

1 Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
2 Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
3 9401 East Stockton Boulevard, Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
4 Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ

6
7
8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**
10

11 SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated
12 employees,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15
16 CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
INC., A California Corporation; and DOES 1
17 to 100, inclusive,

18 Defendants.
19
20
21
22

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA
SETTLEMENT**

Reservation No.: 2676526

Date: December 2, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 28

Judge: Hon. Lauri Damrell

Filed: August 10, 2021

FAC Filed: January 5, 2022

Trial Date: None Set

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on December 2, 2022, at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the
3 matter may be heard in Department 28 of the above-entitled Court, Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez,
4 individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated individuals, hereby move for entry of an Order
5 for the following:

- 6 1. Preliminarily certifying the proposed class herein for purposes of settlement;
- 7 2. Preliminarily appointing Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez as class representative for purposes of
8 settlement;
- 9 3. Preliminarily appointing Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC, as Class Counsel for purposes of
10 settlement;
- 11 4. Preliminarily approving the proposed class action and Private Attorneys General Act
12 settlement, in the amount of \$110,000, which is incorporated herein by reference;
- 13 5. Preliminarily approving the application for payment to Class Counsel of attorneys' fees in
14 the amount of 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount;
- 15 6. Preliminarily approving the application for payment to Class Counsel of reasonable costs not
16 to exceed \$10,000;
- 17 7. Preliminarily and conditionally approving the Class Representative Enhancement Payment of
18 \$10,000 to Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez;
- 19 8. Preliminarily approving the appointment of ILYM Group, Inc. as the Claims Administrator
20 and for payment to ILYM Group, Inc. for administering said class action settlement in an
21 amount not to exceed \$10,000;
- 22 9. Preliminarily approving the settlement of claims under the Private Attorneys General Act for
23 the total amount of \$2,500, 75% of which will be paid to the Labor and Workforce
24 Development Agency and 25% of which will be paid to Aggrieved Employees;
- 25 10. Approving as to form and content the Notice of Settlement, which provide Class Members
26 information regarding the settlement, their ability to opt out of, or object to, the class action
27 settlement and which provides instruction on how to dispute an individual's settlement
28 allocation under the proposed settlement agreement;

11. Approving the proposed procedures to notify the class and determining that the proposed notification procedures and process complies with Class Members' due process rights and directing the Notice of Settlement to be sent by first class mail to Class Members;
12. Directing Defendant to report employment information, including social security numbers, to the Claims Administrator to administer the settlement proceeds;
13. Scheduling a fairness hearing on the question of whether the proposed settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate;
14. Directing that any residue from settlement checks that were not cashed by the check cashing deadline be donated equally, *i.e.*, 50/50, to Capital Pro Bono, Inc., and the Center for Workers' Rights under the doctrine of *cy pres*;
15. Preliminarily and conditionally approving and adopting the Proposed Order and its implementation schedule, which is filed herewith and incorporated by reference.

This motion is being made pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382, Labor Code section 2699(l), and California Rules of Court 3.769 and 3.764, on the grounds that the proposed class action and Private Attorneys General Act settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate as to all Class Members and should be approved by the Court. This motion will be based on the notice of motion, memorandum of points and authorities, the Declaration of Brittany V. Berzin, the Declaration of Silviano Vasquez, exhibits, the record and files of this case, and any further oral or documentary evidence introduced at the hearing of this motion.


Pursuant to Local Rule 1.06 (A), the court will make a tentative ruling on the merits of this matter by 2:00 p.m., the court day before the hearing. The complete text of the tentative rulings for the department may be downloaded off the court's website. If the party does not have online access, they may call the dedicated phone number for the department as referenced in the local telephone directory between the hours of 2:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. on the court day before the hearing and

1 receive the tentative ruling. If you do not call the court and the opposing party by 4:00 p.m. the
2 court day before the hearing, no hearing will be held.

3 Dated: October 27, 2022

Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC

4
5 By: _____


6 Galen T. Shimoda
7 Justin P. Rodriguez
8 Brittany V. Berzin
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
2 Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
3 9401 East Stockton Boulevard, Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
4 Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ

6
7
8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**
10

11 SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated
12 employees,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
16 INC., A California Corporation; and DOES 1
17 to 100, inclusive,

18 Defendants.
19
20
21
22
23

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS &
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Reservation No.: 2676526

Date: December 2, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 28

Judge: Hon. Lauri Damrell

Filed: August 10, 2021

FAC Filed: January 5, 2022

Trial Date: None Set

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Opening Summary of Argument	1
II.	Procedural and Litigation History.....	2
III.	Investigation and Discovery Conducted	2
IV.	Negotiation and Proposed Settlement.....	3
	a. Plaintiff and Defendant Engaged in Extensive Arm’s Length Negotiations	3
	b. The Terms of the Settlement.....	3
	c. Allocation of Settlement Funds	5
V.	Argument	6
	a. Class Action Settlements are Subject to Court Review and Approval Under the California Rules of Court.....	6
	b. The Terms of The Settlement Are Fair and Within the Range of Reasonableness	6
	i. The Settlement is a Result of Extensive, Non-Collusive Arm’s Length Negotiations Between the Parties	7
	ii. The Extent of Investigation and Discovery Completed Provided Ample Information to Enter Into an Informed and Reasonable Settlement	7
	iii. Plaintiff’s Counsel are Experienced in Similar Litigation.....	8
	iv. The Settlement is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Strength of Plaintiff’s Case and the Risks and Costs of Further Litigation	8
	v. The Proposed Settlement is a Reasonable Compromise of Claims	9
	vi. The Enhancement Payment of the Named Plaintiff for Plaintiff’s Services to the Putative Class Is Reasonable and Routinely Awarded by Courts.....	10
	vii. Awarding Attorney’s Fees as a Percentage of the Common Fund Is Reasonable and Customarily Approved by Courts.....	11
	c. Provisional Certification of the Class is Appropriate	13
	i. The Proposed Settlement Class is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous.....	13
	ii. The Commonality, Predominance, and Typicality Requirements are Met	14
	iii. The Adequacy Requirement is Met	15

VI.	Conclusion	15
-----	------------------	----

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CALIFORNIA CASES

<i>Bell v. Farmers Ins. Exchange</i> , 115 Cal.App.4th 715(2004)	12
<i>City of San Jose v. Superior Court</i> , 12 Cal.3d 447 (1974)	14
<i>Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 48 Cal.App.4th 1794 (1996)	7,11,13
<i>Green v. Obledo</i> , 29 Cal.3d 126 (1981)	6
<i>Hebbard v. Calgrove</i> , 28 Cal.App.3d 1017 (1972)	14
<i>Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.</i> , 168 Cal.App.4th 116 (2008)	6, 9
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat., Inc.</i> , 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016)	11
<i>Lee v. Dynamex, Inc.</i> , 166 Cal.App.4th 1325 (2008)	13
<i>McGhee v. Bank of America</i> , 60 Cal.App.3d 442 (1976)	15
<i>Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles</i> , 186 Cal. App. 4th 399 (2010)	9
<i>Neary v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.</i> , 3 Cal.4th 273 (1992)	6
<i>Noel v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.</i> , 7 Cal.5th 955 (2019)	13
<i>North County Contr.'s Assn., Inc. v. Touchstone Ins. Svcs.</i> , 27 Cal.App.4th 1085 (1994)	6
<i>Rebney v. Wells Fargo Bank</i> , 220 Cal.App.3d 1117 (1990)	8
<i>Rose v. City of Hayward</i> , 126 Cal.App.3d 926 (1981)	13
<i>Sanders v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 3 Cal.3d 252 (1970)	12
<i>Serrano v. Priest</i> , 20 Cal.3d 25 (1977)	11
<i>Staton v. Boeing Co.</i> , 327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2003)	12
<i>Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.</i> , 91 Cal.App.4th 224 (2001)	6, 8, 12

CALIFORNIA STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES

Cal. Labor Code section 2699.....	6
Cal. Labor Code section 2699. 3.....	2
Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 3.769.....	6

FEDERAL CASES

<i>Amchem Prods. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997)	14
<i>Avila v. Cold Spring Granite Co.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 130878 (E.D. Cal. 2017)	9

1	<i>Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.</i> , 306 F.R.D. 245 (N.D. Cal 2015)	9
2	<i>Benitez et al. v. Wilbur</i> , USDC Eastern District, Case No. 1:08-cv-01122	12
3	<i>Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert</i> , 444 U.S. 472 (1980)	11
4	<i>Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.</i> , 485 F.Supp. 610 (N.D. Cal. 1979)	8
5	<i>Bravo v. Gale Triangle, Inc.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 77714 (C.D. Cal. 2017)	9
6	<i>Chavez et al. v. Petrissans et al.</i> , USDC Eastern District, Case No. 1:08-cv-00122	12
7	<i>Classen v. Weller</i> , 145 Cal. App. 3d 27 (1983)	14
8	<i>Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, Inc.</i> , USDC Southern District, Case No. 3:09-cv-02745.....	12
9	<i>Gardner v. GC Servs., LP</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47043 (S.D. Cal. 2012)	13
10	<i>Gay v. Waiters' & Dairy Lunchmen's Union</i> , 489 F.Supp. 282 (N.D. Cal. 1980),	
11	<i>aff'd</i> 694 F.2d 531 (9th Cir. 1982)	14
12	<i>Green, et al. v. Penske Logistics, L.L.C., et al.</i> , USDC Southern District,	
13	Case No. 3:09-cv-00069	12
14	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)	6, 14, 15
15	<i>Ingram v. The Coca Cola Co.</i> , 200 F.R.D. 685 (N.D. Ga. 2001)	10
16	<i>In re Activision Sec. Litigation</i> , 723 F. Supp. 1373 (N.D. Cal. 1989)	12
17	<i>In re Heritage Bond Litig.</i> , 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13555 (C.D. Cal. 2005)	7, 12
18	<i>In re Ikon Office Solutions, Inc. Secur. Litig.</i> , 194 F.R.D. 166 (E.D. Pa. 2000)	12
19	<i>In re Omnivision Technologies, Inc.</i> , 559 F.Supp.2d 1036 (2007)	8, 10
20	<i>Jamison v. Butcher & Sherrerd</i> , 68 F.R.D. 479 (E.D. Pa. 1975)	6
21	<i>Martin v. Ameripride Servs.</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61796 (S.D. Cal. 2011)	12
22	<i>Mills v. Electric Auto-Lite Co.</i> , 396 U.S. 375 (1970)	11
23	<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n</i> , 688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982)	8
24	<i>Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt v. Graulity</i> , 886 F.2d 268 (9th Cir. 1989)	11
25	<i>Reed v. 1-800 Contacts, Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 255 (S.D. Cal. 2014)	10
26	<i>Richmond v. Dart Ind., Inc.</i> , 29 Cal.3d 462 (1981)	14
27	<i>Romero v. Producers Dairy Foods, Inc.</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86270, 2007	
28	WL 3492841 (E.D. Ca. Nov. 14, 2007)	12

1	<i>Schiller v. David's Bridal, Inc.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80776 (E.D. Cal. 2012)	13
2	<i>Singer v. Becton Dickenson and Co.</i> , 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53416, 2010 WL 2196104	
3	(S.D. Ca. June 1, 2010)	12
4	<i>Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i> , 901 F. Supp. 294 (N.D. Cal. 1995)	10
5	<i>Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing, Inc.</i> , 266 F.R.D. 482 (E.D. Ca. 2010)	12
6	<i>Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.</i> , 557 F.2d 759 (9th Cir. 1977)	11
7	<i>Waters v. Intern. Precious Metals Corp.</i> , 190 F.3d 1291 (11th Cir. 1999)	11
8	<i>Watson v. Raytheon Company</i> , USDC Southern District, Case No. 3:10-cv-00634	12
9	<i>Williams v. MGM-Pathe Communications Co.</i> , 129 F.3d 1026 (9th Cir. 1977)	11
10	<i>Willis et al. v. Cal-Western Transport</i> , USDC Eastern District, Case No. 1:00-cv-05695	12
11	FEDERAL STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES	
12	Fed. R. Civ. Proc., Rule 23(e).....	6
13	Newberg on Class Actions, (3rd Ed.), 1992, §14.03	12

I. INTRODUCTION AND OPENING SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This Motion is brought seeking preliminary approval of a wage and hour class action settlement in the gross amount of \$110,000. *See generally* Exhibit A (Joint Stipulation Regarding Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release). Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez (“Plaintiff”) brought this class action individually and on behalf of other similarly situated employees employed by Defendant Chriswell Home Improvement, Inc., (“Defendant”). Plaintiff worked for Defendant in California from about March 15, 2021 to June 1, 2021 and was subject to all the same policies and practices that are alleged to be unlawful in this litigation. *See generally* Exhibit B (Plaintiff’s Operative Complaint); Declaration of Silviano Vasquez (“Decl. Vasquez”) ¶ 2.

Plaintiff has alleged that Defendant failed to pay overtime, failed to pay minimum wages, failed to provide meal periods, failed to provide rest periods, failed to provide accurate wage statements, failed to pay final wages, failed to reimburse expenses, and engaged in unfair competition. *See generally* Exhibit B. Plaintiff has also alleged Defendant is liable for a civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) based on these violations. *See id.*; Exhibit C (Plaintiff’s Ltr. to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency [“LWDA”] Regarding PAGA Claims). These violations primarily stem from Plaintiff’s allegations that Defendants violated California law by 1) failing to pay Class Members for all hours worked; and 2) failing to incorporate the value of nondiscretionary remuneration, such as bonuses into Class Members’ regular rates of pay for the purpose of calculating overtime and paid sick time; 3) failing to authorize and permit all meal and rest periods and failing to keep track of whether Class Members’ took meal periods; and 4) failing to reimburse Class Members’ for the use of personal items for work, such as personal cellphones, vehicles, and tools. *See* Exhibit B. Plaintiff has contended that this is a meritorious class action lawsuit and that this case is appropriate for class certification for settlement purposes as the requisites for class certification in this case can be satisfied. *See* Exhibit B.

Defendant has denied all of Plaintiff’s allegations in their entirety and any liability or wrongdoing of any kind. *See* Declaration of Brittany V. Berzin (“Decl. Berzin”), ¶ 5. Defendant has denied that this case is appropriate for class certification other than for purposes of settlement and that Plaintiff would have difficulty proving class certification is proper here. *See id.* However, subject to

1 approval by the Court, the parties have been able to compromise and settle all asserted claims for
2 monetary compensation as a result of extensive investigations, informal document and data exchanges,
3 and extended negotiations relating to all aspects of the asserted claims. *See* Exhibit A. Plaintiff's
4 counsel is convinced that the proposed settlement is in the best interest of the putative class based on
5 the discovery, investigations, negotiations, and a detailed knowledge of the issues in this case. *See*
6 Decl. Berzin, ¶¶ 3, 6-10. The prospect of potential class certification issues and the uncertainty of class
7 certification, difficulties of complex litigation, the lengthy process of establishing specific damages and
8 various possible delays and appeals were carefully considered by Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel in
9 agreeing to the proposed settlement. *See id.*

10 It is well within the discretion of this Court to grant preliminary and conditional approval of the
11 Agreement, which satisfies all of the criteria for preliminary settlement approval under California law.
12 Accordingly, Plaintiff request that the Court: (1) provisionally and conditionally certify the proposed
13 settlement class; (2) grant preliminary and conditional approval of the proposed Agreement (Exhibit
14 A); (3) set dates for and direct distribution to the class of the Notice of Settlement (Exhibit F), which
15 provides Class Members information regarding the settlement, including information regarding the
16 opportunity to opt-out of, or object to, the settlement and notifies each class member of their expected
17 pro rata share of the settlement; and (4) adopt the implementation schedule contained in the proposed
18 order and schedule a final approval hearing.

19 **II. PROCEDURAL AND LITIGATION HISTORY**

20 Plaintiff filed a class action complaint on approximately August 10, 2021, in the Sacramento
21 County Superior Court against Defendants. Plaintiff exhausted administrative remedies under the
22 PAGA by providing notice of the claims and violations to the LWDA. *See* Exhibit C; Cal. Lab. Code §
23 2699.3(a), (c); Decl. Berzin, ¶ 3. Then, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Class Action Complaint on
24 approximately January 5, 2022 to include a PAGA claim. *See id.*; Exhibit B. There is no date set for a
25 motion for certification or trial in this matter. *See* Decl. Berzin, ¶ 4.

26 **III. INVESTIGATION AND DISCOVERY CONDUCTED**

27 Plaintiff thoroughly investigated issues affecting certification, the merits of the class claims, and
28 potential damages for such claims. *See id.* Plaintiff worked during the time all of Defendant's policies

1 and practices at issue in the Complaint were in effect and provided information regarding these policies
2 and practices, enabling pre-filing investigations to take place. *See* Decl. Vasquez ¶¶ 3, 5. The parties
3 engaged in formal and informal discovery and exchange of documents, including a representative
4 sampling of employee data, such as time records, paystubs and relevant policies for the entirety of the
5 statute of limitations applicable to the alleged claims. The discovery covered all aspects of the asserted
6 claims, including certification issues, merits issues, damages, the scope and configuration of Class
7 Members, the content and implementation of the wage and hour policies at issue, issues relating to
8 manageability concerns at trial, among other relevant areas. *See* Decl. Berzin, ¶ 7. The information
9 allowed Plaintiff to determine the extent and frequency of any violations in accordance with Plaintiff's
10 contentions and create an accurate damages model to assess the reasonableness of any settlement. *See*
11 *id.*

12 **IV. NEGOTIATION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT**

13 **a. Plaintiff and Defendants Engaged in Extensive Arm's Length Negotiations**

14 The final settlement occurred only after extended, and sometimes contentious, arm's length
15 negotiations. Over the course of nearly one year, Plaintiff has been investigating the claims and
16 discussing with Defendant's counsel the merits of the claims and certification issues present in this case.
17 *See id.* at ¶¶ 6-10. The parties exchanged substantial amounts of information and legal analysis
18 regarding the asserted claims. *See id.* Then, only after nearly one year of litigation and negotiation,
19 which included a full day mediation with Russ J. Wunderli, Esq., the parties able to reach a mutually
20 agreeable settlement. *See id.* at ¶ 8. In light of the claims and defenses at issue, the parties agreed to a
21 Gross Settlement Amount of \$110,000. *See* Exhibit A.

22 **b. The Terms of the Settlement**

23 Under the Agreement, Defendant has agreed to the following:

- 24 1. The following groups of individuals are covered by the Settlement (*See* Exhibit A, ¶¶
25 1.2, 1.8):

26 All individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendant in
27 California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2017 up to
28 September 26, 2022

1 All individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendant in
2 California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2020 up to
September 26, 2022

3 2. Pay Gross Settlement Amount of \$110,000, exclusive of the employer's share of payroll
4 taxes, to resolve and release the claims alleged in the Complaint. *See id.* at ¶¶ 5.1, 5.2. No portion of
5 the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendant. *See id.* at ¶ 5.6. Aggrieved Employees will still
6 be paid their share of the PAGA Payment regardless of whether they opt out of being Class Members.
7 *See id.* at 7.5.1.

8 3. The parties agree that up to \$10,000 for Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez will be paid as a
9 Class Representative Enhancement Payment. This amount will be in addition to any amount Plaintiff
10 may be entitled to under the terms of the Agreement. *See id.* at ¶ 5.4.

11 4. The parties agree that the cost of administering this class action settlement shall be paid
12 from the settlement proceeds. Subject to Court approval, the parties have selected ILYM Group, Inc. to
13 act as the Claims Administrator, who has provided a maximum cost estimate of \$7,500 to administer
14 the class settlement. *See Exhibit D (ILYM Group, Inc. Quote).* The difference between any actual
15 administration costs and the \$10,000 allocated under the Agreement, if any, will be added to the Net
16 Settlement Amount and paid to Class Members on a pro rata basis. *See id.* at ¶ 5.3

17 5. The parties agree that \$2,500 of the Gross Settlement Amount shall be allocated to
18 resolving claims under the PAGA. Seventy-Five percent (75%) of the PAGA Payment will be paid to
19 the LWDA and Twenty-Five percent (25%) will be paid to Aggrieved Employees. *See id.* at ¶ 5.5.

20 6. The parties agree that up to thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount
21 (\$38,500) will be paid for Plaintiff's attorneys' fees incurred in the litigation of this case. Defendant
22 will not oppose any application for attorneys' fees so long as it is within this threshold. *See id.* at ¶ 5.2.
23 Additionally, the parties agree that Plaintiff will also be entitled to the actual litigation costs as
24 approved by the Court in an amount not to exceed \$10,000. *See id.* The difference between any actual
25 costs and the \$10,000 will be redistributed to Class Members on a pro rata basis. *See Exhibit A, ¶ 5.2.*
26 The proposed notice to be sent to Class Members will state this information. *See Exhibit F.*

27 //

28 //

1 7. Any Claims Administrator Costs, any amounts paid for attorneys' fees and costs, the
2 Class Representative Enhancement Payment, and PAGA Payment will be paid out from the Gross
3 Settlement Amount, not in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. *See* Exhibit A, ¶¶ 5.1-5.5.

4 8. In consideration for the value received in the Agreement, Class Members who fail to
5 timely opt-out of this settlement will waive all Qualified Claimant's Released Claims as set forth in the
6 Agreement. *See* Exhibit A, ¶¶ 1.30-1.31. Aggrieved Employees will waive all Released PAGA Claims
7 as set forth in the Agreement regardless of whether they opt out of being a Class Member. *See id.* at
8 1.33, 7.5.1.

9 9. For any portion of the Net Settlement Amount or PAGA Payment allocated to Qualified
10 Claimants and/or Aggrieved Employees that is not claimed by them by cashing their respective
11 settlement checks within 120 days, the remaining amount shall be paid 50/50 to Capital Pro Bono, Inc.,
12 and the Center for Workers' Rights under the doctrine of *cy pres*. *See* Exhibit A, at ¶ 5.6.

