. I communicated with my attorneys regarding the terms of the settlement which was reached between the parties and understood that I was representing absent class members and therefore wanted the best possible result to be obtained for the class members and I believe a very positive result was in fact achieved via settlement. I reviewed and signed the Memorandum of Understanding on March 13, 2023 and when the final settlement papers were ready, I closely reviewed the Settlement Agreement which I signed on April 11,

1 2023.

2 12. I have been actively involved with this class action lawsuit performing the duties
3 described above. Although I did not keep time records, I was in regular contact with my
4 attorneys, reviewed court filings, and spent a significant amount of time on the issues presented
5 during the lawsuit and in the settlement process. I estimate that I spent approximately 40-50
6 hours working on this case up until this point. I believe I have been diligent and have done what
7 is expected of a named plaintiff and a proposed class representative to date, and will continue to
8 do so. I have and always will maintain the best interest of the class members.
9

10 13. My attorneys explained to me that the settlement process involves a two-step
11 review by the Court to determine whether the settlement is fair before approving the settlement.
12 I know this process also involves notifying all class members of the settlement terms and of their
13 rights to make a claim for their settlement share, to opt out of the settlement or to object to the
14 settlement.
15

16 14. I believe I did the right thing by filing this case on behalf of the class members who,
17 subject to court approval, are in line to receive monetary payments as a result of this case and
18 settlement. This is money they may never have ever gotten if I did not pursue this action on their
19 behalf. I feel significant personal satisfaction to know that I played a role in the class members
20 being entitled to monetary payments as a result of the filing of this lawsuit. I also believe that
21 the requested Class Representative Service Award of \$10,000 from the settlement is fair
22 compensation for the work I performed and the risks I undertook.
23

24 15. As part of the settlement it was necessary for me to sign a general release of all
25 claims I may have against Accurate Delivery Systems. I believe the Class Representative
26 Service Award I have requested provides me with some compensation for this agreed release.
27

16. I have not entered into any undisclosed agreements nor have I received any undisclosed compensation in this case. The only compensation I will receive is whatever amount the Court approves as a service award, as well as my share as a class member of the settlement fund.

17. In light of all the time and effort I have spent on this case, the risk I undertook by suing a former employer, the exposure to being responsible for paying Accurate Delivery Systems' costs in the event we did not win the case, the reputational risk that future employers may hold this lawsuit against me, the general release, and in light of the size of the settlement, I believe the request for \$10,000 as a Class Representative service award is fair and reasonable.

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

Executed on Apr 27, 2023, at Corona, cal.
(city, state)


Ahdy Mikhael (Apr 27, 2023 15:43 PDT)

EXHIBIT #8

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (SBN 068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (SBN 205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (SBN 248066)

Victoria B. Rivapalacio (SBN 275115)

Andrew G. Ronan (SBN 312316)

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858) 551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

WILLIE MARQUEZ and ANDY MIKHAEL

[Additional counsel listed on following page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

WILLIE MARQUEZ and ANDY MIKHAEL, on
behalf of themselves and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ACCURATE DELIVERY SYSTEMS, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB2125337

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Jessica
Morgan, Dept. S-26]*

**DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF JULIO
GARCIA IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Date: November 30, 2023

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Division: S-26

Complaint Filed: August 31, 2020

1
2 **LIDMAN LAW, APC**

3 Scott M. Lidman (SBN 199433)
4 slidman@lidmanlaw.com
5 Elizabeth Nguyen(SBN 238571)
6 enguyen@lidmanlaw.com
7 Milan Moore, Esq. (SBN 308095)
8 mmoore@lidmanlaw.com
9 2155 Campus Drive, Ste 150
10 El Segundo, CA 90245
11 Tel: 424-322-4772
12 Fax: 424-322-4775

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
14 JULIO GARCIA

15 **HAINES LAW GROUP, APC**

16 Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
17 phaines@haineslawgroup.com
18 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
19 El Segundo, CA 90245
20 Tel: (424) 292-2350
21 Fax: (424) 292-2355

22 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
23 JULIO GARCIA

1 **DECLARATION OF JULIO GARCIA**

2 I, JULIO GARCIA, declare as follows:

3 1. I am an individual over the age of 18 and one of the named plaintiffs in this matter. This
4 declaration is submitted in support of approval of the proposed class action settlement (“Settlement”)
5 reached in this case. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and could testify
6 competently to them if called upon to do so.

7 2. I was employed by Defendant Accurate Delivery Systems, Inc. (hereinafter referred to
8 as “Accurate Delivery” or “Defendant”) as a Delivery Driver from approximately 2018 through
9 approximately September 23, 2020. During my employment Accurate Delivery, I, along with the other
10 Delivery Drivers, were required to follow Accurate Delivery’s wage and hour policies and practices.