13 **c. Allocation of Settlement Funds**

14 Payment to Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved Employees of their Claim Amount will not
15 require the submission of a claim form. A Net Settlement Amount will be determined by subtracting
16 from the Gross Settlement Amount any amounts for approved attorneys' fees and costs, any
17 Enhancement Payment to the Class Representative, the Claims Administrator Costs, and the PAGA
18 Payment. Each Class Member's share will be determined by dividing their total weeks worked within
19 the Class Period by the total weeks worked by all Class Members within the Class Period. That
20 fraction will then be multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to arrive at the Class Member's
21 individual share of the Net Settlement Amount. Each Aggrieved Employee's share of the 25% portion
22 of the PAGA Payment will be determined by dividing their total weeks worked within the PAGA
23 Claim Period by the total weeks worked by all Aggrieved Employees within the PAGA Claim Period.
24 That fraction will then be multiplied by the 25% portion of the PAGA Payment to arrive at the
25 Aggrieved Employee's individual share. *See* Exhibit A, at ¶ 5.8.

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **V. ARGUMENT**

2 **a. Class Action Settlements are Subject to Court Review and Approval Under the**
3 **California Rules of Court**

4 A class action may not be dismissed, compromised, or settled without Court approval and the
5 decision to approve or reject a settlement is committed to the Court’s sound discretion. *See* Cal. Rules
6 of Court, Rule 3.769; Fed. R. Civ. Proc., Rule 23(e)¹; *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal. App.
7 4th 224, 234-35 (2001); *see also* Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699(l)(2) (requiring Court review of PAGA
8 settlements). However, courts should give “proper deference to the private consensual decision of the
9 parties,” since “the court’s intrusion upon what is otherwise a private consensual agreement negotiated
10 between the parties to a lawsuit must be limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment
11 that the agreement is not the product of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion between, the negotiating
12 parties, and that the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned.”
13 *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1027 (9th Cir. 1998). Where a settlement is reached on terms
14 agreeable to all parties, a court should disapprove of the settlement “only with considerable
15 circumspection.” *Jamison v. Butcher & Sherrerd*, 68 F.R.D. 479, 481 (E.D. Pa. 1975). The law favors
16 settlement of lawsuits, particularly class actions and other complex cases where substantial resources
17 can be conserved by avoiding the time, expense, and rigors of formal litigation. *See Neary v. Regents of*
18 *Univ. of Cal.*, 3 Cal. 4th 273, 277-81 (1992).

19 **b. The Terms of The Settlement Are Fair and Within the Range of Reasonableness**

20 The purpose of the Court’s preliminary evaluation of a proposed class action settlement is to
21 determine only whether the proposed settlement is within the range of possible approval and whether
22 notice to the class of its terms and conditions and the scheduling of a formal fairness hearing is
23 warranted. *See Wershba*, 91 Cal. App. 4th at 234-35. If the Court finds a proposed settlement falls
24 within “the range of reasonableness,” it should grant preliminary approval of the class action settlement.
25 *See, e.g., North County Contr. ’s Assn., Inc. v. Touchstone Ins. Svcs.*, 27 Cal. App. 4th 1085, 1089-90
26 (1994); *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal. App. 4th 116, 133 (2008). To make the fairness
27

28 ¹The California Supreme Court has authorized California’s trial courts to rely on these federal resources to decide class
 certification issues. *See Green v. Obledo*, 29 Cal.3d 126, 145-46 (1981).

determination, the Court must consider several factors, including:

the strength of the Plaintiff's case, the risk, expense, complexity and likely duration of further litigation, the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, the amount offered in settlement, the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings, the experience and views of counsel, the presence of a governmental participant, and the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement.

Dunk v. Ford Motor Co., 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1801 (1996). However, this Court should begin its analysis with a presumption that the proposed settlement is fair. "A presumption of fairness exists where: (1) the settlement is reached through arm's length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently; (3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation; and (4) the percentage of objectors is small." *Id.* at 1802; *see also In re Heritage Bond Litig.*, 2005 WL 1594403, at *10 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005) ("It is established that the absence of a large number of objectors to a proposed class action settlement raises a strong presumption that the terms of a proposed class settlement action are favorable to the class members").

i. The Settlement is a Result of Extensive, Non-Collusive Arm's Length Negotiations Between the Parties

Settlement in this case was reached only after litigation and extensive arm's length negotiations lasting nearly one year, which included a full day mediation with Russ J. Wunderli, Esq. *See Decl. Berzin*, ¶¶ 6-10. At all times, the negotiations were adversarial and contentious, although still professional in nature. *See id.* Further, while Plaintiff contends he would ultimately prevail on the claims and the issue of certification, this is not a certainty and there is substantial risk in proceeding to further litigation. *See id.* at ¶¶ 6-10. The ability to secure a guaranteed settlement now and ensure Class Members receive some compensation, rather than proceed to further litigation and potentially recover nothing, was a motivating factor in reaching this settlement. *See id.*

ii. The Extent of Investigation and Discovery Completed Provided Ample Information to Enter Into an Informed and Reasonable Settlement

The parties were in possession of all necessary information during the negotiations. The parties engaged in substantial informal and formal discovery and exchange of documents, including a representative sampling of employee data, such as timecards, paystubs, and relevant policies for the entirety of the statute of limitations applicable to the alleged claims, which covered all aspects of the

1 class claims and helped thoroughly vet the extent of Plaintiff's claims against Defendant and create an
2 accurate damages model. *See id.* at ¶ 6-10. Plaintiff was in possession of this information prior to
3 calculating the potential damages in this case. *See id.* As a result, Plaintiff was able to make a
4 reasonable estimation of Defendant's potential liability. *See id.* For these reasons, the settlement now
5 before the Court was reached at a stage where “the parties certainly have a clear view of the strengths
6 and weaknesses of their cases” sufficient to support the settlement. *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.*, 485 F.Supp.
7 610, 617 (N.D. Cal. 1979).

8 **iii. Plaintiff's Counsel are Experienced in Similar Litigation**

9 Plaintiff's counsel has considerable experience in class and PAGA actions and wage and hour
10 litigation. Plaintiff's counsel has brought and are currently bringing several wage and hour class and/or
11 PAGA actions. Thus, Plaintiff's counsel are qualified to evaluate the class claims, value of settlement
12 versus moving for certification and going to trial, and the viability of possible affirmative defenses. *See*
13 *Decl. Berzin*, ¶¶ 11-16. Plaintiff's counsel believes that the settlement is fair and reasonable in light of
14 the complexities of the case, the uncertainties of class certification and litigation, and the secured
15 benefit to the class. *See id.* at ¶ 6.

16 **iv. The Settlement is Fair and Reasonable Based on the Strength of Plaintiff's Case** 17 **and the Risks and Costs of Further Litigation**

18 A review of the Agreement's terms does not give rise to any doubts about its fairness. Based on
19 the records and facts of this case, Plaintiff has secured a gross recovery of approximately 5.3 % and a
20 net recovery of approximately 2% of the claims' maximum likely value. *See id.* at ¶¶ 9-10.
21 Additionally, the average net award per class member is approximately \$263.28. *See id.* This
22 settlement is a reasonable compromise of the class and PAGA claims, and is within the percentile
23 ranges of the total available damages that have been approved in other class settlements. *See Wershba*,
24 91 Cal. App. 4th at 246, 250; *Rebney v. Wells Fargo Bank*, 220 Cal.App.3d 1117, 1139 (1990); *Officers*
25 *for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 688 F.2d 615, 628 (9th Cir. 1982); *see also In re Omnivision*
26 *Technologies, Inc.*, 559 F.Supp.2d 1036, 1042 (2007) (noting that certainty of recovery in settlement of
27 6% of maximum potential recovery after reduction for attorney's fees was higher than median
28 percentage for recoveries in shareholder class action settlements, averaging 2.2%-3% from 2000

through 2002); *Bravo v. Gale Triangle, Inc.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 77714 (C.D. Cal. 2017) (approving a settlement where the net recovery to class members was approximately 7.5% of the projected maximum recovery amount); *Avila v. Cold Spring Granite Co.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 130878 (E.D. Cal. 2017): (approving a settlement with a gross recovery of 11% of the projected maximum damages available and a net recovery of approximately 6.7% of the projected maximum recovery); *Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.*, 306 F.R.D. 245 (N.D. Cal 2015) (approving a settlement where the gross recovery was approximately 8.5% of the projected maximum recovery).

v. The Proposed Settlement is a Reasonable Compromise of Claims

The case of *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal. App. 4th 116 (2008) requires additional information be presented to the Court, acting as a fiduciary for the absent class members “to ensure that the recovery represents a reasonable compromise, given the magnitude and apparent merit of the claims being released, discounted by the risks and expenses of attempting to establish and collect on those claims by pursuing the litigation” *Id.* at 129. *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 399 (2010), clarified that a *Kullar* showing does not require the parties to submit an illusory prediction of the outer reaches of exposure without taking into account the actual risks of certification, decertification, dispositive motions, and trial. *Kullar* also does not require an explicit statement of the maximum amount the plaintiff class could recover if it prevailed on all its claims provided there is a record that allows “an understanding of the amount that is in controversy and the realistic range of outcomes of the litigation.” *Id.* at 409. The *Munoz* Court found that the record before the trial court was sufficient, having included the number of class members, payroll data, declarations describing hours and overtime worked, as well as variances in duties and rest and meal period experience, and a companion action alleging less than \$5,000,000 in damages. This information constituted “an adequate basis from which to garner a reasonably adequate understanding of the amount that is in controversy within the meaning of *Kullar*.” *Id.*

Plaintiff similarly relied upon payroll data and Class Members’ data to determine the realistic potential damages suffered by the class as a whole. *See* Decl. Berzin, ¶¶ 6-10. This analysis allowed Plaintiff to determine the extent and frequency of potential violations on all claims as to all Class Members. *See id.* Ultimately, Plaintiff secured a percentage of the total demand for the putative class

1 that is within the range of what has been found to be sufficient in several other cases. *See, supra*,
2 Section V.c.iv; *see also, e.g., In re Omnivision Technologies, Inc.*, 559 F.Supp.2d at 1042; *Reed v. 1-*
3 *800 Contacts, Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 255 (S.D. Cal. 2014) (approving a settlement of \$11.7
4 million where the maximum range of damages was \$5,000 for each of the alleged 300,000 instances of
5 unlawful recording violations (\$1.5 billion), equaling approximately .78% of the total demand and
6 approximately \$800 per class member). This settlement represents a reasonable compromise given the
7 percentage of the total demand that was secured, the average recovery per class member, the Court's
8 ability and discretion to cut PAGA penalties, and the uncertainty of class certification. *See Decl.*
9 Berzin, ¶¶ 9-10.

10 **vi. The Enhancement Payment to the Named Plaintiff for Plaintiff's Services to the**
11 **Putative Class Is Reasonable and Routinely Awarded by Courts**

12 The Enhancement Payment to the named Plaintiff is intended to recognize the time and effort
13 expended on behalf of the class. Indeed, Courts routinely approve enhancement payments to
14 compensate named plaintiffs for the services they provide and the risks they incurred during the course
15 of the class action litigation. *See Ingram v. The Coca Cola Co.*, 200 F.R.D. 685, 694 (N.D. Ga. 2001).
16 In *Ingram*, the Court approved enhancement payments of \$300,000.00 to each named plaintiff in
17 recognition of the services they provided to the class by responding to discovery, participating in the
18 mediation process, and taking the risk of stepping forward on behalf of the class. *See Id.* at 694; *see*
19 *also Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*, 901 F.Supp. 294 (N.D. Cal. 1995) (approving a \$50,000.00
20 enhancement payment).

21 In this case, Plaintiff provided and explained documents, being available at all times to discuss
22 the case with Plaintiff's counsel. *See Decl. Berzin*, ¶ 7; *Decl. Vasquez*, ¶ 5. Plaintiff spent a significant
23 amount of time pursuing this litigation for the benefit of all Class Members. *See id.* Plaintiff brought
24 this action knowing there would be a delay in any payment as the litigation progressed, rather than
25 proceeding on individual claims in front of the California Labor Commissioner. *See id.* Payment of
26 \$10,000 to Plaintiff is appropriate given the risk, assistance, time required in bringing this case and
27 resolution of this case.

28 //

vii. Awarding Attorneys' Fees as a Percentage of the Common Fund Is Reasonable and Customarily Approved by Courts

California state and federal courts have recognized that when a litigant's efforts create or preserve a fund from which others derive benefits, the Court may spread litigation costs proportionally among all the beneficiaries to compensate those who created the fund. *See Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert*, 444 U.S. 472, 477-478 (1980) ("A lawyer who recovers a common fund for the benefit of persons other than . . . her client is entitled to a reasonable attorney's fee from the fund as a whole."); *Vincent v. Hughes Air West, Inc.*, 557 F.2d 759, 769 (9th Cir. 1977); *Mills v. Electric Auto-Lite Co.*, 396 U.S. 375 (1970); *Waters v. Intern. Precious Metals Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1291 (11th Cir. 1999); *see also Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal.3d 25, 34-35 (1977); *Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat., Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 506 (2016). The purpose of this equitable doctrine is to avoid unjust enrichment of counsel and to "spread litigation costs proportionally among all the beneficiaries so that the active beneficiary does not bear the entire burden alone." *Vincent*, 557 F.2d at 769; *Williams v. MGM-Pathe Communications Co.*, 129 F.3d 1026, 1027 (9th Cir. 1977). California state courts have approved use of a percentage of the fund to calculate reasonable attorney fee awards where the amount of the settlement is certain or is an easily calculable sum of money. *See Dunk*, 48 Cal. App. 4th at 1808.

The Ninth Circuit has also held that the common fund doctrine applies when: (1) the class of beneficiaries is sufficiently identifiable; (2) the benefits can be accurately traced; and (3) the fee can be shifted with some exactitude to those benefitting. *See Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt v. Graulity*, 886 F.2d 268, 271 (9th Cir. 1989). These criteria are "easily met" when "each member of a certified class has an undisputed and mathematically ascertainable claim to part of a lump-sum settlement recovered on her behalf." *Id.* at 271 (citations omitted). Under the three (3) factors set forth in *Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt*, the common fund doctrine applies in this case because there is a sufficiently identifiable class of beneficiaries (*e.g.* the settlement class), the benefits can be accurately traced to the settlement Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel were able to negotiate on behalf of the class, and the fee can be shifted with exactitude to those benefiting as the fee request is a specific, lump-sum percentage of the common fund. As set forth in the fee award examples provided below for the Court's reference, it is an accepted practice in wage and hour class action settlements to award attorneys' fees based on a percentage of the

common fund. *See, e.g., Staton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 967-972 (9th Cir. 2003); *Sanders v. City of Los Angeles*, 3 Cal.3d 252, 261, 263 (1970); *Wershba*, 91 Cal. App. 4th at 254; *Bell v. Farmers Ins. Exchange*, 115 Cal. App. 4th 715, 726, 765 (2004).

Historically, attorneys' fee awards in common fund cases in general range from 20% to 50% of the fund, depending on the circumstances of the case. *See Newberg on Class Actions*, (3rd Ed.), 1992, §14.03 (finding 50% to be the upper limit). Awards ranging between 30% and 40% of the fund are generally approved as reasonable in wage and hour settlements below \$10 million:

More particularly, courts may award attorneys fees in the 30-40% range in wage and hour class actions that result in recovery of a common fund under \$10 million. *See Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing, Inc.*, 266 F.R.D. 482, 491-492 (E.D. Ca. 2010) (citing to five recent wage and hour class actions where federal district courts approved attorney fee awards ranging from 30 to 33%); *Singer v. Becton Dickinson and Co.*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53416, 2010 WL 2196104, *8 (S.D. Ca. June 1, 2010) (approving attorney fee award of 33.33% of the common fund and holding that award was similar to awards in three other wage and hour class action cases where fees ranged from 33% to 40%); *Romero v. Producers Dairy Foods, Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86270, 2007 WL 3492841 (E.D. Ca. Nov. 14, 2007).

See Martin v. Ameripride Servs., 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61796 at *22-23 (S.D. Cal. 2011). Plaintiff's request of thirty five percent (35%) of the settlement sum for attorneys' fees is within established rates for fee awards in class settlements pursuant to the common fund doctrine, especially in light of the excellent results achieved in this case. *See In re Activision Sec. Litigation*, 723 F.Supp. 1373, 1379 (N.D. Cal. 1989); *Watson v. Raytheon Company*, USDC Southern District, Case No. 3:10-cv-00634; *Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, Inc.*, USDC Southern District, Case No. 3:09-cv-02745; *Green, et al. v. Penske Logistics, L.L.C., et al.*, USDC Southern District, Case No. 3:09-cv-00069; *Benitez et al. v. Wilbur*, USDC Eastern District, Case No. 1:08-cv-01122; *Chavez et al. v. Petrissans et al.*, USDC Eastern District, Case No. 1:08-cv-00122; *Willis et al. v. Cal-Western Transport*, USDC Eastern District, Case No. 1:00-cv-05695. To determine whether a percentage is reasonable, a court should consider: (1) the percentage that would likely be negotiated between parties in a similar case; (2) the percentage applied in other class actions; (3) the quality of class counsel; (4) the size of the award; and (5) whether there are any objections by class members. *See In re Ikon Office Solutions, Inc. Secur. Litig.*, 194 F.R.D. 166, 193 (E.D. Pa. 2000); *In re Heritage Bond Litig.*, 2005 WL 1594403, at *21 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005) ("the absence of objections or disapproval by class members to class

1 counsel's fee request further supports finding the fee request reasonable").

2 These factors support Plaintiff's request for reasonable attorneys' fees. The typical percentage
3 negotiated between parties ranges from thirty-five to forty percent (35% to 40%) in individual litigation
4 depending on the complexity of the case. In class action litigation, the typical percentage negotiated
5 between parties ranges from thirty to forty percent (30% to 40%) based on the same factors. Plaintiff's
6 request of 35% falls within these typical fee arrangements. *See* Decl. Berzin, ¶ 18. The quality of
7 counsel and the average size of settlement payments to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees
8 (\$263.28) also support the fee request when compared to other settlements courts have considered as
9 good results. *See Schiller v. David's Bridal, Inc.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80776 at *48 (E.D. Cal.
10 2012) ("Class Members will receive an average of approximately \$198.70, with the highest payment to
11 a Class Member being \$695.78 . . . Overall, the Court finds that the results achieved are good, which is
12 highlighted by the fact that there was no objection to the settlement amount or the attorneys' fees
13 requested."); *Gardner v. GC Servs., LP*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47043, 18 (S.D. Cal. 2012) ("the
14 results achieved in this case were very favorable. Class members are provided with immediate
15 monetary relief, with an average award of around several hundred dollars and a minimum award of
16 \$50").

17 **c. Provisional Certification of the Class is Appropriate**

18 Class certification is appropriate when (1) the class is ascertainable and (2) there is "a well-
19 defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be
20 represented." *Dunk*, 48 Cal. App. 4th at 1806. The "community of interest" element "embodies three
21 factors: (1) common questions of law or fact predominate; (2) class representatives with claims or
22 defenses typical of the class; and (3) class representatives who can adequately represent the class." *Id.*
23 Here, the parties agree that, for the purposes of settlement, these prerequisites are met. *See* Exhibit A.

24 **i. The Proposed Settlement Class is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous**

25 The proposed settlement class is ascertainable because all putative class members can be readily
26 identified through employee personnel and payroll files. *See Noel v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.*, 7 Cal.5th
27 955, 980 (2019); *Rose v. City of Hayward*, 126 Cal.App.3d 926, 932 (1981); *Lee v. Dynamex, Inc.*, 166
28 Cal. App. 4th 1325, 1334 (2008). The numerosity requirement is met because there are 160 individuals

1 who fall within the definition of Class Member, which makes joinder of all members impracticable.
2 *See Gay v. Waiters' & Dairy Lunchmen's Union*, 489 F.Supp. 282 (N.D. Cal. 1980), *aff'd* 694 F.2d 531
3 (9th Cir. 1982); *Hebbard v. Calgrove*, 28 Cal. App. 3d 1017, 1030 (1972) (noting no set minimum to
4 meet the numerosity prerequisite, but a class as few as twenty-eight (28) members is acceptable). Thus,
5 these requirements are satisfied.

6 **ii. The Commonality, Predominance, and Typicality Requirements are Met**

7 The commonality requirement is met when there are questions of law or fact regarding the class
8 as a whole. *See Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1019. Commonality requires only that some common legal or
9 factual questions exist; Plaintiff need not show that all issues in the litigation are identical. *See*
10 *Richmond v. Dart Ind., Inc.*, 29 Cal.3d 462, 473 (1981); *City of San Jose v. Superior Court*, 12 Cal.3d
11 447, 460 (1974). Common questions of law or fact must also predominate over individual questions
12 and class-wide treatment of a dispute must be superior to individual litigation.² *See Richmond*, 29
13 Cal.3d at 469. Predominance requires a putative class be sufficiently cohesive to warrant adjudication
14 by representation. *See Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1022. The typicality requirement is met when claims of the
15 named representative are typical of those of the class, though "they need not be substantially identical."
16 *Id.* at 1020; *Classen v. Weller*, 145 Cal. App. 3d 27, 46-47 (1983).

17 The common questions of law and fact in this case stem from Plaintiff's contention that
18 Defendant violated California law by 1) failing to pay Class Members for all hours worked; and 2)
19 failing to incorporate the value of nondiscretionary remuneration, such as bonuses into Class Members'
20 regular rates of pay for the purpose of calculating overtime and paid sick time; 3) failing to authorize
21 and permit all meal and rest periods and failing to keep track of whether Class Members' took meal
22 periods; and 4) failing to reimburse Class Members' for the use of personal items for work, such as
23 personal cellphones, vehicles, and tools. *See Exhibit B*. The waiting time penalties, unfair
24 competition, and PAGA claims are derivative of these violations. *See id.* Plaintiff and the Class
25 Members seek the same remedies under state law. Under these specific circumstances, the
26 commonality and predominance requirements are satisfied. Regarding the typicality requirement,
27

28 ²When assessing predominance and superiority, a court may consider that the class will be certified for settlement purposes only and that manageability of trial is therefore irrelevant. *See Amchem Products v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591 (1997).

1 Plaintiff contends he suffered from the same unlawful policies, treatment, and circumstances as Class
2 Members did, will request the same remedies, and will rely on the same methods of proof to establish
3 liability and damages. *See id.* Thus, the typicality requirement is also satisfied for settlement purposes.

4 **iii. The Adequacy Requirement is Met**

5 The adequacy of representation requirement is met if the named representative and counsel have
6 no interests adverse to those of the putative class members and are committed to vigorously prosecuting
7 the case on behalf of the class. *See Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1020; *McGhee v. Bank of America*, 60
8 Cal.App.3d 442, 450-51 (1976). Those standards are met here. Under the proposed settlement,
9 Plaintiff and the putative Class Members will receive a pro rata share of the settlement based on the
10 number of workweeks they worked for Defendants. *See* Exhibit A. Finally, any settlement class
11 member who wishes to opt-out of the settlement may do so, and he or she may also dispute the number
12 of workweeks stated in the Notice of Settlement (Exhibit F).

13 There is no conflict of interest between Plaintiff and Class Members. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's
14 counsel have pursued the claims made in the operative Complaint vigorously on behalf of the class.
15 Plaintiff's counsel, with Plaintiff's assistance, thoroughly investigated the claims made in this case by
16 speaking with Plaintiff and reviewing substantial amounts of documents. Plaintiff's counsel thereafter
17 engaged Defendant's counsel in settlement discussions over the course of nearly one year. Moreover,
18 Plaintiff's counsel has experience defending and bringing wage and hour claims. Because Plaintiff's
19 counsel has vigorously pursued Plaintiff's and the Class Members' claims, the adequacy requirement is
20 met. *See generally* Decl. Berzin.

21 **VI. CONCLUSION**

22 For all of the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court preliminarily and
23 conditionally certify the class for settlement purposes; grant preliminary and conditional approval to the
24 proposed settlement, including the Plaintiff's Class Representative Enhancement Payment, the payment
25 to the LWDA under PAGA, and Class Counsel's application for reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;
26 approve the Notice of Settlement, including the proposed deadlines for opting-out of and objecting to
27 the settlement; and schedule the final settlement approval hearing. A copy of Plaintiff's proposed order
28 is being filed concurrently herewith.

1
2 Dated: October 27, 2022

Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC

3
4 By: _____



Galen T. Shimoda
Justin P. Rodriguez
Brittany V. Berzin
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
9401 East Stockton Boulevard, Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated
employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
INC., A California Corporation; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF BRITTANY V. BERZIN
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Reservation No.: 2676526

Date: December 2, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 28

Judge: Hon. Lauri Damrell

Filed: August 10, 2021

FAC Filed: January 5, 2022

Trial Date: None Set

1 I, Brittany V. Berzin, declare:

2 1. I am an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of
3 California and an attorney of record for Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez ("Plaintiff") herein. I am making
4 this declaration on behalf of the named Plaintiff, the putative class members, and in support of
5 Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Motion"). A true
6 and correct copy of the Joint Stipulation Regarding Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release
7 ("Agreement") in this matter is filed with this Motion as Exhibit A.

8 2. This case was brought as a wage and hour class action based on Plaintiff's contention
9 that Defendant Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc. ("Defendant") failed to pay overtime, failed to pay
10 minimum wages, failed to provide meal periods, failed to provide rest periods, failed to provide
11 accurate wage statements, failed to pay final wages, failed to reimburse expenses, and engaged in unfair
12 competition. Plaintiff also alleged liability for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act
13 ("PAGA"). These claims were based allegations that Defendants violated California law by 1) failing
14 to pay Class Members for all hours worked; and 2) failing to incorporate the value of nondiscretionary
15 remuneration, such as bonuses into Class Members' regular rates of pay for the purpose of calculating
16 overtime and paid sick time; 3) failing to authorize and permit all meal and rest periods and failing to
17 keep track of whether Class Members' took meal periods; and 4) failing to reimburse Class Members'
18 for the use of personal items for work, such as personal cellphones, vehicles, and tools. The PAGA,
19 waiting time penalty, wage statement violation, and unfair competition claims also derive from these
20 violations.

21 3. Plaintiff is the only named representative in this matter. From our initial investigations
22 of Plaintiff's claims and documents, we believed these claims had merit and could be maintained as a
23 class action. We filed the action on or about August 10, 2021. Plaintiff exhausted administrative
24 remedies through the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") prior to amending the
25 Complaint to add a PAGA claim. Plaintiff filed a notice with the LWDA on August 10, 2021, setting
26 forth the facts and theories of liability. A true and correct copy of the notice filed with the LWDA is
27 being filed with this Motion as Exhibit C. A copy of the notice was also sent to Defendants via
28 certified mail and the \$75.00 filing fee was remitted to the LWDA at that time. There was no response

1 by the LWDA regarding its intent to investigate the claims alleged in Plaintiff's notice for more than 65
2 days. As such, Plaintiff became authorized to commence a civil action under the PAGA and filed a
3 First Amended Complaint on January 5, 2022. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's operative
4 Complaint is filed with this Motion as Exhibit B. A copy of the Complaint was uploaded to the LWDA
5 on January 21, 2022, after we received an endorsed copy back from Court.

6 4. Currently, there is no date set for a motion to certify the class and there is no trial date.

7 5. Defendant is represented in this matter by Coggins Law and Elguindy Meter & Koegel,
8 APC. From the beginning, Defendant has contested the merits of this case, the suitability of the case
9 for class action or representative treatment, the manageability of the case at trial, and Plaintiff's ability
10 to prove a violation in each pay period for each employee among other defenses and contentions they
11 made challenging the propriety of this action. Defendant further contended, even assuming there was a
12 finding supporting the imposition of PAGA penalties, that the Court would likely exercise its discretion
13 to substantially reduce any such penalties owed based on evidence of good faith attempts to comply
14 with California Labor Code obligations by Defendant. Notwithstanding its agreement to settle this
15 matter, Defendants believe the practices Plaintiff is contending are unlawful either do not exist or, to
16 the extent they do exist, fully comply with all state and federal employment laws with respect to
17 Plaintiff and Class Members. Also, Defendant has contended that this matter is not appropriate for
18 class certification outside of this proposed class settlement.

19 6. Based on the expected testimony from Plaintiff and Class Members, a review of
20 Defendant's policies and procedures and other documents relating to the alleged claims, information on
21 the number of Class Members, Class Members' dates of employment, and a representative sample of
22 Class Members' payroll data, the scope of the potential damages to Plaintiff and Class Members in light
23 of the claims alleged, the uncertainty in the law with regard to certification, and the negotiations that
24 have taken place, I am convinced that the proposed settlement is in the best interest of the class. The
25 length and risks of trial and other normal perils of litigation that impact the value of the claims were also
26 considered and weighed in reaching the Agreement. In addition, I carefully considered the prospect of
27 potential class certification issues as well as the uncertainty of class certification, the difficulties of
28 complex litigation, and the lengthy process of establishing specific damages and various possible delays

1 and appeals in agreeing to the proposed settlement. I further considered the fact that penalties under the
2 PAGA could be substantially cut at the discretion of the Court even if Plaintiff was successful on
3 proving those claims and there was risk that a Court could find no willfulness in the failure to pay wages
4 at separation, which would eliminate the value of the waiting time penalty claim entirely. Overall, I
5 believe it is more beneficial to secure a guaranteed benefit to the class now rather than to proceed with
6 litigation and potentially obtain zero funds to the class due to legal or factual issues in the case.

7 7. My office, including the partners Galen T. Shimoda and Justin P. Rodriguez, our
8 paralegals, and myself, along with Plaintiff's assistance, thoroughly investigated the merits of the claims
9 and potential damages for such claims. The parties engaged in formal and informal discovery and
10 exchange of documents, including a representative sampling of employee data, such as timecards,
11 paystubs, and relevant policies for the entirety of the statute of limitations applicable to the alleged
12 claims. The discovery covered all aspects of the asserted claims, including certification issues, merits
13 issues, damages, the scope and configuration of Class Members, the content and implementation of the
14 wage and hour policies at issue, issues relating to manageability concerns at trial, among other relevant
15 areas. From this production we were able to determine information critical to a reliable damages
16 analysis such as the average hourly rate, average daily hours worked, average number of workweeks and
17 pay periods that had potential violations based on the asserted claims, the frequency with which
18 violations occurred in a given week and/or pay period, and the number of former employees. This
19 information allowed my office to assess both liability and damages and create an accurate damages
20 model. Plaintiff assisted in all aspects of this litigation including providing factual information relating
21 to Plaintiff's and Class Members' employment conditions, providing a substantial number of documents,
22 and answering questions regarding Defendant's factual contentions in this matter. This was important
23 because it directly related to our ability to maintain this case as a class action and our ability to obtain a
24 favorable settlement for the class.

25 8. Throughout this litigation our office had numerous communications with Defendant's
26 Counsel discussing our respective positions. The parties engaged in mediation on July 28, 2022 using
27 an experienced mediator, Russ J. Wunderli, Esq. It was only after nearly one year of extensive, arm's
28 length negotiations that the parties were able to reach a settlement, which only occurred after a full-day

1 mediation. The negotiations were at all times contentious and adversarial, though still professional in
2 nature. Prior to mediation, Defendant contended that it was having financial issues and was
3 contemplating filing for bankruptcy. My office reviewed Defendant's recent tax returns and a profit and
4 loss statement to verify this claim. I also conducted independent research through public records
5 searches to determine the assets of Defendant and its owners. This settlement was agreed to taking into
6 account Defendant's financial condition.

7 9. The parties reviewed and analyzed substantial amounts of data regarding the class
8 claims. Based on our analysis and review of all relevant documents and Class Member information, I
9 have determined that the maximum damages for the asserted class claims is approximately
10 \$3,170,230.56, which includes civil penalties under the PAGA. The likely exposure for PAGA
11 penalties is approximately \$1,329,552.80 based on the counts alleged to the LWDA and the class data.
12 Based on our research, we did not find any prior Labor Commissioner or court decisions that stated
13 Defendant's practices and/or policies were improper. As such, a "subsequent violation" may not be
14 found for penalty calculation purposes and the exposure analysis here is based on an "initial violation"
15 valuation being adopted by any fact finder if this matter went to trial.

16 10. However, I believe the PAGA penalties in this case may be reduced due to the fact that
17 the penalties would be in addition to amounts owed for substantive violations and much of the penalties
18 are based on violations due to technical non-compliance with the Labor Code. Furthermore,
19 Defendants produced a substantial number of documents that a Court may find demonstrates a good
20 faith attempt at compliance that merits the reduction of civil penalties. Courts regularly cut civil
21 penalties on PAGA claims where statutory penalties for the same violations are assessed as well.
22 Courts are statutorily authorized to use discretion to reduce penalties and the range of discretion used
23 varies substantially. *See Thurman v. Bayshore Transit Mgmt., Inc.*, 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1135 (2012)
24 (30% reduction); *Fleming v. Covidien, Inc.*, 2011 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 154590, *9 (C.D. Cal. 2011)
25 (82% reduction). Thus, civil penalties may be cut to approximately \$239,319.50 (82% reduction) or
26 lower given the derivative recovery. Taking this into account, the likely recovery if Plaintiff was
27 successful at trial on proving all the substantive class damages plus civil penalties after a reduction of
28 the PAGA penalties would be approximately \$2,079,997.26. Taking this into account, Plaintiff's

1 \$110,000 gross recovery under the Agreement represents approximately 5.3% of the maximum likely
2 value in this matter. After deducting from the Gross Settlement Amount the proposed allocations for
3 attorneys' fees and costs, any Enhancement Payment to the Class Representative, Claims Administrator
4 Costs, and the 75% portion of the PAGA Payment to the LWDA, the net recovery under the Agreement
5 represents approximately 2% of the maximum likely value in this matter. The average net award is
6 approximately \$263.28. I believe the Agreement represents a reasonable compromise of claims based
7 on the legal and factual disputes in this case. The ability to secure a guaranteed settlement now and
8 ensure Class Members receive some compensation, rather than proceed to further litigation and
9 potentially recover nothing, was a motivating factor in reaching this Agreement.

10 11. In agreeing to represent Plaintiff and take on the case for all Class Members, our office
11 agreed to take this case on a contingency basis, meaning that we would take a percentage of any
12 settlement or judgment should we recover a monetary amount. We took a risk that we would not
13 recover any money in this matter if we were unsuccessful at trial. We also took on the risk that the case
14 may be subject to an unfavorable summary judgment ruling. However, we believe it is important to
15 make sure employees are able to find affordable representation in order to ensure that employers are
16 complying with all their legal obligations towards employees and paying employees all their hard-
17 earned wages.

18 12. I am an associate at Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC. Our law firm is a boutique law
19 practice that focuses primarily on employment litigation, emphasizing wage and hour litigation. I
20 attended and graduated college from U.C. Davis, receiving a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology. I
21 received my J.D. from the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law. I joined Shimoda &
22 Rodriguez Law, PC as a law clerk in February 2015 where I gained civil litigation experience working
23 on individual, class action and PAGA employment cases throughout law school. I also participated in
24 an employment law clinic in 2015 and 2016 that helps low-income workers by providing free legal
25 consultations, advising employees of their legal remedies on a variety of matters (*e.g.*, wage and hour,
26 discrimination/harassment, California leave laws, unemployment, workers' compensation, retaliation,
27 and wrongful termination, etc.), preparing wage claims, and providing representation in wage claims
28 before the California Labor Commissioner. From 2016-2017, I completed an externship at the Federal

1 Public Defenders Office as a Certified Law Student where I obtained discovery, completed legal
2 research, drafted motions, negotiated plea deals, represented clients in a variety of hearings (*e.g.*,
3 arraignments, motion hearings, sentencing hearings, etc.), and defended a client against five
4 misdemeanor charges in a jury trial in the United States District Court for The Eastern District of
5 California. I was also a member of the nationally recognized McGeorge Mock Trial Team and went on
6 to coach a high school Mock Trial team in 2018 after graduating from law school. In May 2017, I
7 graduated from the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law with Great Distinction and was
8 inducted into the Order of the Coif, graduating in the top 10% of my class. I received the Witkin
9 Award for Academic Excellence in Legal Research and Writing, Civil Procedure, Bankruptcy, and
10 Criminal Procedure. From 2020 to present, I have been recognized as a Super Lawyer (Rising Star). I
11 have been a member of the executive committee of the Sacramento County Bar Association Labor &
12 Employment Section since January 2020, serving as Co-Chair of the committee in 2021. I have over
13 seven years of experience working on civil litigation and employment law matters. Most of that
14 experience has been specific to analyzing and litigating wage and hour claims. As an associate, I have
15 worked on a variety of individual, class action, and PAGA cases involving wage and hour claims, such
16 as failure to pay overtime, failure to pay minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest periods,
17 failure to pay reimbursement expenses, unlawful deductions, failure to keep accurate time records,
18 failure to provide paid sick leave, failure to pay all wages upon separation, unfair competition, breach
19 of contract, independent contractor misclassification, and salaried misclassifications. Some of the class
20 action and/or PAGA cases I am litigating and/or have litigated as lead or co-counsel include the
21 following:

- 22 • *Arosemena v. Ranchhodrai, Inc., et al.*, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2019-15963 (San Joaquin
23 Sup. Ct.);
- 24 • *Arroyo v. Epic Home Solar*, Case No. 34-2021-00310634 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 25 • *Balli v. Brown Box Investments, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 34-2018-00232656 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 26 • *Barkhousen, et al. v. Bank of Stockton*, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2019-17145 (San Joaquin
27 Sup. Ct.);

- 1 • *Barrios v. American Property Management, Inc.*, Case No. 1:18-cv-00352-AWI-SKO (E.D.
- 2 Cal.);
- 3 • *Blair v. Clark Wagaman Designs*, Case No. 34-2021-00313156 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 4 • *Callahan v. Creative Alternatives, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2027518 (Stanislaus Sup. Ct.);
- 5 • *Collazo v. T.O.P. Marketing Group, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2022-00314092 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 6 • *Cristobal v. BAT Residential Services, Inc.*, Case No. FCS056331 (Solano Sup. Ct.);
- 7 • *Coronado v. MGD, Inc.*, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2021-893 (San Joaquin Sup. Ct.);
- 8 • *Estrada v. MAD Security Services, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2021-00300627 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 9 • *Ferreyra v. Point Digital Finance, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 20CV373776 (Santa Clara Sup. Ct.);
- 10 • *Finance of America Wage And Hour Cases*, Case No. JCCP 5081 (Orange County Sup. Ct.);
- 11 • *Gomez, et al. v. Kleary Masonry, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2020-00278067 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 12 • *Gonzalez v. Northcentral Pizza, LLC, et. al.*, Case No. 34-2019-00252018 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 13 • *Gordon, et al. v. Hospice Source, LLC*, Case No. 34-2019-00250022 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 14 • *Green v. Warden Security Associates, Inc.*, Case No. 22CV396140 (Santa Clara Sup. Ct.);
- 15 • *Hampton v. Unlimited Security Specialists, Inc.*, Case No. CV2021-2130 (Yolo Sup. Ct.);
- 16 • *Hercules, et al. v. Maximus Services, LLC*, Case No. 34-2019-00268385 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 17 • *Insixiengmay v. Hyatt Corporation*, Case No. 2:18-cv-02993-TLN-DB (E.D. Cal);
- 18 • *Kurtz v. Perimeter Security Group, LLC, et al.*, Case No. CU19-083650 (Nevada Sup. Ct.);
- 19 • *Leong-Call v. MRB Foods, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2020-00287486 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 20 • *Magat v. Medical Care Professionals, Inc., et. al.*, Case No. SCV0042579 (Placer Sup. Ct.);
- 21 • *Mayorga v. Brown Strauss, Inc.*, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2020-0010906 (San Joaquin Sup.
- 22 Ct.);
- 23 • *McGhee v. Salute Incorporated*, Case No. 34-2022-00315317 (Sac Sup. Ct.);
- 24 • *McMahon v. Airco Mechanical, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2019-00259269 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 25 • *Meals v. Grass Valley Extended Care, Inc., et al.*, Case No. CU19-083606 (Nevada Sup.
- 26 Ct.);
- 27 • *Munoz v. Wilmor And Sons Plumbing And Construction*, Case No. 34-2021-00306609 (Sac.
- 28 Sup. Ct.);

- *Neufield v. Professional Transportation, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2021-00309849 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Ruiz v. CTE Cal, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2020-00289168 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Saavedra, et al. v. SMF Global, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2018-00243363 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Scarano v. J.R. Putman, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 34-2018-00244753 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Scoggins, et al. v. Energy Star Construction, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2018-00243048 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Strawn v. Bridgestone Retail Operations, LLC*, Case No. 34-2018-00242049 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Sullivan v. National Response Corporation*, Case No. 34-2018-00244757 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Tracy v. Von Housen's Sacramento, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2020-00282778 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Uribe v. Ecoguard Pest Management, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2021-00300650 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Villarruel, et al. v. General Produce Company, et al.*, Case No. 34-2021-00311463 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Walker v. Yan Kalika Dental Corporation*, Case No. 34-2021-00305106 (Sac. Sup. Ct.); and
- *Webb v. Professional Healthcare At Home, LLC*, Case No. FCS055317 (Solano Sup. Ct.).

13. The preceding list of cases does not include those where, for a variety of reasons, the case was initially filed as a class and/or PAGA action, but did not maintain that status through the end of the case.

14. Justin P. Rodriguez, Esq., also worked with me on this matter and was critical in assisting with all aspects of the litigation of this case. Mr. Rodriguez attended and graduated college from U.C. Davis, receiving a Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and the Departmental Citation for Academic Achievement in the Philosophy program. He was one of only two recipients of this award out of the entire Philosophy Department. After U.C. Davis, Mr. Rodriguez attended the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law, graduating in 2011 and receiving a Juris Doctorate. He graduated in the top 20% of his class and was a member of the Traynor Honor Society at McGeorge. Other academic achievements of his include receiving a Witkin Award (top grade) in his legal research and writing course, a Witkin Award in complex civil litigation, being a member of the Dean's List from 2008 to 2011, being a Legislative Staff Writer for the *McGeorge Law Review* from 2009–2010, being an Associate Comment Editor for the *Pacific McGeorge Global Business & Development Law Journal*

1 from 2010–2011, and being selected as a Sacramento County Bar Association Diversity Fellow in
2 2009. Mr. Rodriguez was also a member of the Employment and Labor Law Society and an officer for
3 the Latino Law Students Association from 2009 to 2010.