11 3. I am informed and believe, and on that basis state, that throughout my employment with
12 Accurate Deliver, I was not paid for all of my time worked. Specifically, because Accurate Delivery
13 paid me a percentage for every delivery, I was not paid for the tasks unrelated to deliveries, including,
14 waiting for customers, fueling my delivery van, washing my delivery van, completing paperwork,
15 conducting pre- and post-shift inspections, and unloading/loading my delivery van.

16 4. I also did not get all of my required meal and rest breaks. Specifically, due to the work
17 demand imposed by Accurate Delivery and the nature of my work, it is my understanding my meal
18 breaks were often late, short, and/or missed in violation of California law. I also did not get paid rest
19 breaks because of how I was paid at Accurate Delivery. I also had to use my cellular phone to check
20 the status of my assigned tasks, but Accurate Delivery did not reimburse me for these business expenses.

21 5. As a result, and because my wage statements did not include the total hours worked, it
22 is my understanding that Accurate Delivery did not provide me with accurate, itemized wage statements
23 nor did it pay me for all wages owed upon my separation of employment with Accurate Delivery.

24 6. I have worked closely with my lawyers on this case. I answered all of their questions
25 about my employment and made myself available to speak and meet with my lawyers whenever I was
26 needed, including the entire day of the mediation on March 7, 2023 and throughout the settlement
27 process.
28

1 7. At the time of filing this lawsuit, I understood that this lawsuit had the chance to benefit
2 my former co-workers and current employees of Accurate Delivery by helping them recover penalties
3 owed to them. As the named Plaintiff, I knew that I would be taking on certain risks that the other
4 employees would not have to take on. I also knew that there was a risk that I could be liable for Accurate
5 Delivery's costs if we lost the case. I was also scared that it would be difficult for me to get a similar
6 job in the future because other companies might not want to hire me if they knew I had filed a lawsuit
7 against my former employer. Even though I understood that joining a lawsuit is a public record and
8 could stigmatize me and may affect my future employability, I accepted that burden for the benefit of
9 other employees of Accurate Delivery because I wanted Accurate Delivery to pay its current and former
10 Delivery Drivers for wages and penalties owed according to the law and face consequences for not
11 doing so.

12 8. I have been actively involved in this case since joining this lawsuit. Without revealing
13 and/or waiving attorney-client privileged communications, I have communicated with my attorneys on
14 numerous occasions. I estimate that I have spent approximately 8 hours meeting with my lawyers
15 concerning the case and my responsibilities as a class representative, which included, among other
16 things, gathering various employment and non-employment related documents for use in the lawsuit,
17 reviewing documents with my lawyers and answering their questions, answering follow up questions
18 and providing guidance regarding Accurate Delivery's policies and practices and compensation pay
19 plan. Also, I routinely checked in with my attorneys and their staff to make sure I did not miss any
20 important updates in this case. In connection with the settlement in this case, I spent over 2 hours
21 reviewing the settlement agreement and discussing it with my attorneys. I made sure to ask my lawyers
22 any questions I had about the terms of the settlement agreement because I wanted to understand
23 everything before I signed it.

24 9. As part of the proposed Settlement, I have also agreed to a full general release of claims
25 related to my employment with Accurate Delivery that extends beyond the release of claims applicable
26 to members of the Class as defined in the Settlement. I understand that this includes all claims, whether
27 known or unknown, under federal, state, or local law against Accurate Delivery.
28

1 10. I believe my claims are typical of the members of the Class because they were required
2 to follow the same policies and procedures I was required to follow when I worked for Accurate
3 Delivery. I believe Accurate Delivery's policies and procedures were the same for all Delivery Drivers
4 in California. Since the same policies and procedures applies to myself and the other Delivery Drivers,
5 I believe they were not paid for all time worked, did not receive all of their meal and rest breaks, was
6 not reimbursed for using their personal cellular phones, did not receive accurate wage statements, and
7 were not paid all wages owed upon their separation of employment.

8 11. As far as I am aware, I have no conflicts with any of the other hourly, non-exempt
9 employees. I understand that as the proposed class representative, I am responsible for representing
10 the interests of all members of the class in litigation to recover money damages for the Class and I
11 consider the interests of the Class and put the interests of the Class before my own interests.

12 12. I understand that my attorneys will request that the Court award me Service Award of
13 \$10,000.00 for my service and efforts on the case. This proposed \$10,000.00 Service Award is not
14 contingent upon me supporting the proposed Settlement.

15 I have reviewed this written statement and fully understand all of its contents. I declare under
16 penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

17 Executed on April 11, 2023 at Riverside, California.

18
19  Julio Garcia
20

21 JULIO GARCIA
22
23
24
25
26
27
28