4 15. Mr. Rodriguez was an associate of the Shimoda Law Corp from 2011 to 2016 and
5 became a partner in 2017. Shimoda Law Corp. became Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC, in 2022.
6 Since 2017, he has received an AV Preeminent rating from Martindale-Hubbell for his legal ability and
7 ethical standards. From 2018 to present, he has been recognized as a Super Lawyer (Rising Star). In
8 September 2018, he was a panel speaker for the Sacramento County Bar Association Labor and
9 Employment Law Section’s presentation of “*Epic Systems*, PAGA, and the Future of Employment
10 Arbitration in California.” In July 2020, he was a panel speaker for the Association of Defense
11 Counsel of Northern California & Nevada presentation of “Class Actions and PAGA Claims.” His
12 practice focuses on complex civil litigation, including wage and hour class actions, PAGA claims, and
13 Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) claims. He is actively involved in most of the complex litigation
14 handled by our firm. Class and/or PAGA actions he has litigated or is currently litigating, including the
15 instant case, includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- 16 • *Aanerud v. Neumann Ltd., et al.*, Case No. 34-2014-00169324 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 17 • *Adams-Angway v. Placer Title Company, et al.*, Case No. SCV0040845 (Placer Sup. Ct.);
- 18 • *Adewumi v. GHS Interactive Security, LLC*, Case No. 34-2017-00210768 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 19 • *Arrington v. Capital Express Lines, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 34-2012-00134195 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 20 • *Aslam v. American Custom Private Security, Inc.*, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2018-0012080
21 (San Joaquin Sup. Ct.);
- 22 • *Aslam v. Cypress Security, LLC*, Case No. 34-2017-00220143 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 23 • *Aslam v. Surveillance, Security, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2017-00220142 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 24 • *Azzolino v. Brake Masters of Sacramento, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 34-2017-00218293 (Sac.
25 Sup. Ct.);
- 26 • *Barkhausen v. Bank of Stockton*, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2019-17145 (San Joaquin Sup.
27 Ct.);
- 28 • *Benak v. MDStat Urgent Care, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2015-00188181 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);

- 1 • *Bigornia v. Quest Diagnostics Clinical Laboratories, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 34-2019-
- 2 00271174 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 3 • *Blig v. Medical Management International, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2017-00213906 (Sac. Sup.
- 4 Ct.);
- 5 • *Caguioa, et al. v. Fortune Senior Enterprises, et al.*, Case No. 34-2014-00171831 (Sac. Sup.
- 6 Ct.);
- 7 • *Camacho, et al. v. Z Street, Inc., d.b.a. Tower Café, et al.*, Case No. 34-2014-00163880 (Sac.
- 8 Sup. Ct.);
- 9 • *Castorena v. Flowmaster, Inc.*, Case No. CV18-2191 (Yolo Sup. Ct.);
- 10 • *Cannon v. Miller Event Management, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 34-2014-00168103 (Sac. Sup.
- 11 Ct.);
- 12 • *Carr, et al. v. CableCom, LLC*, Case No. 34-2017-00212739 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 13 • *Chace v. Daisy Holdings, LLC, dba Pine Creek Care Center, et al.*, Case No. 34-2017-
- 14 00209613 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 15 • *Clamens-Hollenback v. Atterro, Inc.*, Case No. 17-CV-305535 (Santa Clara Sup. Ct.);
- 16 • *Cress, et al. v. Mitsubishi Chemical Carbon Fiber and Composites, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2017-
- 17 00222101 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 18 • *De Arcos v. Amware Pallet Services, LLC*, Case No. CV-17-629 (Yolo Sup. Ct.);
- 19 • *Ferreyra v. Point Digital Finance, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 20CV373776 (Santa Clara Sup. Ct.);
- 20 • *Foye v. The Golden 1 Credit Union*, Case No. 34-2018-00235003 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 21 • *Garcia v. A-L Financial Corp.*, Case No. 34-2014-00171831 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 22 • *Garcia v. Royal Plywood Company, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 34-2017-00221627 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- 23 • *Gomes v. Progressive Casualty Insurance Company*, Case No. 34-2018-00241979 (Sac. Sup.
- 24 Ct.);
- 25 • *Gomez v. Mayflower Farms Incorporated, et al.*, Case No. CV24157 (Colusa Sup. Ct.);
- 26 • *Gilliam v. Matrix Energy Services, Inc.* Case No. RG 11592345 (Alameda Sup. Court);
- 27 • *Gonzalez v. Northcentral Pizza, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 34-2019-00252018 (Sac Sup. Ct.);
- 28 • *Gordon, et al. v. Hospice Source, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 34-2019-00250022 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);

- *Gotts v. John L. Sullivan Chevrolet, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2018-00231576 (Sac Sup. Ct.);
- *Hartwell v. Techforce Telecom, Inc.*, Case No. 39-2014-00307197 (San Joaquin Sup. Ct.);
- *Hellum v. AI Protective Services, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 34-2018-00234449 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Hercules v. Maximus Services, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 34-2019-00268385 (Sac Sup. Ct.);
- *Hernandez v. Snyir, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2017-00207641 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Heinz v. Wright Tree Services*, Case No. 34-2012-00131949 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Hoover v. Mom365*, Case No. 2:17-cv-01328-TLN-CKD (E.D. Cal.);
- *Insixiengmay v. Hyatt Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 2:18-cv-02993-TLN-DB (E.D. Cal.);
- *Josol v. Dial Medical Corp.*, Case No. 34-2008-00010040 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *McMahon v. Airco Mechanical, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2019-00259269 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Muhieddine v. KBA Docusys, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2014-00164720 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Nguyen v. Cardinal Health Pharmacy Services, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 2:19-cv-01939-KJM-EFB (E.D. Cal.);
- *Prasad v. D. G. Smith Enterprises, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2017-00215046 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Ralston v. JMJ Incorporated, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 34-2017-00217047 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Roberts v. CableCom, LLC*, Case No. 34-2017-00212739 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Robinson v. West of Chicago Restaurants, Inc., dba Chicago Fire*, Case No. 34-2010-00082201 (Sac Sup. Ct.);
- *Salas, et al. v. Joint Ventures, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 34-2018-00227493 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Salmon v. Ovation Fanfare, L.P., et al.*, Case No. 34-2018-00244749 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Scarano v. J.R. Putman, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2018-00244753 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Smith v. Greyhound Lines, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2017-00219188 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Sullivan v. National Response Corporation*, Case No. 34-2018-00244757 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Talent v. Leslie's Poolmart, Inc.*, Case No. 34-2012-00128539 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Thornton v. McConnell Jones Lanier & Murphy LLP*, Case No. 34-2017-00211553 (Sac. Sup. Ct.);
- *Watson v. Quarter At A Time, LLC*, Case No. 34-2017-00217570 (Sac. Sup. Ct.); and
- *Willis v. Premier Pools, Incorporated*, Case No. 34-2017-00211710 (Sac. Sup. Ct.).

1 16. The preceding list of cases does not include those where, for a variety of reasons, the
2 case was initially filed as a class and/or PAGA action, but did not maintain that status through the end
3 of the case. I am requesting attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to the common fund doctrine as I believe
4 it to be applicable to the present case pursuant to *Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal.3d 25, 34-35 (1977), *Laffitte*
5 *v. Robert Half Internat. Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480 (2016), and *Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt v. Graulity*, 886
6 F.2d 268, 271 (9th Cir. 1989). Plaintiff and our firm have been able to secure an identifiable benefit on
7 behalf of the class and equity counsels that the cost of the representation should be born equally
8 amongst all class members receiving these benefits. The settlement recovery provides an excellent
9 result and is the product of substantial time and effort in analyzing the facts and law applicable to this
10 case.

11 17. I agreed to take this case on a contingency basis and as a class action with the possibility
12 that I would not receive any compensation for my time and efforts due to issues regarding the merits
13 and/or certification and have carried that risk over the course of the case. I have reviewed fee
14 arrangements and Court ordered fee awards in similar class cases and I believe that the thirty five
15 percent (35%) fee request is within the accepted ranges. I will include a lodestar analysis to support
16 this request with Plaintiff's motion for final approval. In my experience with contingency cases in
17 employment law cases, the typical percentage negotiated between parties ranges from thirty-five to
18 forty percent (35% to 40%) in individual litigation. In class action litigation, my experience in my own
19 firm and working with several other firms has been that the typical percentage negotiated between
20 parties and approved by a court ranges from thirty to forty percent (30% to 40%) based on the same
21 factors. I have also reviewed several recent Federal District Court Cases where the Court has approved
22 common fund based fee requests. These cases include *In re Activision Sec. Litigation*, 723 F.Supp.
23 1373, 1379 (N.D. Cal. 1989), *Watson v. Raytheon Company*, USDC Southern District, Case No. 3:10-
24 cv-0063, *Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, Inc.*, USDC Southern District, Case No. 3:09-cv-02745, *Green,*
25 *et al. v. Penske Logistics, L.L.C., et al.*, USDC Southern District, Case No. 3:09-cv-00069, *Benitez et*
26 *al. v. Wilbur*, USDC Eastern District, Case No. 1:08-cv-01122, *Chavez et al. v. Petrissans et al.*, USDC
27 Eastern District, Case No. 1:08-cv-00122, and *Willis et al. v. Cal-Western Transport*, USDC Eastern
28 District, Case No. 1:00-cv-05695, which are cited in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

1 I believe my request of \$38,500 (approximately 35%) for attorneys' fees is justified given the results
2 obtained on behalf of the class. Moreover, at this time, my firm has advanced all costs for Plaintiff and
3 Class Members and has not received any compensation whatsoever for our time expended in this case.
4 The expected costs through final approval are not expected to exceed \$10,000. Attached as Exhibit E is
5 a true and correct copy of the costs incurred prior to the filing of this Motion and the expected costs
6 incurred through the final approval and fairness hearing. Any difference in the actual costs and the
7 maximum amount allocated under the Agreement will be added to the Net Settlement Amount.

8 18. I have used several class action administrator companies in the wage and hour class
9 actions I have resolved in the past and believe ILYM Group, Inc. will provide the best service to
10 administer the proposed class settlement. ILYM Group, Inc. has provided a quote for the estimated
11 maximum cost of administering the class settlement of approximately \$10,000. A true and correct copy
12 of a cost estimate provided by ILYM Group, Inc. is filed with this Motion as Exhibit D. This is only an
13 estimate, and final pricing may vary depending on the issues, if any, that arise during the administration
14 of the settlement. However, the difference between the actual, lesser costs and \$10,000, if any, will be
15 paid to the participating Class Members on a pro rata basis.

16 19. A copy of the Agreement and the entire Motion was submitted to the LWDA for review
17 at the same time the Motion was submitted to the Court pursuant to California Labor Code section
18 2699(1)(2). A true and correct copy of documents demonstrating the settlement documents were
19 provided to the LWDA and that the LWDA has confirmed receipt are being filed with this Motion as
20 Exhibit G.

21 20. A true and correct copy of the proposed Notice of Settlement is being filed with this
22 Motion as Exhibit F.

23 21. The intended *cy pres* beneficiaries in this case are Capital Pro Bono, Inc. ("CPB") and
24 The Center For Workers Rights ("CFWR"). Only those funds that remain from uncashed settlement
25 checks will be sent to the *cy pres* beneficiaries pursuant to section 5.6 of the Agreement.

26 22. CPB is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit in good standing with the State of California that was
27 established in 1981 and incorporated in 1986 to provide free civil legal services to the indigent,
28 primarily through the use of volunteer attorneys. The formal service area includes Sacramento, Yolo,

San Joaquin, El Dorado and Placer counties, however it also regularly provides assistance, whether in person or by phone, to individuals residing outside those counties, including Solano, Nevada, Merced, Sutter, Yuba, and Stanislaus counties. CPB changed its name in 2020 from Voluntary Legal Services Program of Northern California (“VLSP”) to Capital Pro Bono, Inc. CPB has been the recipient of *cy pres* funds from several jurisdictions in the State of California pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 384, including from Sacramento County Superior Court.

23. If CPB is approved as a *cy pres* beneficiary, any funds received will be dedicated to the Employment Law Clinic and Advice Line project, which assists the indigent with legal matters related to their current or former employment. This assistance regularly includes, but is not limited to, free legal advice regarding claims for unpaid wages, failure to provide meal and rest periods, failure to pay reimbursement, and waiting time penalty claims. CPB provides legal advice, assistance with legal forms, and direct representation in administrative hearings, including administrative hearings in front of the California Labor Commissioner for unpaid wages. CPB has a staff attorney and clinic coordinator who provide assistance, along with experienced employment law attorney volunteers. These services have been a focus of the Employment Law Clinic and Advice Line project since its inception with VLSP and continuing through today under CPB.

24. CFWR is also a qualified *cy pres* designee in class actions, under section 384, as it is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit in good standing with the State of California providing free civil legal services to the indigent. Since its inception in 2014 and in partnership with Legal Aid at Work, the CFWR offers one-on-one legal consultations for low-wage workers. The CFWR discusses employment issues with workers and advises them as to the available legal remedies. In addition to individual counseling on employment issues, the CFWR educates workers, unions, and community members about workplace laws and remedies through “Know-Your-Rights” trainings conducted by the CFWR staff and volunteers.

25. The CFWR provides limited representation for low-wage workers in wage claims before the California Labor Commissioner. The CFWR has provided services to low-wage workers in a variety of industries across the entire state of California. CFWR primarily focuses on the enforcement of basic workplace protections, including claims for unpaid wages, minimum wage violations, failure to pay overtime, failure to pay reimbursement, waiting time penalties, and meal and rest period violations. The

CFWR helps workers navigate the wage claim process before the California Labor Commissioner through advice given at its legal consultation clinics and/or, in some cases, through representing workers in these claims. If the CFWR is approved as a *cy pres* beneficiary, the funds received will be dedicated towards assisting low-wage workers with wage claims and enforcing the California Labor Code with respect to those wage claims.

26. I believe the services provided by CPB and the CFWR promote the law consistent with the objective of wage and hour class actions in general and in this case specifically.

27. I have spoken with every other attorney at my firm to determine whether they have any relationship with either of the proposed *cy pres* beneficiaries.

28. I have never done any work, volunteer or otherwise with Capital Pro Bono, Inc. During law school, I was a student volunteer for the CFWR for two summers. Since graduating law school, I have volunteered for the CFWR approximately one to two times per year, assisting in the advice clinic. I am currently the Chair of the Board of Directors for CFWR. I have never received payment or compensation of any kind in connection with any work I've done with the CFWR. Justin Rodriguez has volunteered for both CPB and the CFWR numerous times over the past several years, either directly in the advice clinics or by presenting seminars on wage and hour laws for law students seeking to also volunteer at advice clinics. He has also volunteered by sitting on CPB's advisory committee. I believe these entities provide quality service and attention to individuals in need of employment law advice and representation at the California Labor Commissioner. I believe the services they provide directly support and promoted the purposes underlying this lawsuit. I do not receive any compensation, whether direct or indirect, for designating these entities as *cy pres* beneficiaries.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 27th day of October 2022 in Elk Grove, California.



Brittany V. Berzin

Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
9401 East Stockton Boulevard, Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated
employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
INC., A California Corporation; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF SILVIANO VASQUEZ
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Reservation No.: 2676526

Date: December 2, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 28

Judge: Hon. Lauri Damrell

Filed: August 10, 2021

FAC Filed: January 5, 2022

Trial Date: None Set

I, Silviano Vasquez, declare:

1. I am a competent adult, I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration, and I am making this declaration on behalf of myself, as a named plaintiff, and in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement.

2. I worked for Defendant Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc. ("Defendant") from approximately March 15, 2021 to June 1, 2021 as a non-exempt employee. I was subject to all of Defendant's policies and practices that have been alleged as unlawful in the Complaint and the notice sent to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, including Defendant's failure to pay all hours worked

3. I have actively participated in the litigation of this case. I have given a detailed account of all the facts related to my employment and the claims asserted in the Complaint. I provided extensive documentation in support of the claims brought against Defendants including paystubs, Defendant's policies, and other documents related to my work with Defendants and to the claims brought in the class action. I met with and assisted my attorneys Brittany V. Berzin in understanding the documents and providing context for Defendant's payroll process as it applied to me and how I believed it applied to Defendant's other employees.

4. My attorneys explained to me the risks and benefits of bringing a class action and a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act. I understood that I took on the risk, both professionally and financially, in pursuing the case as a class and representative action rather than pursuing my claims individually. I understood that pursuing the case as a class action meant that it would take substantially longer than pursuing a claim with the California Labor Commissioner and that I risked getting nothing in the end, but I believed it was important to make sure that Defendants followed the law for everyone.

5. I maintained communication with my attorneys throughout the litigation, discussing the facts and policies at issue in the case with Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC. I asked questions when I needed clarification about various aspects of this case to make sure there were continually steps taken to advance the interests of the class. I also understood that the recovery in this case was for the benefit of my fellow coworkers, not just for me. When my attorneys contacted me asking for more information or documents related to the case, I made myself available and tried to give or obtain any


1 additional information I could. I participated in the negotiations and settlement discussions in this case,
2 including participating in mediation by phone, speaking with my attorney to answer questions,
3 providing any additional information needed to assist the negotiations, and discussing the potential
4 terms of the Agreement to evaluate its adequacy.

5 6. I have reviewed the final Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and
6 Release, discussed the terms with my attorneys, and asked my attorney any questions I had. I believe
7 the settlement terms and allocations are fair and reasonable given the facts of the case.

8 7. As a Class Representative, I took on the risk of having to pay Defendant's costs if we
9 were unsuccessful in bringing our claims.

10 8. I understand that any Class Representative Enhancement Payment I may receive is for
11 my participation as a Class Representative and it is not contingent on my support or approval of the
12 Agreement. I do not believe I have any conflicts with any Class Members.

13 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
14 true and correct. Executed this 24 of October 2022 in Sacramento, California.

15 DocuSigned by:
16 
17 80511F4423499433...
18 Silviano Vasquez
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
9401 East Stockton Boulevard, Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated
employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
INC., A California Corporation; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**EXHIBIT LIST AND EXHIBITS IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Reservation No.: 2676526

Date: December 2, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 28

Judge: Hon. Lauri Damrell

Filed: August 10, 2021

FAC Filed: January 5, 2022

Trial Date: None Set

<u>EXHIBIT</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
A	Joint Stipulation Regarding Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release
B	Plaintiff's Operative Complaint
C	Plaintiff's Letter to the LWDA Regarding PAGA Claims
D	ILYM Group, Inc. Quote
E	Plaintiff's Itemized Costs
F	Proposed Notice of Settlement
G	Proof of Submission of Proposed Settlement Agreement to LWDA

Dated: October 27, 2022

Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC

By: _____



 Galen T. Shimoda
 Justin P. Rodriguez
 Brittany V. Berzin
 Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT A

Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
9401 East Stockton Blvd., Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ

COGGINS LAW

BRIAN L. COGGINS / Bar No. 239481
9001 Foothills Blvd., Ste. 110
Roseville, CA 95747
Telephone: (916) 270-2895

ELGUINDY MEYER & KOEGEL, APC

DAVID M. DANIELS / Bar No. 170315
2990 Lava Ridge Ct., Ste. 205
Roseville, CA 95661
Telephone: (916) 778-3310

Attorneys for Defendants CHRISWELL HOME
IMPROVEMENTS, INC., PAUL C. CROMWELL
and CHRIS J. MESUNAS

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
INC., A California Corporation; and DOES 1 to
100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 34-2021-00305938

**JOINT STIPULATION REGARDING CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AND
RELEASE**

Filed: August 10, 2021

FAC Filed: January 5, 2022

Trial Date: None Set

1 This Joint Stipulation Regarding Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release is made and
2 entered into between the Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself, the Labor and
3 Workforce Development Agency, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees, and Defendants Chriswell
4 Home Improvements, Inc., Paul C. Cromwell and Chris J. Mesunas (“Defendants”). This Agreement is
5 subject to the terms and conditions set forth below and the approval of the Court.

6 **1. DEFINITIONS**

7 The following terms, when used in this Agreement, have the following meanings:

8 1.1 “Action” means the above stated lawsuit, *Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.*,
9 Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2021-00305938, filed August 10, 2021.

10 1.2 “Aggrieved Employee(s)” means all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work
11 for Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc. in California as non-exempt employees during the PAGA Claim
12 Period.

13 1.3 “Agreement” or “Settlement” or “Settlement Agreement” means this Joint Stipulation
14 Regarding Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release.

15 1.4 “Claim Amount” means an individual Qualified Claimant’s and Aggrieved Employee’s
16 allocation of the Net Settlement Amount and PAGA Payment respectively, as defined in Sections 1.21,
17 1.25, 5.5, and 5.8.

18 1.5 “Claims Administrator” means and refers to ILYM Group, Inc., the third-party entity that
19 will administer the Agreement as outlined in Sections 4 and 7, or any other third-party class action
20 settlement claims administrator agreed to by the Parties and approved by the Court for the purposes of
21 administering this Agreement. The Parties each represent that they do not have any financial interest in
22 the Claims Administrator or otherwise have a relationship with the Claims Administrator that could create
23 a conflict of interest.

24 1.6 “Claims Administrator Costs” means the fees and expenses reasonably incurred by the
25 Claims Administrator as a result of the procedures and processes expressly required by this Agreement,
26 and shall include all costs of administering the Agreement, including, but not limited to, all tax document
27 preparation, custodial fees, and accounting fees incurred by the Claims Administrator; all costs and fees
28 associated with preparing, issuing and mailing any and all notices and other correspondence to Class

Members and/or Aggrieved Employees; all costs and fees associated with communicating with Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees, Class Counsel, and Defendants’ Counsel; all costs and fees associated with computing, processing, reviewing, and paying the Claim Amounts, and resolving disputes; all costs and fees associated with calculating tax withholdings and payroll taxes, if any, making related payment to federal and state tax authorities, if any, and issuing tax forms relating to payments made under the Agreement; all costs and fees associated with preparing any tax returns and any other filings required by any governmental taxing authority or agency; all costs and fees associated with preparing any other notices, reports, or filings to be prepared in the course of administering Claim Amounts; and any other costs and fees incurred and/or charged by the Claims Administrator in connection with the execution of its duties under this Agreement.

1.7 “Class Counsel” means Galen T. Shimoda, Justin P. Rodriguez and Brittany V. Berzin of Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC.

1.8 “Class Member(s)” means all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc. in California as non-exempt employees during the Class Period.

1.9 “Class Period” means August 10, 2017 up to either (1) the Preliminary Approval Date, or (2) September 26, 2022, whichever is earlier.

1.10 “Class Representative” means Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez.

1.11 “Complaint” means the operative Complaint on file in the Action with the Court.

1.12 “Court” means the Sacramento County Superior Court.

1.13 “Defendants” means Chriswell Home Improvement, Inc., Paul C. Cromwell and Chris J. Mesunas.

1.14 “Defendants’ Counsel” means Coggins Law and Elguindy Meyer & Koegel, APC.

1.15 “Enhancement Payment” means the amount approved by the Court to be paid to the Class Representative in recognition of the time and effort expended on behalf of Class Members for the benefit of Class Members, which is in addition to any Claim Amount paid to the Class Representative as a Qualified Claimant.

1.16 “Effective Date” means the Final Approval Date unless there is a timely objection lodged that has not later been withdrawn, in which case the Effective Date will be either (a) the 60th calendar day

1 after a signed order approving this settlement has been filed provided no appellate proceeding having been
2 filed; or (b) seventh (7th) calendar day after any appellate proceeding opposing the settlement has been
3 finally dismissed with no material change to the terms of this settlement and there is no right to pursue
4 further remedies or relief, whichever is later.

5 1.17 “Final Approval Date” means the date a signed order granting final approval of this
6 Agreement is filed with the Court.

7 1.18 “Gross Settlement Amount” is the sum of One Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars and No
8 Cents (\$110,000).

9 1.19 “LWDA” means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

10 1.20 “Net Settlement Amount” is the portion of the Gross Settlement Amount available for
11 distribution to Qualified Claimants, as described in this Agreement, after deduction of Class Counsel’s
12 attorneys’ fees and litigation costs, Claims Administrator Costs, the PAGA Payment, and Enhancement
13 Payment to the Class Representative.

14 1.21 “Notice of Settlement” means the document substantially in the form attached hereto as
15 Exhibit 1.

16 1.22 “Notice Period” means sixty (60) calendar days from the initial mailing of the Notice of
17 Settlement to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees.

18 1.23 “PAGA” means Private Attorneys General Act.

19 1.24 “PAGA Payment” means the amount allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount towards
20 resolving claims under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*

21 1.25 “PAGA Claim Period” means August 10, 2020 up to either (1) to the Preliminary Approval
22 Date or (2) September 26, 2022, whichever is earlier.

23 1.26 “Parties” mean Defendants and Plaintiff.

24 1.27 “Preliminary Approval Date” means the date a signed order granting preliminary approval
25 of this Agreement is filed with the Court.

26 1.28 “QSF” means a Qualified Settlement Fund set up by the Claims Administrator for the
27 benefit of the Qualified Claimants and/or Aggrieved Employees and from which the payments under this
28

Agreement shall be made. Any amounts Defendants have agreed to pay under this Agreement shall remain the property of Defendants until the payments required under the Agreement are made.

1.29 “Qualified Claimant” means any and all Class Members who have not made any timely request to opt-out of the Agreement.

1.30 “Qualified Claimant’s Released Claims” means all claims contained in the operative Complaint, and any additional wage and hour claims that could have been brought based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint, through the Class Period. This release excludes the release of claims not permitted by law. The Qualified Claimant’s Released Claims exclude claims for workers’ compensation or unemployment insurance benefits. This release will cover all Class Members who do not opt out.

1.31 “Qualifying Workweeks” are weeks worked by Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees during the Class Period and/or PAGA Claim Period, respectively, in California. For Class Members, workweeks shall be defined as the total length of service (in days) in California during the Class Period divided by seven. For Aggrieved Employees workweeks shall be defined as the total length of service (in days) in California during the PAGA Claim Period divided by seven. The calculation of a Class Member’s and/or Aggrieved Employee’s workweeks and a determination as to whether a Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee was actively employed in California in a particular workweek shall be construed from Defendants’ records.

1.32 “Released PAGA Claims” means any all Private Attorneys General Act claims for civil penalties contained in Plaintiff’s letter to the LWDA and/or operative Complaint, through the PAGA Claim Period. Aggrieved Employees cannot opt out of this waiver of claims.

1.33 “Released Parties” means Defendants, as well as Defendants’ officers, shareholders, directors, agents, employees, attorneys, and insurers.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE LITIGATION

2.1 On or about August 10, 2021, Plaintiff sent notice to the LWDA to exhaust administrative remedies under the PAGA for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest periods, failure to provide accurate wage statements, failure to pay final wages, failure to pay reimbursements for expenses, failure to maintain accurate records and

1 failure to provide paid sick leave. The LWDA did not respond to the notice within the statutorily required
2 time frame and, as such, Plaintiff became authorized to act as a Private Attorneys General on all alleged
3 PAGA claims.

4 2.2 On or about August 10, 2021, Plaintiff filed a class action Complaint in Sacramento
5 County Superior Court on behalf of himself and Class Members alleging claims for failure to pay
6 minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest
7 periods, failure to provide accurate wage statements, failure to pay final wages, failure to pay
8 reimbursements for expenses, and unfair competition. Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint on
9 approximately January 5, 2022 to add a PAGA cause of action based on the violations alleged in the
10 August 10, 2021 notice to the LWDA on behalf of himself and Aggrieved Employees.

11 2.3 Through informal discovery, Defendants and Defendants' Counsel provided Class
12 Counsel with copies of all applicable versions of its policies and procedures, employee handbooks,
13 information on Class Members including, but not limited to, Class Members' dates of employment, total
14 number of Class Members, as well as timecard data and payroll reports for a randomly selected sample of
15 Class Members.

16 2.4 On July 28, 2022, the Parties participated in a lengthy mediation with private mediator
17 Russ J. Wunderli, Esq. At the conclusion of the mediation, the Parties were able to come to a resolution.
18 At all times, the Parties' settlement negotiations have been non-collusive, adversarial, and at arm's length.

19 2.5 Discussions between Plaintiff and Class Counsel, between counsel for the Parties,
20 document productions, extensive legal analysis, the provision of information by Defendants to Plaintiff
21 and the detailed analysis of the records, including expert analysis, have permitted each side to assess the
22 relative merits of the claims and the defenses to those claims.

23 2.6 In the Action, Plaintiff contends that Defendants violated California law by 1) failing to
24 pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for all hours worked; and 2) failing to incorporate the value
25 of nondiscretionary remuneration, such as bonuses into Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees'
26 regular rates of pay for the purpose of calculating overtime and paid sick time; 3) failing to authorize and
27 permit all meal and rest periods and failing to keep track of whether employees took meal periods; and 4)
28 failing to reimburse employees for the use of personal items for work, such as personal cellphones,

1 vehicles, and tools. Defendants have denied each of Plaintiff's claims and Defendants have denied that
2 this Action is appropriate for class certification for anything other than settlement purposes. The agreed
3 upon Gross Settlement Amount was reached after evaluating the Parties' theories of potential exposure
4 for the underlying claims and the class data supporting these claims. The Parties, with the assistance of
5 the mediator, also assessed appropriate discounts to the potential liability based on Defendants' claim of
6 financial hardship.

7 2.7 The Parties agree that the above-described investigation and evaluation, as well as
8 discovery and the information exchanged to date, are more than sufficient to assess the merits of the
9 respective Parties' positions and to compromise the issues on a fair and equitable basis. Plaintiff, Class
10 Counsel, Defendants, and Defendants' Counsel have concluded that it is desirable that the Action be
11 settled in a manner and upon such terms and conditions set forth herein in order to avoid further expense,
12 inconvenience and distraction of further legal proceedings, and the risk of an adverse outcome each of the
13 Parties potentially face in the Action. Therefore, the Parties desire to resolve the claims in the Action.
14 Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendants, and Defendants' Counsel are of the opinion that the Agreement for
15 the consideration and terms set forth herein is fair, reasonable, and adequate in light of all known facts
16 and circumstances.

17 **3. THE CONDITIONAL NATURE OF THIS AGREEMENT**

18 3.1 This Agreement and all associated exhibits or attachments are made for the sole purpose
19 of settling the Action. This Agreement and the settlement it evidences are made in compromise of disputed
20 claims. Because the Action was pled as a class action, this Agreement must receive preliminary and final
21 approval by the Court. Accordingly, the Parties enter into this Agreement and associated settlement on a
22 conditional basis. If the Court does not enter an order granting final approval of the Agreement, or if the
23 Court's approval of the settlement is reversed or materially modified on appellate review, this Agreement
24 shall be deemed null and void; it shall be of no force or effect whatsoever; it shall not be referred to or
25 utilized for any purpose whatsoever; and the negotiation, terms and entry of the Agreement shall remain
26 subject to the provisions of California Evidence Code Sections 1119 and 1152, Federal Rule of Evidence
27 408, and any other analogous rules of evidence that may be applicable.

28 //

3.2 Defendants have denied all claims as to liability, damages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, fees, restitution, injunctive relief and all other forms of relief asserted in the Action. Defendants have agreed to resolve the Action via this Agreement, but to the extent this Agreement is deemed void or the Final Approval Date does not occur, Defendants do not waive, but rather expressly reserve, all rights to challenge all such claims and allegations in the Action upon all procedural and factual grounds, including, without limitation, the ability to challenge class or collective treatment on any grounds, as well as to assert any and all other potential defenses or privileges.

4. SCOPE OF THE CLASS

4.1 The scope of the class of individuals encompassed under the Agreement, who are entitled to all benefits as authorized under the Agreement and subject to all obligations and duties required under the Agreement, shall include all Class Members as defined in Section 1.8 and all Aggrieved Employees as defined in Section 1.2. However, it shall not include any Class Members who submit valid and timely requests to opt-out of the Agreement and settlement, as set forth in Section 7.5.1.

4.2 Individuals entitled to recover under this Agreement will include only those individuals who are identified as being within the scope of this Agreement under Section 4.1.

4.3 Any person who believes that he or she is a Class Member or Aggrieved Employee and wishes to participate in the Agreement, but did not receive a Notice of Settlement because his or her name did not appear on the class list provided to the Claims Administrator prior to mailing, may submit a data request to the Claims Administrator. The data request must contain all of the following information: (a) the full name and, if applicable, Social Security Number of the individual making the request; (b) the name used by such employee as of the time his or her employment with Defendants ended; (c) the years during which such employee was employed with Defendants; and (d) a return address to which a response may be sent. Every data request must be postmarked on or before the conclusion of the Notice Period or otherwise submitted to the Claims Administrator such that it is received before the conclusion of the Notice Period. Upon receipt of any data requests, the Claims Administrator shall promptly (in no event more than two business days) transmit the data requests to Defendants' Counsel and request that Defendants review their records.

//

1 4.4 If Defendants agree that the person listed in a data request is a Class Member and/or
2 Aggrieved Employee, the Claims Administrator shall promptly mail a Notice of Settlement to the person
3 who submitted the data request, at the address designated for that purpose in the data request. All
4 provisions of this Agreement relating to the Notice of Settlements shall apply to Notice of Settlements
5 sent in response to data requests, and any person who submits a data request and is sent a Notice of
6 Settlement in response shall be treated by the Claims Administrator as a Class Member and/or Aggrieved
7 Employee for all other purposes.

8 4.5 If Defendants disagree that the person listed in a data request is a Class Member and/or
9 Aggrieved Employee, Defendants' Counsel and Class Counsel shall attempt to resolve any such dispute
10 in good faith within seven (7) calendar days of Class Counsel being advised in writing of the data request
11 dispute. Defendants' records shall control unless the individual submitting the data request provides
12 persuasive evidence to doubt the accuracy of those records. Each data request dispute that Defendants'
13 Counsel and Class Counsel cannot timely resolve shall be resolved by the Claims Administrator. The
14 Claims Administrator must accept and weigh all the evidence provided in a good faith attempt to resolve
15 the dispute. The Claims Administrator must resolve any dispute submitted to it within seven (7) calendar
16 days after Defendants' Counsel and Class Counsel submit the dispute to the Claims Administrator. The
17 decision by the Claims Administrator shall be final and there shall be no right of appeal.

18 **5. TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT**

19 The Parties agree as follows:

20 5.1 Gross Settlement Amount: In consideration and exchange for the releases described in
21 Section 6, Defendants shall pay the Gross Settlement Amount (\$110,000). Funding of the Gross
22 Settlement Amount shall occur within 30 calendar days after the Effective Date to be held in trust in a
23 QSF by the Claims Administrator. The Gross Settlement Amount includes payments to Qualified
24 Claimants, Aggrieved Employees, all attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses related to the Action
25 incurred to date, as well as all such fees and costs incurred in documenting the Agreement, administering
26 the Agreement (including Claims Administrator Costs), and obtaining final approval of the Agreement,
27 the Enhancement Payment to the Class Representative and the PAGA Payment. Any monies necessary
28 to satisfy Defendants' tax obligations (*e.g.* employer FICA, FUTA and SDI contributions on wage

1 payments) on any monies distributed to Qualified Claimants will be paid in addition to the Gross
2 Settlement Amount.

3 5.2 Attorneys' Fees and Costs: Class Counsel will apply to the Court for attorney's fees of
4 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount, which shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendants
5 have agreed to not oppose Class Counsel's application for attorneys' fees so long as it does not exceed the
6 35% threshold. Class Counsel will also be entitled to reimbursement for advanced litigation expenses not
7 to exceed \$10,000, which shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendants have agreed to
8 not oppose Class Counsel's request for reimbursement for advanced litigation expenses so long as they
9 do not exceed the \$10,000 threshold. The Claims Administrator will issue Class Counsel an IRS Form
10 1099 for the attorneys' fees and costs paid under this Agreement. In the event that the Court awards less
11 than the requested attorney's fees and/or costs, the portion of the requested amounts not awarded to Class
12 Counsel shall be added to the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Qualified Claimants on a pro
13 rata basis.

14 5.3 Claims Administrator Costs: The Claims Administrator Costs shall be paid from the Gross
15 Settlement Amount and shall not exceed \$10,000. The difference between any actual costs and the
16 allocated \$10,000 shall be added to the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Qualified Claimants
17 on a pro rata basis.

18 5.4 Enhancement Payment: Class Counsel, on behalf of Plaintiff, shall apply to the Court for
19 an Enhancement Payment to the Class Representative in an amount not to exceed \$10,000 to compensate
20 for the risks, time, and expense of his involvement in the Action and securing the benefits of this
21 Agreement for Class Members. The Enhancement Payment is in addition to the Claim Amount Plaintiff
22 would otherwise be due under the Agreement as a Qualified Claimant. Defendants have agreed to not
23 oppose Class Counsel's request for an Enhancement Payment to Plaintiff so long as it does not exceed the
24 amount stated herein. The Enhancement Payment will be designated as a non-wage payment and reported
25 on an IRS Form 1099-MISC. In the event that the Court awards less than the Enhancement Payment
26 amount requested, then any portion of the requested amount not awarded to the Class Representative shall
27 be added to the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Qualified Claimants on a pro rata basis.

28 //

1 5.5 PAGA Payment: Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars No Cents (\$2,500) of the Gross
2 Settlement Amount shall be allocated to resolving claims under the PAGA. Seventy-Five percent (75%)
3 of the PAGA Payment will be paid to the LWDA and Twenty-Five percent (25%) will be paid to
4 Aggrieved Employees on a pro rata basis as described below in Section 5.8. Any amount not approved
5 by the Court for the allocated PAGA Payment shall be added to the Net Settlement Amount to be
6 distributed to Qualified Claimants on a pro rata basis.

7 5.6 Treatment of Residue and Cy Pres: For any portion of the Net Settlement Amount or
8 PAGA Payment allocated to Qualified Claimants and/or Aggrieved Employees that were not claimed by
9 cashing their respective settlement checks before the deadline to do so, that remaining amount shall be
10 donated equally, i.e. 50/50, to Capital Pro Bono, Inc., and the Center for Workers' Rights. No portion of
11 the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendants for any reason.

12 5.7 No Additional Benefits Contributions: All Claim Amounts paid to Qualified Claimants
13 and Aggrieved Employees shall be deemed to be income solely in the year in which such amounts were
14 actually received. It is expressly understood and agreed that the receipt of such Claim Amounts will not
15 entitle any Qualified Claimant or Aggrieved Employee to any new or additional compensation or benefits
16 under any company bonus or other compensation or benefit plan or agreement in place during the period
17 covered by the Agreement, nor will it entitle any Qualified Claimant Aggrieved Employee to any increased
18 retirement, 401(k) and/or 403(b) benefits or matching benefits, or deferred compensation benefits. It is
19 the intent of this Agreement that the Claim Amounts provided for in this Agreement are the sole payments
20 to be made by Defendants to the Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved Employees in connection with this
21 Agreement (notwithstanding any contrary language or agreement in any benefit or compensation plan
22 document that might have been in effect during the period covered by this Agreement).

23 5.8 Pro Rata Distribution Formula: Payment to Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved
24 Employees of their Claim Amount will not require the submission of a claim form. A Net Settlement
25 Amount will be determined by subtracting from the Gross Settlement Amount any amounts for approved
26 attorneys' fees and costs, any Enhancement Payment to the Class Representative, the Claims
27 Administrator Costs, and the PAGA Payment. Each Class Member's share will be determined by dividing
28 their total Qualifying Workweeks within the Class Period by the total Qualifying Workweeks by all Class

Members. That fraction will then be multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to arrive at the Class Member's individual share of the Net Settlement Amount. Each Aggrieved Employee's share of the 25% portion of the PAGA Payment will be determined by dividing their total Qualifying Workweeks within the PAGA Claim Period by the total Qualifying Workweeks by all Aggrieved Employees within the PAGA Claim Period. That fraction will then be multiplied by the 25% portion of the PAGA Payment to arrive at the Aggrieved Employee's individual share.

5.9 Tax Allocation: The Parties recognize that the Claim Amounts to be paid to Qualified Claimants and/or Aggrieved Employees reflect a settlement of a dispute over claimed penalties and wages. The Claims Administrator shall calculate the employer's share of payroll taxes on the amounts paid to Qualified Claimants as wages as well as calculating all required withholdings and deductions from said wage payments. The characterization of Claim Amounts to Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved Employees are as follows:

5.9.1 One third (1/3) of each Qualified Claimants' Claim Amount shall be allocated for payment of disputed wages and shall be subject to required employer taxes. Qualified Claimants shall receive an IRS Form W-2 for reporting of this portion of their Claim Amount.

5.9.2 Two thirds (2/3) of each Qualified Claimants' Claim Amount shall be allocated for disputed statutory penalties and interest, and no amount shall be deducted for any taxes. This portion of the Claim Amount consists of other income, not wages, for which the Qualified Claimants shall receive an IRS Form 1099-MISC.

5.9.3 The entirety (100%) of each Aggrieved Employee's share of the 25% portion of the PAGA Payment shall be allocated for payment of disputed civil penalties, and no amount shall be deducted for any taxes. This portion of the Claim Amount consists of other income, not wages, for which the Aggrieved Employees shall receive an IRS Form 1099-MISC.

5.10 Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved Employees shall be solely responsible for the reporting and payment of their share of any federal, state and/or municipal income or other taxes on payments made pursuant to this Agreement, and shall hold the Parties, Class Counsel, and Defendants' Counsel free and harmless from any claims resulting from treatment of such payments as non-taxable, including the treatment of such payments as not subject to withholding or deduction for payroll and employment taxes.

No party has made any representation to any of the other Parties as to the taxability of any payments pursuant to this Agreement, including the payments to Qualified Claimants, the payments to Aggrieved Employees, the payments to Class Counsel, the payments to the Class Representative, the payroll tax liability of Defendants, or the allocation of the Net Settlement Amount or PAGA Payment to wage and non-wage income as provided in this Section, or otherwise as to tax implications of any provision of this Agreement.

5.11 No Additional Contribution by Defendants: Defendants' monetary obligation under this Agreement is limited to the Gross Settlement Amount and any employer side payroll taxes owed on amounts characterized as wages under this Agreement. All other costs and expenses arising out of or in connection with the performance of this Agreement shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, unless expressly provided otherwise herein. However, in the event this agreement is deemed null and void as described in Section 3 because the Court, in its independent determination, finds that the Agreement does not meet the standards for settlement approval, then Defendants and Plaintiff shall be equally responsible for the costs of the Claims Administrator incurred between the date the Agreement was executed and the date of such event.

5.12 Certification For Settlement Purposes: The Parties agree that, for purposes of settlement only, certification of the class as defined in Section 1.8 and 4.1 is appropriate and the requisites for establishing class certification have been met and are met.

5.13 Adequacy of Class Counsel and Class Representative: The Parties agree that, for purposes of settlement only, Class Counsel and Plaintiff are adequate representatives for Class Members and Aggrieved Employees.

6. RELEASE

6.1 Release of Claims by Qualified Claimants: Upon the Effective Date, all Qualified Claimants will be deemed to fully, finally and forever release Qualified Claimant's Released Claims as to all Released Parties. In addition, on the Effective Date, all Qualified Claimants and their successors in interest will be permanently enjoined and forever barred from prosecuting any of Qualified Claimant's Released Claims against any of the Released Parties.

//

6.2 Release of Claims by Aggrieved Employees: Upon the Effective Date, all Aggrieved Employees will be deemed to fully, finally and forever release the Released PAGA Claims as to all Released Parties. In addition, on the Effective Date, all Aggrieved Employees and their successors in interest will be permanently enjoined and forever barred from prosecuting any of the Released PAGA Claims against any of the Released Parties.

7. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

7.1 Duties of Claims Administrator: The Claims Administrator shall be responsible for: 1) receiving Class Member and Aggrieved Employee contact information and confirming addresses are valid; 2) calculating estimated Claim Amounts and any and all taxes associated with the Claim Amounts, including Employer taxes; 3) taking appropriate steps to trace and locate any individual Class Members and Aggrieved Employee whose address or contact information as provided to the Claims Administrator is inaccurate or outdated and mailing the Notice of Settlement to Class Members; 4) providing notification to the appropriate state and federal officials of this Agreement as required under the law; 5) receiving, independently reviewing, and resolving any challenges (in consultation with Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel) from Class Members or Aggrieved Employees, including any associated documentation, regarding their Qualified Workweek calculations; 6) receiving and serving on Class Counsel, Defendants' Counsel, and the Court, copies of any written objections, and/or any opt out statements; 7) establishing a toll free telephone line and responding to inquiries and requests for information or assistance from Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees; 8) maintaining a QSF; 9) determining and paying the final amounts due to be paid under the Agreement after resolution of all challenges, disputes, opt-outs, awarded attorneys' fees and costs, Claims Administrator Costs, PAGA Payment, taxes, any Enhancement Payments, and for funds that cannot be distributed due to the inability to locate Class Members or Aggrieved Employees; 10) determining the validity of any disputes or late opt-outs by previously unidentified Class Members or Aggrieved Employees; 11) paying any residual funds from uncashed checks; 12) reporting to Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel regarding the statistics of the administration, including (a) the number of initial Notice of Settlements mailed; (b) the number of forwarded Notice of Settlements; (c) the number of re-mailed Notice of Settlements; (d) the number of total undeliverable Notice of Settlements; (e) the number of address traces performed for

undeliverable Notice of Settlements; (f) the number of Notice of Settlements undeliverable from traced addresses; (g) the number of total objections received; (h) the number of opt-out requests received; (i) the number of disputes received; (j) the number of disputes resolved; 13) providing a declaration to the Court regarding the final statistics of the administration and compliance with all payment obligations under the Agreement; 14) completing all necessary tax reporting on the QSF and payment of the Claim Amounts to Qualified Members and Aggrieved Employees; and 15) carrying out other related tasks as necessary to effectuate the terms of this Agreement and any Order of the Court. All disputes relating to the Claims Administrator's ability and need to perform its duties shall be referred to the Court, if necessary, which will have continuing jurisdiction over the terms and conditions of this Agreement, until all payments and obligations contemplated by the Agreement have been fully executed.

7.2 Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees: The Notice of Settlement will provide Class Members and Aggrieved Employees with a summary of the terms and conditions of the Agreement, how to participate in the settlement, how to object to the Agreement, how to dispute the individual's Qualifying Workweeks, and how to opt-out from the Agreement. The Notice of Settlement will also inform Class Members and Aggrieved Employees of the Gross Settlement Amount, Net Settlement Amount, proposed attorneys' fees and costs allocations, any proposed Enhancement Payments, proposed Claims Administrator Cost allocations, proposed PAGA Payment allocations, the scope of the class, the nature and extent of the released claims, dates set for a fairness hearing and hearing on Class Counsels' motion for attorneys' fees and costs. The Notice of Settlement shall include information regarding Class Member's and Aggrieved Employee's estimated Claim Amount. The Notice of Settlement will provide information on how to access electronic copies online of the Notice of Settlement, any motions for approval of the Agreement, any motions for approval of attorneys' fees and costs, and any other documents as the Court directs.

7.3 Class Member Data and Mailing: No later than fourteen (14) calendar days after the Preliminary Approval Date, Defendants shall provide the Claims Administrator with the name, last known mailing address, last known telephone number, Social Security Number, start and end date of employment (if any) of each Class Member and Aggrieved Employee, and any other information the Claims Administrator needs to effectuate notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees as outlined herein.

1 The Claims Administrator shall review the data to determine the number of Qualifying Workweeks for
2 each Class Member and Aggrieved Employee. No later than fourteen (14) calendar days after receipt of
3 such address information, the Claims Administrator will perform a national change of address (“NCOA”)
4 search, update the addresses per the results of the NCOA search, and then mail the Notice of Settlement,
5 substantially in the form attached as Exhibit 1, to each Class Member and Aggrieved Employee by first-
6 class mail, postage prepaid. The Claims Administrator shall maintain all information received from
7 Defendants confidential to itself, and Defendants’ Counsel. However, Class Counsel shall be able to
8 review the breakdown of Qualified Workweeks and estimated Claim Amounts for Class Members and
9 Aggrieved Employees prior to mailing for quality assurance provided the personal identifying information
10 is redacted and/or omitted.

11 7.4 Returned and/or Re-mailed Notice of Settlements: In the event that a Notice of Settlement
12 is returned to the Claims Administrator as undeliverable on or before the conclusion of the Notice Period,
13 the Notice of Settlement shall be sent to the forwarding address affixed thereto within five (5) calendar
14 days. If no forwarding address is provided, then the Claims Administrator shall promptly attempt to
15 determine a correct address using a skip-trace, computer or other search using the name, address and/or
16 Social Security number of the individual involved, and shall then perform a single re-mailing within five
17 (5) calendar days to any more recent address found as a result of the search. Following each search that
18 does not result in a corrected address, for those Class Members who appear to be current employees of
19 Defendants at the time of the Preliminary Approval Date, the Claims Administrator shall contact
20 Defendants’ Counsel for assistance and Defendants shall cooperate in good faith with the Claims
21 Administrator’s reasonable efforts to obtain valid mailing addresses for Class Members to the extent they
22 are active employees of Defendants. In the event the Notice of Settlement is forwarded to a new address
23 and/or re-mailed to a Class Member, the deadline for the Class Member to submit any request to opt-out,
24 a dispute, or an objection shall be the end of the Notice Period or 10 days from the date of the re-
25 mailing/forwarding to a new address, whichever is later. In the event the procedures in this Section are
26 followed and the Class Member does not timely and properly request to opt-out, the Class Member shall
27 be bound by all terms of the Agreement, including the releases contained in Section 6.

28 //

1 7.5 Responses to Notice of Settlement:

2 7.5.1 *Opt-Outs:* The Notice of Settlement shall provide that Class Members who wish
3 to exclude themselves from the Agreement must submit a request to opt-out as provided in this Section.
4 The request to opt-out must (a) state the Class Member's full name and date of birth; (b) a statement that
5 he or she does not want to be a Class Member, does not want to participate in the settlement, and/or wants
6 to be excluded from the settlement; (c) identify the case name and number (i.e. Vasquez v. Chriswell
7 Home Improvement, Inc., 34-2021-00305938); (d) be signed; and (e) be post-marked no later than the
8 conclusion of the Notice Period or the re-mailing timeline stated in Section 7.4. The Class Member must
9 personally sign the request to opt-out. No request to opt-out may be made on behalf of a group of Class
10 Members. The date of the postmark on the return-mailing envelope shall be the exclusive means used to
11 determine whether a request to opt-out has been timely submitted. Any Class Member who requests to
12 opt-out of the Agreement will not be entitled to any benefit of the Agreement or any portion of the Net
13 Settlement Amount, will not be bound by the Agreement, nor will they have any right to object, appeal or
14 comment thereon. Class Members who fail to submit a valid and timely request to opt-out shall be bound
15 by all terms of the Agreement and any order or final judgment thereon, regardless of whether they
16 otherwise have requested to opt-out of the Agreement. Aggrieved Employees cannot opt out of this
17 Agreement as it relates to the PAGA Payment or Released PAGA Claims regardless of whether they opt
18 out of being a Class Member.

19 7.5.2 *Objection Procedures:* Any Class Member who does not opt-out but who wishes
20 to object to this Agreement or otherwise to be heard concerning this Agreement shall send their written
21 objections to the Claims Administrator and also serve copies of the objections on Class Counsel and
22 Defendants' Counsel. The Notice of Settlement shall make clear that the Court can only approve or deny
23 the Agreement, not change the terms of the Agreement. The objection must (a) state the Class Member's
24 full name and date of birth; (b) provide evidence that the individual is, in fact, a Class Member; (c) state
25 the reasons for the objection(s), including any legal analysis and/or supporting documentation; (d) identify
26 the case name and number (i.e. Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvement, Inc., 34-2021-00305938) (e)
27 be signed; and (f) be post-marked no later than the conclusion of the Notice Period or the re-mailing
28 timeline stated in Section 7.4. The objecting Class Member must also file a notice of intent to appear with

1 the Court and serve the notice on Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel, if they intend to appear at the
2 final approval hearing.

3 7.5.3 *Dispute Procedures:* Any Class Member who disputes the number of Qualifying
4 Workweeks on the Notice of Settlement shall contact the Claims Administrator. The dispute must (a)
5 identify the nature of the dispute; (b) provide any information or documentation supporting the dispute;
6 (c) be signed; and (d) be post-marked no later than the conclusion of the Notice Period or the re-mailing
7 timeline stated in Section 7.4. The Claims Administrator shall promptly (in no event more than two
8 business days) forward all such disputes to Defendants' Counsel and request that Defendants review the
9 dispute. Defendants' records shall presumptively control unless the Class Member can produce
10 documentation evidencing other periods of employment worked. If Defendants do agree with submitted
11 information, the Class Member shall be credited or subtracted Qualifying Workweeks in accordance with
12 their submitted dispute and that final number of Qualified Workweeks shall govern the calculation of that
13 Class Member's Claim Amount. If Defendants do not agree with the submitted information, Defendants'
14 Counsel will promptly advise Class Counsel of the dispute, which includes turning over any
15 documentation submitted by the Class Member as part of the dispute. Defendants' Counsel and Class
16 Counsel shall attempt in good faith to resolve any such dispute within five (5) calendar days of Class
17 Counsel being advised of the dispute. Each dispute that Defendants' Counsel and Class Counsel cannot
18 timely resolve shall be resolved by the Claims Administrator or Court.

19 7.5.4 *Deficient Opt-Outs, Objections, or Disputes:* In the event that a deficient opt-out,
20 objection, or dispute is received on or before the conclusion of the Notice Period, the Claims Administrator
21 shall mail a letter to the Class Member within five (5) calendar days informing them of the deficiency. If
22 a deficiency letter is mailed to a Class Member, the deadline for the Class Member to cure the deficiency
23 shall be the end of the Notice Period or 10 calendar days from the date of the deficiency letter, whichever
24 is later.

25 7.6 Due Process Acknowledgement: Compliance with the procedures set forth in Sections 7.1
26 to 7.5.4 shall constitute due and sufficient notice to Class Members of the Action and the Agreement and
27 shall satisfy Class Members' due process rights. Nothing else shall be required of the Parties, Class
28 Counsel or Defendants' Counsel to provide notice of the proposed Agreement.

1 7.7 Claims Administrator Declaration Regarding Notice Period: Within fourteen (14) calendar
2 days after the conclusion of the Notice Period, the Claims Administrator shall provide Class Counsel and
3 Defendants' Counsel with a signed declaration under penalty of perjury providing a complete and detailed
4 report regarding the statistics and responses of settlement administration to date and all the Claims
5 Administrators' obligations under Sections 5.8 to 5.9.3 and 7.1 to 7.5.4.

6 7.8 Claims Administrator Payments to Qualified Claimants, Class Counsel and Plaintiff:
7 Within seven (7) calendar days after the Effective Date and the Court's determination of the amount of
8 attorneys' fees and costs payable to Class Counsel, the Enhancement Payment payable to Plaintiff, the
9 PAGA Payment, and Claims Administrator Costs, the Claims Administrator shall calculate the final Net
10 Settlement Amount, the final Claim Amounts for Qualified Claimants and/or Aggrieved Employees, any
11 applicable taxes thereon, and report the results of these calculations Class Counsel and Defendants'
12 Counsel. Defendants shall wire the Gross Settlement Amount and applicable taxes necessary to fund the
13 Settlement as described in Section 5.1 to the Claims Administrator within thirty (30) calendar days after
14 the Effective Date to be held in trust in a QSF. Within seven (7) calendar days after Defendants fund
15 the settlement, the Claims Administrator shall deliver payment of Class Counsels' attorney's fees and
16 costs, the Enhancement Payment payable to Plaintiff, the 75% portion of the PAGA Payment payable to
17 the LWDA, Claims Administrator Costs, and payment to Qualified Claimants and/or Aggrieved
18 Employees as required under this Agreement and approved by Court.

19 7.8.1 The Claims Administrator shall wire the Court-approved attorneys' fees and costs
20 to Class Counsel unless another method is requested by Class Counsel. Class Counsel shall provide the
21 Claims Administrator with the pertinent taxpayer identification number and payment instructions after the
22 Final Approval Date.

23 7.8.2 The Claims Administrator shall send a check by mail for the Court-approved
24 Enhancement Payment to the Class Representative, care of Class Counsel unless another method is
25 requested by Class Counsel.

26 7.8.3 Only Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will receive their Claim
27 Amount.

28 //

7.8.4 The Claims Administrator shall remit and report the applicable portions of the payroll tax payment to the appropriate taxing authorities on a timely basis pursuant to its duties under this Agreement. Defendants agree to reasonably cooperate with the Claims Administrator to the extent necessary to determine the amount of the payroll tax payment required.

7.9 Settlement Check Expiration and Uncashed Checks: The Claims Administrator shall issue Claim Amounts to Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved Employees in the form of a check, which shall become null and void if not deposited within one hundred eighty (180) calendar days of issuance. After one hundred eighty (180) calendar days of issuance, the checks shall be voided and funds from all uncashed checks shall be transmitted in accordance with Section 5.6. The Claims Administrator shall deliver these funds within fourteen (14) calendar days after the check cashing deadline.

7.10 Claims Administrator Declaration Regarding Compliance and Settlement Administration: Within twenty-one (21) days after the last day for Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved Employees to cash their settlement checks, the Claims Administrator shall provide Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel with a signed declaration under penalty of perjury providing a complete and detailed report regarding the settlement administration documenting that all payments under the Agreement have been made, that the Court's final approval order has been complied with, and that all the obligations of the Claims Administrator have been completed.

8. PRELIMINARY SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION SCHEDULE

8.1 The schedule may be modified depending on whether and when the Court grants necessary approvals, orders notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, and sets further hearings. The schedule may also be modified to correct clerical errors and to reflect the provisions in the Agreement as described above. In the event of such modification, the Parties shall cooperate to complete the settlement procedures as expeditiously as reasonably practicable. The preliminary schedule for notice, approval, and payment procedures carrying out the Agreement is as follows:

Last day for Defendants to provide Claims Administrator with Class Member and Aggrieved Employee information	Within 14 calendar days after the Preliminary Approval Date
--	---

Last day for Claims Administrator to complete NCOA search, update Class Member and Aggrieved Employee mailing information, and mail Notice of Settlement	Within 14 calendar days after the Claims Administrators' receipt of Class Members' information from Defendants
Last day for Class Members to opt-out, submit disputes, submit objections, and submit data requests	60 calendar days after mailing of Notice of Settlement or within 10 days after Notice of Settlement is re-mailed, whichever is later
Last day for Claims Administrator to provide Parties with signed declaration reporting on settlement administration statistics	Within 14 calendar days after end of the Notice Period
Last day for Claims Administrator to calculate the final Net Settlement Amount, the final Claim Amounts for Qualified Claimants and/or Aggrieved Employees, any applicable taxes thereon, and report the results of these calculations to Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel	Within 7 calendar days after the Effective Date
Last day for Defendants to fund settlement	Within 30 calendar days after the Effective Date
Last day for Claims Administrator to deliver payment of Class Counsel's attorney's fees and costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Payment, Claims Administrator Costs, payment to Qualified Claimants, and payment to Aggrieved Employees	Within 7 calendar days after Defendants fund the settlement
Last day for Qualified Members and Aggrieved Employees to cash settlement checks	180 calendar days after issuance of checks to Qualified Members and Aggrieved Employees
Last day for Claims Administrator to deliver value of uncashed settlement checks to <i>cy pres</i> beneficiaries	Within 14 calendar days after settlement check cashing deadline
Last day for Claims Administrator to provide Parties with compliance declaration	Within 21 calendar days after settlement check cashing deadline

1 **9. DUTIES OF THE PARTIES**

2 9.1 Preliminary Approval: The Parties will cooperate in obtaining, through an unopposed
3 motion to be filed as soon as reasonably practicable, an order from the Court preliminarily approving this
4 Agreement at the earliest possible date concurrently with the Court's certification of the Action as a class
5 action for settlement purposes. The Parties further agree to fully cooperate in the drafting and/or filing of
6 any further documents or filings reasonably necessary to be prepared or filed, shall take all steps that may
7 be requested by the Court relating to, or that are otherwise necessary to the approval and implementation
8 of this Agreement and shall otherwise use their respective best efforts to obtain certification for settlement
9 purposes, approval of, and implementation of this Agreement. The Parties will submit this Agreement to
10 the Court for preliminary approval of its terms and for approval of the steps to be taken to obtain its final
11 approval. Within one week of signing this Agreement Class Counsel shall provide a draft of the
12 Preliminary Approval Motion to Defendants' Counsel. Defendants' Counsel will provide comments
13 and/or proposed revisions within one week after receipt of the draft Preliminary Approval Motion from
14 Class Counsel. With regard to the final approval documents, a similar one-week maximum review and
15 response time shall be observed by the Parties. The Parties will request that the Court's preliminary
16 approval of this Agreement be embodied in an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action and
17 PAGA Settlement.

18 9.1.1 Plaintiff's motion shall seek an order: 1) Preliminarily approving the Agreement; 2)
19 Approving as to form and content the proposed Notice of Settlement; 3) Directing the mailing of the
20 Notice of Settlement by first class mail to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees; 4) Preliminarily
21 appointing Plaintiff and Class Counsel as representatives of Class Members; 5) Preliminarily approving
22 settlement administration services to be provided by the Claims Administrator; 6) Preliminarily approving
23 the proposed Enhancement Payment to Plaintiff; 7) Preliminarily approving the application for payment
24 of reasonable attorneys' fees and reimbursement of litigation-related expenses to Class Counsel; and 8)
25 Scheduling a fairness hearing on the question of whether the proposed Agreement should be finally
26 approved as fair, reasonable and adequate as to the Class Members.

27 9.1.2 Defendants shall not oppose Plaintiff's motion for approval of the proposed
28 Agreement.

1 9.1.3 The Parties shall cooperate with each other and the Claims Administrator during
2 the process of giving Class Members notice and opportunity to object to the Agreement, as necessary and
3 appropriate to assure effective communication to individual Class Members of information about their
4 rights and obligations under this Agreement.

5 9.2 Final Approval and Fairness Hearing: On a date approved by the Court and set forth in the
6 Notice of Settlement, the Court shall hold the Final Approval and Fairness Hearing where objections, if
7 any, may be heard. Class Counsel shall provide the Court as part of the motion for final approval of the
8 Agreement, a declaration by the Claims Administrator of due diligence and proof of mailing of the Notice
9 of Settlement required to be mailed to Class Members by this Agreement, and of the delivery results of
10 the Claim Administrator's mailings including tracing and re-mailing efforts.

11 9.2.1 Class Counsel will submit a proposed order and judgment for final approval, which
12 shall include findings and orders: 1) Approving the Agreement, adjudging the terms thereof to be fair,
13 reasonable and adequate, and directing that its terms and provisions be carried out; 2) Approving the
14 payment of an Enhancement Payment to the Class Representative; 3) Approving Class Counsel's
15 application for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of out-of-pocket litigation expenses; 4)
16 Approving the Claims Administrator Costs; and 5) Providing that the Court will retain jurisdiction to
17 oversee administration and enforcement of the terms of the Agreement and the Court's orders.

18 9.2.2 Following entry of the Court's Order granting final approval of the Agreement, the
19 Parties will each act to ensure the fulfillment of all its provisions, including but not limited to the
20 following: 1) Should an appeal be taken from the final approval of the Agreement or motion to set aside
21 the judgement be filed, all parties will support the final approval order on appeal or otherwise; 2) Class
22 Counsel will assist the Claims Administrator as needed or requested in the process of identifying and
23 locating Qualified Claimants and Aggrieved Employees entitled to payments under the Agreement and
24 assuring delivery of such payments; 3) Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel will cooperate with each
25 other and assist the Claims Administrator as needed or requested in completing the distribution of any
26 residual amounts, as specified above, to the *cy pres* beneficiaries; 4) Class Counsel, in conjunction with
27 the Claims Administrator, will certify to the Court completion of all payments required to be made by this
28 Agreement.

1 9.3 Final Judgment: If the Court approves this Agreement at the final approval and fairness
2 hearing, the Parties will request that the Court enter an Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action
3 and PAGA Settlement and Final Judgment.

4 9.4 Notice to LWDA: Plaintiff will provide notice to the Labor and Workforce Development
5 Agency (“LWDA”) of this settlement in accordance with Labor Code § 2699(1)(2).

6 **10. MISCELLANEOUS TERMS**

7 10.1 Defendants’ Right to Withdraw Based on Opt-Outs: If, prior to the Final Approval Date,
8 10% or more of the Class Members have submitted proper and timely requests to opt-out in accordance
9 with the provisions of the Agreement, Defendants may rescind the Agreement and all actions taken in its
10 furtherance will be thereby null and void. Defendants must exercise this right of rescission, in writing, to
11 Class Counsel, within seven (7) calendar days after the Claims Administrator notifies the Parties of the
12 total number of opt-outs. If the option to rescind is exercised, then any Claims Administrator Costs shall
13 be paid by Defendants. Defendants have represented that there are no more than 3,987 workweeks
14 during the Class Period. In the event the number of workweeks during the Class Period is more than
15 4,386 (*i.e.*, greater than 10% more than 3,987), then the Gross Settlement Amount shall be increased
16 proportionally by the workweeks in excess of 3,987, multiplied by the pay period value. For example,
17 if there were 11,900 workweeks represented to exist during the Class Period, but there are actually
18 15,000 workweeks in the Class Period, and the actual workweek value is \$5.00 per workweek,
19 Defendants would have to increase the Gross Settlement Amount by \$15,500.00 (15,000 workweeks –
20 11,900 workweeks = 3,100 workweeks x \$5.00/workweek).

21 10.2 Circular 230 Disclaimer: EACH PARTY TO THIS AGREEMENT (FOR PURPOSES OF
22 THIS SECTION, THE “ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY” AND EACH PARTY TO THIS AGREEMENT
23 OTHER THAN THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY, AN “OTHER PARTY”) ACKNOWLEDGES AND
24 AGREES THAT (1) NO PROVISION OF THIS AGREEMENT, AND NO WRITTEN
25 COMMUNICATION OR DISCLOSURE BETWEEN OR AMONG THE PARTIES OR THEIR
26 ATTORNEYS AND OTHER ADVISERS, IS OR WAS INTENDED TO BE, NOR SHALL ANY SUCH
27 COMMUNICATION OR DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTE OR BE CONSTRUED OR BE RELIED UPON
28 AS, TAX ADVICE WITHIN THE MEANING OF UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT

1 CIRCULAR 230 (31 CFR PART 10, AS AMENDED); (2) THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY (A) HAS
2 RELIED EXCLUSIVELY UPON HIS, HER OR ITS OWN, INDEPENDENT LEGAL AND TAX
3 COUNSEL FOR ADVICE (INCLUDING TAX ADVICE) IN CONNECTION WITH THIS
4 AGREEMENT, (B) HAS NOT ENTERED INTO THIS AGREEMENT BASED UPON THE
5 RECOMMENDATION OF ANY OTHER PARTY OR ANY ATTORNEY OR ADVISOR TO ANY
6 OTHER PARTY, AND (C) IS NOT ENTITLED TO RELY UPON ANY COMMUNICATION OR
7 DISCLOSURE BY ANY ATTORNEY OR ADVISER TO ANY OTHER PARTY TO AVOID ANY
8 TAX PENALTY THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY; AND (3) NO
9 ATTORNEY OR ADVISER TO ANY OTHER PARTY HAS IMPOSED ANY LIMITATION THAT
10 PROTECTS THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF ANY SUCH ATTORNEY'S OR ADVISER'S TAX
11 STRATEGIES (REGARDLESS OF WHETHER SUCH LIMITATION IS LEGALLY BINDING) UPON
12 DISCLOSURE BY THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY OF THE TAX TREATMENT OR TAX
13 STRUCTURE OF ANY TRANSACTION, INCLUDING ANY TRANSACTION CONTEMPLATED
14 BY THIS AGREEMENT.

15 10.3 No Prior Assignments: The Parties represent, covenant, and warrant that they have not
16 directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to
17 any person or entity any portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action or right released
18 and discharged in this Agreement.

19 10.4 Waiver of Appeal and Ability to Opt Out: To the extent permitted by applicable law, by
20 signing this Agreement Defendants are waiving any rights to appeal from the Court's approval of the
21 settlement unless the Court materially modifies the settlement. Furthermore, by signing this Agreement
22 Plaintiff is waiving any right or ability to opt out of this Agreement during the Notice Period or otherwise.

23 10.5 Exhibits Incorporated by Reference: The terms of this Agreement include the terms set
24 forth in any attached Exhibits, which are incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth in this
25 Agreement. Any Exhibits to this Agreement are an integral part of the Settlement.

26 10.6 Judgment and Retention of Jurisdiction to Enforce: Upon the Effective Date, judgment
27 will be entered according to this Agreement. The Parties stipulate and agree that the Sacramento County
28 Superior Court shall have continuing jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the Agreement pursuant to Civil

1 Procedure Code section 664.6 and that the prevailing party any action necessary to enforce the terms of
2 the Agreement after default by the other party may recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs related
3 thereto.

4 10.7 Mutual Cooperation: The Parties agree to cooperate fully with one another to accomplish
5 and implement the terms of this Agreement. Such cooperation shall include, but not be limited to,
6 execution of such other documents and the taking of such other action as may reasonably be necessary to
7 fulfill the terms of this Agreement. The Parties to this Agreement shall use their best efforts, including
8 all efforts contemplated by this Agreement and any other efforts that may become necessary by Court
9 order, or otherwise, to effectuate this Agreement and the terms set forth herein.

10 10.8 No Admission of Liability: Neither the acceptance nor the performance by Defendants of
11 the terms of this Agreement, nor any of the related negotiations or proceedings, is or shall be claimed to
12 be, construed as, or deemed to be, an admission by Defendants of the truth of any of the allegations in the
13 Complaint, the representative character of the Action, the validity of any of the claims that were or could
14 have been asserted by Plaintiff and/or Class Members in the Action, or of any liability or guilt of
15 Defendants in the Action. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to be or deemed an admission by
16 Defendants of any liability, culpability, negligence, or wrongdoing toward Plaintiff, the Class Members,
17 or any other person, and Defendants specifically disclaim any liability, culpability, negligence, or
18 wrongdoing toward Plaintiff, the Class Members, or any other person. Each of the Parties has entered
19 into this Stipulation with the intention to avoid further disputes and litigation.

20 10.9 Notices: Unless otherwise specifically provided herein, all notices, demands, or other
21 communications given hereunder shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been duly given as of
22 the third business day after mailing by United States certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed as
23 follows:

24 To Plaintiff and the Class:

25 Justin P. Rodriguez
26 Brittany V. Berzin
27 Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
28 9401 East Stockton Blvd., Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624

To Defendants:

Brian Coggins
Coggins Law
9001 Foothills Blvd., Ste. 110
Roseville, CA 95747

10.10 Mutual Drafting of Agreement: The Parties hereto agree that the terms and conditions of this Agreement are the result of lengthy, intensive, arm's-length negotiations between the Parties and that this Agreement shall not be construed in favor of or against any party by reason of the extent to which any party or its counsel participated in the drafting of this Agreement.

10.11 Attorneys' Fees and Costs Limitations: Neither Class Counsel nor any other attorneys acting for, or purporting to act for, the Class, Class Members, or Plaintiff, may recover or seek to recover any amounts for fees, costs, or disbursements from the Releasees or the Gross Settlement Amount except as expressly provided in this Agreement.

10.12 No Modifications: This Agreement may be amended or modified only by a written instrument signed by counsel for all Parties or their successors-in-interest. This Agreement may not be discharged except by performance in accordance with its terms.

10.13 Authorization to Enter Into Settlement Agreement: Counsel for all Parties warrant and represent they are expressly authorized by the Parties whom they represent to negotiate this Agreement and to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms and to execute any other documents required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement.

10.14 Class Member Signatories: Because the Action has not yet been certified, and the Class Members are so numerous, the Parties agree that it is impossible or impractical to have each Class Member sign this Agreement. It is agreed that, for purposes of seeking approval of the Agreement, this Agreement may be executed on behalf of all Class Members by the Class Representative.

10.15 Counterparts: This Agreement shall become effective upon its execution by all of the undersigned. Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendants and Defendants' Counsel may execute this Agreement in counterparts, and execution of counterparts shall have the same force and effect as if each had signed

1 the same instrument. Facsimile, electronic, and/or scanned copies of signatures shall have the same force
2 and effect of originals.

3 10.16 Choice of Law: The Agreement and any exhibits hereto shall be considered to have been
4 negotiated, executed, and delivered, and to have been wholly performed, in the State of California, and
5 the rights and obligations of the Parties to the Agreement shall be construed and enforced in accordance
6 with, and governed by, the substantive laws of the State of California without giving effect to that State's
7 choice of law principles.

8 10.17 Headings and Captions: Section titles or captions contained in the Agreement are inserted
9 as a matter of convenience and for reference, and in no way define, limit, extend, or describe the scope of
10 this Agreement, or any provision thereof.

11 10.18 No Retaliation or Discouragement: The Parties agree they will take no action that could
12 be construed as retaliation against any Class Members for participating or seeking to participate in this
13 class action settlement. The Parties will not discourage any class member from participating or seeking
14 to participate in this class action settlement. This is a material term of the Agreement and non-breaching
15 Parties will seek court intervention if this provision is breached. Should non-breaching Party prevail, they
16 shall be entitled to further attorneys' fees and costs.

17 10.19 Integrated Agreement: This Agreement sets forth the entire understanding between the
18 Parties and supersedes any and all prior agreements, oral or written, pertaining to the subject matter hereof.
19 Each party acknowledges that there is no representation, inducement, promise or agreement which has
20 been made, orally or otherwise, by the other party, concerning the terms or conditions of this Agreement,
21 which is not expressly embodied in this Agreement. In entering into this Agreement, the Parties represent
22 that the terms of this Agreement are fully understood and voluntarily accepted by the Parties.

23 10.20 Binding on Successors and Assigns: This Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to
24 the benefit of, the successors or assigns of the Parties to this Agreement, as previously defined.

25 10.21 Invalidity of Any Provision: Before declaring any provision of this Agreement invalid, the
26 Court will first attempt to construe the provision as valid to the fullest extent possible consistent with
27 applicable precedents so as to define all provisions of this Settlement Agreement valid and enforceable.
28

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement is executed by the Parties and their duly authorized attorneys, as of the day and year herein set forth.

Date: _____

Date: 9-12-2022

Date: 7/12/2022

Date: 11/2/2022

Chris J. Mesunas

Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC

Dated: 9-14-22


By: Justin P. Rodriguez
 Brittany V. Berzin
 Attorney for Plaintiff and Aggrieved
 Employees

10.22 Waiver of Compliance: No waiver of any condition or covenant contained in this Agreement or failure to exercise a right or remedy by any of the Parties hereto will be considered to imply or constitute a further waiver by such party of the same or any other condition, covenant, right or remedy.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement is executed by the Parties and their duly authorized attorneys, as of the day and year herein set forth.

For Plaintiff:

Date: 9/8/2022

DocuSigned by:

8D51F4423499433...
Silviano Vasquez

For Defendants:

Date: _____

By: _____
For Chriswell Home Improvement, Inc.

Date: _____

Paul C. Cromwell

Date: _____

Chris J. Mesunas

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC


Dated: _____

By: _____
Justin P. Rodriguez
Brittany V. Berzin
Attorney for Plaintiff and Aggrieved
Employees

1 APPROVED AS TO FORM

COGGINS LAW

2
3
4 Dated: 9/13/2022

By: 

Brian Coggins
Attorney for Defendants

EXHIBIT 1

CALIFORNIA SUPERIOR COURT
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on behalf of all
other similarly situated employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS, INC., A
California Corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION AND
PAGA SETTLEMENT, AND HEARING DATE FOR
FINAL COURT APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

ATTENTION: all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendant in California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2017 up to September 26, 2022 (the “Class Members”).

PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY. THIS NOTICE RELATES TO A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION LITIGATION AND POTENTIAL DISBURSEMENT OF SETTLEMENT FUNDS TO YOU. IF YOU ARE A CLASS MEMBER, IT CONTAINS IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE OR TO OPT OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT ACCORDING TO THE PROCEDURES DESCRIBED BELOW.

Pursuant to an order from the Sacramento County Superior Court (“Court”) granting preliminary approval of this class action settlement, entered on [REDACTED], you are receiving notice of a proposed class action and Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) settlement between Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez (“Plaintiff” or “Class Representative”) and Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc. (“Defendant”) and its owners Paul C. Cromwell (“Cromwell”) and Chris J. Mesunas (“Mesunas”) on behalf of Class Members as defined above. You are receiving this notice because Defendant’s records indicate you fall within the definition of “Class Member.” Defendant’s records also indicate that you worked [REDACTED] weeks during the applicable Class Period (as defined below), which means your share of the settlement proceeds is estimated to be [REDACTED]. Your actual share of the settlement proceeds will vary depending on the total number of Class Members that choose to participate and the resolution of any workweek disputes as described in this notice.

The terms of the Agreement and a description of the case are identified in this notice. Pursuant to the Court’s order, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:

I. BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

On August 10, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Complaint against Defendant in the Sacramento County Superior Court of California on behalf of himself and Class Members. The term “Action” means this putative class action pending in Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2021-00305938. The Class Period is August 10, 2017 up to September 26, 2022 (the “Class Period”).

In the Action, Plaintiff sought to obtain unpaid wages, interest, statutory penalties, civil penalties, fees, and costs on behalf of himself, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiff alleged that Defendant failed to pay overtime, failed to pay minimum wages, failed to provide meal periods, failed to provide rest periods, failed to provide accurate wage statements, failed to pay final wages, failed to reimburse expenses, and engaged in unfair competition. Defendant has denied Plaintiff’s allegations. The Action has been actively litigated. There have been on-going investigations, and there has been an exchange of extensive documentation and information. Furthermore, the Parties have participated in a full day mediation facilitated by a neutral third party. Based upon the negotiations, and all known facts and circumstances, including the various risks and uncertainties related to legal actions, the Parties reached a class-wide settlement. By settling, the Parties will avoid the risks associated with a lengthy litigation process. Despite agreeing to and supporting the Agreement, Defendant continues to deny all allegations and claims. Defendant has entered into this Settlement to fully, finally, and forever resolve this Action, based on the terms set forth in the Agreement, in order to avoid the burden and expense associated with ongoing litigation.

The Parties have entered into a Joint Stipulation of Regarding Class Action PAGA Settlement and Release (“Agreement” or “Settlement”), which has been preliminarily approved by the Court. The Agreement applies to any and all Class Members as defined above. “Class Member” does not include persons who submit valid request to opt out (as explained below). If you are a Class Member,

you have the opportunity to participate in the Settlement, or to exclude yourself (“opt out”) from the settlement. This notice is to advise you of how you can either participate in the Settlement or be excluded from the Settlement.

II. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

A. The Amount of the Settlement

Under the terms of the Agreement, Defendant, Cromwell and Mesunas have agreed to pay a total sum of One Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$110,000) (“Gross Settlement Amount”). Deducted from this Gross Settlement Amount will be sums approved by the Court for attorneys’ fees not to exceed 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount which equals \$38,500, attorneys’ costs not to exceed \$10,000, Claims Administrator Costs estimated not to exceed \$10,000, Class Representative’s Enhancement Payment of \$10,000, and \$2,500 for alleged PAGA penalties (the “PAGA Payment”), which will result in a “Net Settlement Amount” for distribution to all Class Members. Any employer side taxes attributable to payments allocated as wages will be paid by Defendant, Cromwell or Mesunas in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. As explained further below, the amount of each Class Member’s share of the Net Settlement Amount will depend on the number of weeks worked by participating Class Members during the Class Period. Of the \$2,500 allocated to resolving the PAGA claims, 75% of the PAGA Payment will be paid to the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency and 25% of the PAGA Payment will be divided among Aggrieved Employees, which are defined as all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendant in California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2020 up to September 26, 2022.

The number of weeks you worked during the Class Period and your estimated share of the Net Settlement Amount and PAGA Payment (“Claim Amount”) is stated on the first page of this notice. The actual amount received may be more or less than the amount stated depending on the actual number of weeks worked by participating Class Members, the resolution of any disputes regarding workweeks, and on the distributions finally approved and allocated by the Court. However, whether Class Members opt out will have no effect on Aggrieved Employees’ allocations for the PAGA claims.

B. Claim Amounts and Allocation Between Class Members and Aggrieved Employees

Defendant will pay Claim Amounts through the Claims Administrator, as described below, to each Class Member who does not opt out of the settlement and to Aggrieved Employees. All Claim Amounts will be subject to appropriate taxation. The Parties have agreed, based on the allegations in the Action that all Claim Amounts payable to eligible Class Members will be allocated from the Net Settlement Amount and paid as 2/3 for disputed interest, statutory penalties, and other non-wage damages for which IRS Forms 1099-MISC and 1099-INT will issue and 1/3 for disputed wages for which IRS Forms W-2 will issue. The PAGA Payment to Aggrieved employees will be paid as 100% for civil penalties.

Payment to Class Members who do not opt out and Aggrieved Employees will not require the submission of a claim form. Each Class Member’s share will be determined by dividing their total weeks worked within the Class Period by the total weeks worked by all Class Members within the Class Period. That fraction will then be multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to arrive at the Class Member’s individual share of the Net Settlement Amount. Each Aggrieved Employee’s share of the 25% portion of the PAGA Payment will be determined by dividing their total weeks worked within the PAGA Claim Period by the total weeks worked by all Aggrieved Employees within the PAGA Claim Period. That fraction will then be multiplied by the 25% portion of the PAGA Payment to arrive at the Aggrieved Employee’s individual share. Receipt of the Claim Amounts will not entitle any Class Member or Aggrieved Employee to additional compensation or benefits under any compensation, retirement or benefit plan or agreement in place during the period covered by the Settlement.

C. Calculations to Be Based on Defendant’s Records and Resolution of Workweek Disputes

For each Class Member, the amount payable will be calculated by the Claims Administrator from Defendant’s records. Defendant’s records will be presumed correct unless evidence to the contrary is provided to the Claims Administrator. Defendant’s records and any additional evidence will be reviewed by the Claims Administrator in the event of a dispute about the number of workweeks worked by an individual Class Member. If a Class Member disputes the accuracy of Defendant’s records, all supporting documents evidencing additional workweeks must be submitted by the Class Member. The dispute must (a) identify the nature of the dispute; (b) provide any information or documentation supporting the dispute; (c) be signed; and (d) be post-marked no later than [REDACTED]. The dispute will be resolved by the Claims Administrator based on the records and evidence provided. The Claims Administrator’s decision on all disputes will be final and binding.

D. Release of Claims

For those Class Members who do not opt out and Aggrieved Employees, the Agreement contains the following releases:

Class members who do not opt out will be deemed to have released all claims contained in the operative Complaint, and any additional wage and hour claims that could have been brought based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint, through the Class Period. This release excludes the release of claims not permitted by law. This release exclude claims for workers' compensation or unemployment insurance benefits. This release will cover all Class Members who do not opt out.

Aggrieved Employees will be deemed to have released any all Private Attorneys General Act claims for civil penalties contained in Plaintiff's letter to the LWDA and/or operative Complaint, through the PAGA Claim Period. Aggrieved Employees cannot opt out of this waiver of claims.

The individuals released ("Released Parties") include Defendant, Cromwell, and Mesunas as well as their officers, shareholders, directors, agents, employees, attorneys, and insurers.

Class Members can talk to one of the lawyers appointed as Class Counsel (listed below) for free or talk to their own lawyer if Class Members have questions about the released claims and what they mean.

E. Attorneys' Fees and Costs

Defendant, Mesunas and Cromwell agreed to pay Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs to be approved by the Court, up to a maximum of 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount which equals \$38,500, and attorneys' costs not to exceed \$10,000. Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs will be paid and deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount.

III. WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS AS A CLASS MEMBER

A. Participating in the Settlement

If you wish to participate in the settlement and believe your workweek information is accurate, **you do not need to take any further action**. Payment will be automatically made to you consistent with the terms of the Agreement and Court Order. If you wish to dispute the workweek calculation, you may follow the procedures outlined in Section II.C above. California law protects Class Members from retaliation based on their decision to participate in the Settlement.

B. Excluding Yourself from the Settlement

If you do not wish to participate in the settlement, you may be excluded (*i.e.*, "opt out") by submitting a timely written request to the Claims Administrator. The request to opt-out must (a) state your full name and date of birth; (b) a statement that you do not want to be a Class Member, do not want to participate in the settlement, and/or wants to be excluded from this settlement; (c) identify the case name and number (*i.e.* *Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.*, 34-2021-00305938); (d) be signed; and (e) be post-marked no later than [REDACTED]. The request to opt out must be signed, dated and mailed by First Class U.S. Mail or the equivalent, to:

[admin info]

The request to opt out must be postmarked no later than [REDACTED]. If you submit a request to opt out which is not postmarked by [REDACTED], your request to opt out will be rejected, and you will be bound by the release and all other terms of the Agreement. If the request to opt out is sent from within the United States it must be sent through the United States Postal Service by First Class Mail, or the equivalent. Do not use a postage meter as that may not result in a postmark appearing on the envelope containing your request to opt out. Any Class Member who submits a complete and timely request to opt out shall, upon receipt by the Claims Administrator, no longer be a Class Member and not received their share of the class settlement payment. Aggrieved Employees cannot opt out of this Agreement and will receive their share of the PAGA Payment regardless of whether they opt out of being a Class Member.

C. Objection to Settlement

If you do not opt out of the settlement, you can object to the terms of the Agreement. However, if the Court rejects your objection, you will still be bound by the terms of the Agreement. You can ask the Court to deny approval by filing an objection. You

cannot ask the Court to order a larger settlement; the Court can only approve or deny the settlement. If the Court denies approval, no settlement payments will be sent out and the lawsuit will continue. If that is what you want to happen, you must object. The objection must (a) state your full name and date of birth; (b) provide evidence that you are, in fact, a Class Member; (c) state the reasons for the objection(s), including any legal analysis and/or supporting documentation; (d) identify the case name and number (i.e. *Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.*, 34-2021-00305938) (e) be signed; and (f) be post-marked no later than [REDACTED]. The objection must be sent to the Claims Administrator at the address identified in section III.B and to counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant at the addresses identified in section VI of this notice.

If you have submitted a written objection as outlined above, you may also appear at the Final Approval Hearing, either in person or through your own attorney, to state your objection. However, you must file a notice of intent to appear with the Court and serve the notice on counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant. If you appear through your own attorney, you are responsible for paying that attorney.

IV. EFFECT OF THE SETTLEMENT: RELEASED RIGHTS AND CLAIMS

After final approval of the settlement has been granted by the Court, each and every Class Member who does not opt out of the settlement and Aggrieved Employee, will release Defendant and the Released Parties from the released claims described above. In other words, if you were employed as a Class Member by Defendant in California during the Class Period, and you do not exclude yourself from the settlement, you will be deemed to have entered into this release and to have released the above-described claims. In addition, you will be barred from ever suing Defendant and the Released Parties with respect to the claims covered by this settlement. If the settlement is not approved by the Court or does not become final for some other reason, the litigation will continue.

V. FINAL SETTLEMENT APPROVAL HEARING

The Court will hold a hearing in Department 28, 720 9th Street, Sacramento, California 95814, on [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] to determine whether the Agreement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate. The Court also will be asked to approve Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs. The hearing may be continued without further notice to Class Members. It is not necessary for you to appear at this hearing, unless you wish to object to the settlement.

VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Copies of all documents filed in this lawsuit may be accessed online at [REDACTED]. If you want additional information about this lawsuit and its proceedings, you can contact Class Counsel or Defendant's Counsel as follows:

Justin P. Rodriguez
Brittany V. Berzin
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
9401 East Stockton Blvd., Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733
On behalf of Plaintiff

Brian Coggins
Coggins Law
9001 Foothills Blvd., Ste. 110
Roseville, CA 95747
Telephone: (916) 270-2895
Facsimile: (916) 270-2894
On behalf of Defendant

PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR THE COURT CLERK'S OFFICE TO INQUIRE ABOUT THIS SETTLEMENT OR THE CLAIM PROCESS. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, CALL [REDACTED]

BY ORDER OF THE COURT

EXHIBIT B

FILED
Superior Court Of California,
Sacramento
01/05/2022
reanmiguel
By _____, Deputy
Case Number:
34-2021-00305938

1 Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
2 Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
3 Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
4 **Shimoda Law Corp.**
5 9401 East Stockton Boulevard, Suite 120
6 Elk Grove, CA 95624
7 Telephone: (916) 525-0716
8 Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated
employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1 to
100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
DAMAGES:**

1. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages
2. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages
3. Meal Period Violations
4. Rest Period Violations
5. Wage Statement Violations
6. Waiting Time Penalties
7. Failure to Reimburse Expenses
8. Unfair Competition
9. Private Attorneys General Act

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and all other similarly
2 situated employees, hereby files this Complaint against Defendants CHRISWELL HOME
3 IMPROVEMENTS, INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (hereinafter all
4 collectively referred to as "Defendants"). On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges the following:

5 INTRODUCTION

6 1. This is a class action lawsuit brought by Plaintiff for failure to pay minimum wages,
7 failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods or pay premiums in lieu thereof, failure to
8 provide rest periods or pay premiums in lieu thereof, failure to provide accurate wage statements, failure
9 to pay final wages, failure to reimburse for expenses, failure to maintain accurate records, and unfair
10 competition. Plaintiff has also alleged a representative claim for civil penalties under the Private
11 Attorneys General Act.

12 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13 2. The Sacramento County Superior Court has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to
14 California Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10 to determine alleged violations of the California
15 Labor Code, California Business and Professions Code, and Wage Order No. 16.

16 3. Venue is proper pursuant to Civil Procedure Code §§ 395(a) and 395.5, in that
17 Defendants reside in Sacramento County and/or are foreign entities and have not designated any county
18 in California as being where they maintain their principal offices. In addition, some of the wrongful acts
19 and violations of law asserted herein occurred within Sacramento County, and Defendants' obligation to
20 pay wages arose in Sacramento County pursuant to *Madera Police Officers Assn. v. City of Madera*, 36
21 Cal.3d 403, 414 (1984).

22 4. Plaintiff sought permission pursuant to Labor Code section 2699 *et seq.* to pursue the
23 claims set forth in this Complaint against Defendants as a Private Attorney General on behalf of himself
24 and other similarly situated employees. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff gave written
25 notice via online submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") on
26 approximately August 10, 2021. Plaintiff provided facts and legal bases for his claims within the notice
27 to the LWDA on all violations asserted under the Private Attorneys General Act cause of action.
28 Plaintiff submitted the \$75.00 filing fee. The August 10, 2021 notice was also sent via certified mail to

1 Defendants on the same day. Plaintiff is informed and believes, that to date, the LWDA has not
2 provided any response to Plaintiff's notice correspondence. Accordingly, Plaintiff is informed and
3 believes that he has exhausted all administrative remedies pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act
4 and may bring this action on behalf of himself and all Aggrieved Employees. See Cal. Labor Code §
5 2699.3(a)(2)(A), (c)(3); *Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Sup. Ct.*, 134 Cal.App.4th 365, 383 n.18, 385 n.19
6 (2005). Aggrieved Employees includes all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for
7 Defendants in California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2020 to the present.

8 PARTIES

9 5. SILVIANO VASQUEZ is an individual over the age of eighteen (18) and is a resident
10 of the State of California.

11 6. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges, CHRISWELL HOME
12 IMPROVEMENTS, INC., is now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint was a California
13 Corporation and the owner and operator of an industry, business and/or facility doing business in the
14 State of California.

15 7. Defendants DOES 1 through 100 are affiliates, subsidiaries and related entities and
16 the alter egos of each of the other Defendants named herein, corporate or otherwise, who participated
17 in and are liable for the actions herein alleged. Plaintiff will seek to amend this Complaint to allege
18 the true names and capacities of these DOE Defendants when they are ascertained. At all times
19 mentioned herein, each Defendant was the agent or employee of each of the other Defendants and
20 was acting within the course and scope of such agency or employment. The Defendants are jointly
21 and severally liable to Plaintiff.

22 8. At all times mentioned herein, each Defendant was the agent or employee of each of the
23 other Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of such agency or employment. The
24 Defendants are jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff.

25 9. Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint
26 were members of and/or engaged in a joint employment, joint venture, partnership and common
27 enterprise, and were acting within the course and scope of, and in pursuance of said joint employment,
28 joint venture, partnership and common enterprise.

10. Defendants, and each of them, now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint approved, ratified, acquiesced, aided or abetted the acts and omissions alleged in this Complaint.

11. Defendants proximately caused Plaintiff to be subjected to the unlawful practices, wrongs, complaints, injuries and/or damages alleged in this Complaint.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The class which Plaintiff seeks to represent is composed of, and defined, as follows:

all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendants in California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2017 the present.

13. This action has been brought and may be properly maintained as a class action, pursuant to the provision of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, because there is a well-defined community of interests in the litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable.

(a) **Numerosity**: The putative class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all members is impracticable under the circumstances of this case. While the exact number of class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants have employed as many as fifty (50) individuals falling within the above stated class definition throughout the State of California during the applicable statute of limitations, who were subjected to the policies and practices outlined in this Complaint. As such, joinder of all members of the putative class is not practicable.

(b) **Common Questions Predominate**: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the putative class and predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the class. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation, the following:

- (1) Whether as a result of Defendants' policies and practices Plaintiff and putative class members were deprived of meal periods or premiums;
- (2) Whether as a result of Defendants' policies and practices Plaintiff and putative class members were deprived of rest periods or premiums;

- 1 (3) Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and putative class members for all
2 hours worked;
- 3 (4) Whether Defendants included all non-discretionary remuneration paid to
4 employees when calculating their regular rate of pay for overtime and sick leave
5 purposes;
- 6 (5) Whether as a result of Defendants' policies and practices Plaintiff's and putative
7 class members received all wages, due and owing, at the time of their termination
8 or separation; and
- 9 (6) Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff's and putative class members with wage
10 statements that complied with Labor Code section 226.
- 11 (c) Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the putative
12 class. The putative class also sustained damages arising out of Defendants' common
13 course of conduct in violation of the law as complained of herein. Plaintiff and all
14 members of the putative class were non-exempt employees who were not paid for all
15 work performed, not paid overtime owed, not provided with meal and rest periods or
16 premiums in lieu thereof, and not paid all sick leave wages owed resulting in unpaid
17 wages at their separation. Additionally, Defendants issued Plaintiff and all members of
18 the putative class wage statements that did not comply with Labor Code section 226. As
19 a result, Plaintiff and each member of the putative class will have suffered the same type
20 of harm and seek the same type of recovery based on the same legal theories.
- 21 (d) Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the
22 putative class. For all relevant times, Plaintiff resided in California and worked for
23 Defendants in California. Moreover, Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the
24 putative class as Plaintiff has no interests that are adverse to those of putative class
25 members. Additionally, Plaintiff has retained counsel who has substantial experience in
26 complex civil litigation and wage and hour matters.
- 27 (e) Superiority: A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient
28 adjudication of the controversy since individual joinder of all members of the putative

1 class is impracticable. Class action treatment will permit a larger number of similarly
2 situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously,
3 efficiently, and without the unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous
4 individual actions would engender. Further, as damages suffered by each individual
5 member of the class may be relatively small, the expenses and burden of the individual
6 litigation would make it difficult or impossible for individual members of the class to
7 redress the wrongs done to them, and an important public interest will be served by
8 addressing the matter as a class action. The cost to the court system of adjudication of
9 such individualized litigation would be substantial. Individualized litigation would also
10 present the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments.

11 14. Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the
12 management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

13 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

14 15. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 14 as though fully
15 set forth herein.

16 16. Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately March 15, 2021 to June 1, 2021 as
17 an hourly, non-exempt employee. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not fully compensated
18 due to Defendants' multiple Labor Code violations.

19 17. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for all hours spent
20 working. Defendants used phone applications to coordinate employees' schedules and for timekeeping.
21 Plaintiff and similarly situated employees received nightly texts they were required to review and
22 respond to regarding shift scheduling during hours that they were not clocked in.

23 18. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were also required to clock in and out using a
24 phone app. After Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were done working for the day, they would
25 submit their time entries through the app. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees routinely found that
26 their submitted times were rounded in a way that reduced working hours prior to the entries being
27 approved by management. Defendants used this rounding policy to reduce labor costs and avoid
28

1 compensating employees for all time worked. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are owed
2 unpaid minimum and overtime wages due to Defendants rounding policy.

3 19. Defendants did not consistently provide Plaintiff and similarly situated employees with
4 the required thirty (30) minute lunch break every five hours of work or ten (10) minute rest breaks every
5 four hours. To reduce labor costs and increase profits, Defendants mandated that construction projects
6 were completed as fast as possible, even if that meant foregoing meal and rest breaks. Defendants often
7 instructed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to continue working through meal and rest breaks to
8 complete construction jobs as quickly as possible. Despite Plaintiff and similarly situated employees not
9 entering meal breaks through the timekeeping app, Defendants would change employee submissions to
10 reflect that a meal break had occurred before approving the entries. Plaintiff and similarly situated
11 employees are owed unpaid meal and rest period premiums, as well as unpaid minimum wages and
12 overtime that would have resulted had there been no unlawful deduction of thirty (30) minutes from
13 Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' hours worked.

14 20. Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for work-
15 related uses of personal items. Defendants required that employees have their own cell phones, personal
16 vehicles, and personal tools for work purposes. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees used their
17 personal cell phones while working to enter their hours, update management on project progress and
18 completion, coordinate worksite duties, and coordinate work schedules.

19 21. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees used their personal vehicles to transport
20 materials and travel to and in between jobsites. Employees were forced to spend their own money on
21 gas and maintenance costs related to work-related use of their personal vehicles. Plaintiff and similarly
22 situated employees we also required to purchase and use tools needed to complete construction projects
23 without being reimbursed or being paid two times the minimum wage. Plaintiff and similarly situated
24 employees are owed reimbursement for personal expenditures and work-related usage of personal items
25 required by Defendants.

26 22. Defendants failed to properly calculate overtime and paid sick time wages at Plaintiff's
27 and similarly situated employees' regular rate of pay. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees
28 received non-discretionary remuneration in addition to basic rate of pay that was not included in

1 calculating regular rate of pay for overtime and paid sick leave purposes. This included, but was not
2 limited to, bonuses and commissions. Due to Defendants' failure to include the additional renumeration
3 in the overtime and paid sick leave regular rate of pay calculations, Plaintiff and similarly situated
4 employees are owed unpaid wages.

5 23. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and similarly situated employees with accurate
6 wage statements. Defendants improperly excluded missed or delayed meal and rest period premiums
7 owed to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees. Defendants also failed to properly account for
8 unpaid minimum, overtime, and paid sick leave wages as a result of their time rounding policy and
9 improper regular rate of pay calculations. Defendants distributed wage statements with inaccurate gross
10 wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned, and applicable hourly rates in effect. Due to
11 Defendants failure to accurately account for all wages owed to Plaintiff and similarly situated
12 employees, Defendants owe penalties for distributing inaccurate wage statements.

13 24. At the time of Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' termination and/or separation,
14 Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were owed minimum wages, regular wages, paid sick leave
15 wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premiums. To date, Defendants have not paid Plaintiff
16 and similarly situated employees these unpaid wages.

17 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION** 19 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES** 20 **(As to all Defendants)**

21 25. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 24 as though fully
22 set forth herein.

23 26. During the period Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, Defendants were required to
24 compensate Plaintiff at one and one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of
25 eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and two (2) times the regular rate of pay for
26 hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours per day. *See, e.g., IWC Wage Order No. 16, section*
(3)(A); Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194.

27 27. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day
28 and/or forty (40) hours per week on several occasions while employed by Defendants. However,

Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for all overtime hours worked at their regular rate of pay.

28. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not exempt from overtime protections employees under the California Wage Orders and Labor Code.

29. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have been damaged as stated in the section below entitled "DAMAGES," which is incorporated here to the extent pertinent as if set forth here in full.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES
(As to all Defendants)

30. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 29 as though fully set forth herein.

31. For the period preceding the filing of this Complaint, Defendants were required to compensate Plaintiff and similarly situated employees with at least California's applicable minimum for every hour worked. *See* MW-Order 2019; IWC Wage Order, No. 16, section 4(A); Cal. Lab. Code § 1194.

32. Plaintiff was not exempt to the State's Minimum Wage Order. Defendants were aware of their obligation to pay the minimum wage for each hour worked but failed to do so.

33. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees have been damaged as stated in the section below entitled "DAMAGES," which is incorporated here to the extent pertinent as if set forth here in full.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(As to all Defendants)

34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 33 as though fully set forth herein.

35. An employer must provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512.

1 36. California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Order No. 16, section
2 11(A) require an employer to provide an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30)
3 minutes for each work period of more than five (5) hours.

4 37. California Labor Code section 512 and Wage Order No. 16 section 11(B) further
5 provide that employers may not employ employees for a work period for more than ten (10) hours
6 per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes.
7 However, if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may
8 be waived so long as there was no waiver as to the first meal period. Employees are entitled to one
9 (1) hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided.

10 38. Defendants employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for periods of more
11 than five (5) hours without providing meal breaks of at least thirty (30) minutes or a second meal
12 period of at least thirty (30) minutes when Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked more
13 than ten (10) hours in a day. Defendants also failed to allow Plaintiff and similarly situated
14 employees to take their first meal period before the completion of their fifth hour of work and failed
15 to allow Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to take their second meal period before the
16 completion of their tenth hour of work. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees did not waive their
17 rights to all meal periods throughout their employment.

18 39. Defendants further failed to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees the
19 applicable meal period premiums for any such missed meal breaks.

20 40. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated
21 employees have been damaged as stated in the section below entitled "DAMAGES," which is
22 incorporated here to the extent pertinent as if set forth here in full.

23 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
24 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
 (As to all Defendants)

25 41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 40 as though fully
26 set forth herein.

27 42. An employer must provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the
28 applicable Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7.

1 43. California Labor Code section 226.7 and Wage Order No. 16, section 12(A) require
2 an employer to provide a rest period of not less than ten (10) minutes for each work period of more
3 than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof.

4 44. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and similarly
5 situated employees to take paid rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each work period that
6 they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof.

7 45. Defendants further failed to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees the
8 applicable rest period premiums for any such missed rest periods.

9 46. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated
10 employees have been damaged as stated in the section below entitled "DAMAGES," which is
11 incorporated here to the extent pertinent as if set forth here in full.

12 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
13 **WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**
14 **(As to all Defendants)**

15 47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 46 as though fully
16 set forth herein.

17 48. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a), an employer must provide an itemized
18 statement to an employee, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, showing:

19 *(1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for*
20 *any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is*
21 *exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or*
22 *any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the*
23 *number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the*
24 *employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that*
25 *all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated*
26 *and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the*
27 *period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and*
28 *the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee*
identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name
and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is
a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the
name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the
employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate
by the employee. The deductions made from payment of wages shall be
recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the
month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement and the record of the
deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at

1 *the place of employment or at a central location within the State of*
2 *California.*

3 49. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants intentionally and knowingly failed to provide an
4 itemized statement or failed to provide an accurate and complete itemized statement showing the
5 requirements set forth in California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, Defendants did not
6 accurately itemize all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, all regular, overtime
7 and double time hours worked and corresponding rates of pay, and gross and net wages earned. The
8 paystubs also did not accurately itemize Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' total hours
9 worked due to Defendants' rounding policy and changing of timesheets that resulted in off-the-clock
10 work. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not able to promptly and easily determine
11 their total hours worked from their paystubs alone. Additionally, Plaintiff and similarly situated
12 employees suffered confusion over whether they received all wages owed and were prevented from
13 effectively challenging information on their wage statements.

14 50. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated
15 employees have been damaged as stated in the section below entitled "DAMAGES," which is
16 incorporated here to the extent pertinent as if set forth here in full.

17 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
18 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**
19 **(As to all Defendants)**

20 51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 50 as though fully
21 set forth herein.

22 52. An employer must pay an employee who is terminated all unpaid wages immediately
23 upon termination. *See Cal. Lab. Code § 201.*

24 53. An employer must pay an employee who resigns all unpaid wages within seventy-two
25 (72) hours of their resignation. *See Cal. Lab. Code § 202.*

26 54. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees did not receive all wages, including minimum
27 and overtime wages, meal and rest period premiums, or all sick leave pay owed at their termination or
28 within the required time after their separation from employment.

1 55. An employer who willfully fails to pay an employee wages in accordance with California
2 Labor Code sections 201 and/or 202 must pay the employee a waiting time penalty of up to thirty (30)
3 days. *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

4 56. Defendants knew of their obligation to pay Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees'
5 their final wages when their employment terminated. Indeed, Defendants had knowledge that Plaintiff
6 and similarly situated employees were not being paid accurately due to their rounding policy and
7 practice of adding meal breaks to timesheets that had not occurred. Such conduct shows Defendants had
8 knowledge of earned, but unpaid wages at the time of separation, yet Defendants still refused to pay the
9 remaining wages owed.

10 57. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees
11 have been damaged and deprived of their wages and thereby seek their daily rate of pay multiplied by
12 thirty (30) days for Defendants' failure to pay all wages due.

13 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
14 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**
 (As to all Defendants)

15 58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 57 as though fully
16 set forth herein.

17 59. California Labor Code section 2802(a) states that "An employer shall indemnify his or
18 her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of
19 the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even
20 though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be
21 unlawful."

22 60. Defendants required Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to use their personal cell
23 phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools but failed to reimburse them for such use. Defendant
24 required Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to use their personal items for work-related activities.

25 61. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees
26 have been damaged as stated in the section below entitled "DAMAGES," which is incorporated here to
27 the extent pertinent as if set forth here in full.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION
UNFAIR COMPETITION
(As to all Defendants)

62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 61 as though fully set forth herein.

63. Unfair competition shall mean and include any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising and any act prohibited by Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 17500) of Part 3 of Division 7 of the Business and Professions Code. *See* California Business and Professions ("B&P") Code § 17200.

64. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not paid all wages owed, including minimum and overtime wages, and meal and rest period premiums, paid sick leave, or reimbursed for business expenses, during their employment or any time thereafter.

65. Plaintiff further alleges that such actions and/or conduct constitute a violation of the California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") (Business and Professions Code 17200 *et seq.*) pursuant to *Cortez v. Purolator Air Filtration Products Co.*, 23 Cal. 4th 163 (2000).

66. As a direct and legal result of the Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, pursuant to the UCL (including B&P Code §17203), Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are entitled to restitution, including, but not limited to, interest and penalties pursuant to Business & Professions Code sections 17203, 17208, violations of California Labor Code sections 226.7, 510, 512, and 1194 all in an amount as yet unascertained but subject to proof at trial, for four (4) years from the filing of this Action.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(As to all Defendants)

67. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 66 as though fully set forth herein.

68. Plaintiff has alleged to the Labor Commissioner that Defendants have violated the following provisions of the Labor Code in their dealings with him and other similarly situated current and former employees:

- Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194; IWC Wage Order 16, § 3 (Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

- Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3 (Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements)
- Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203, 256 (Failure to Pay Final Wages)
- Violation of Labor Code §§ 558, 558.1 (Provisions Regulating Hours and Days of Work in Any Industrial Welfare Commission Order)
- Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512; IWC Wage Order 16, §§ 11(A) and 11(B) (Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Pay Premiums in Lieu Thereof)
- Violation of Labor Code § 226.7; IWC Wage Order 16, § 12(A) (Failure to Provide Rest Periods or Pay Premiums in Lieu Thereof)
- Violation of Labor Code § 2802 (Failure to Pay Reimbursements for Expenses)
- Violation of Labor Code § 226.3, 1174 (Failure to Maintain Accurate Records)
- Violation of Labor Code § 246, 246.5, 248.5 (Failure to Provide Paid Sick Leave)

69. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants as provided in the Labor Code, or, if no civil penalty is provided, default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2).

70. Plaintiff seeks these civil penalties from Defendants pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and 2699.3.

DAMAGES

WHEREFORE Plaintiff requests relief as follows:

1. A jury trial;
2. As to the First Cause of Action:
 - a. Wages in an amount to be proven at trial;
 - b. Interest for the wages due pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194;
 - c. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194;
3. As to the Second Cause of Action:
 - a. Wages in an amount to be proven at trial;
 - b. Interest for the wages due pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194;

- 1 c. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred pursuant to California Labor
2 Code section 1194;
- 3 d. Liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2;
- 4 4. As to the Third Cause of Action:
- 5 a. Wages in an amount to be proven at trial;
- 6 b. Attorney's fees, costs and interest pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
7 section 1021.5;
- 8 5. As to the Fourth Cause of Action:
- 9 a. Wages in an amount to be proven at trial;
- 10 b. Attorney's fees, costs and interest pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
11 section 1021.5;
- 12 6. As to the Fifth Cause of Action:
- 13 a. Penalties as provided for in Labor Code section 226, including the greater of all
14 actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the
15 violation occurred and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each
16 violation in the subsequent pay periods, but not to exceed four thousand dollars
17 (\$4,000.00);
- 18 b. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred pursuant to Labor Code section
19 226(e);
- 20 7. As to the Seventh Cause of Action:
- 21 a. An amount to be proven at trial;
- 22 b. For attorney's fees, interest, and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c);
- 23 8. As to the Ninth Cause of Action:
- 24 a. For civil penalties as provided for in the Labor Code for each enumerated
25 violation in the amount of \$2,000,000;
- 26 b. For those Labor Code sections, the violation of which there is no civil penalty
27 provided, the default penalty provided in Labor Code section 2699(f): for any
28 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay

1 period; For any subsequent violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
2 aggrieved employee per pay period;


- 3 c. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 2699;
4 d. For any other remedies as allowed by law and/or deemed appropriate by the
5 Court;

6 9. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper,
7 including, but not limited to:

- 8 a. Wages as proved at trial;
9 b. Injunctive and Declaratory relief;
10 c. Attorney's fees and costs as provided for by law; and
11 d. Interest.

12
13 Dated: January 4, 2022

Shimoda Law Corp.

14
15 By: 

16 Galen T. Shimoda
17 Justin P. Rodriguez
18 Brittany V. Berzin
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 *Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.*
2 *Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2021-00305938*

3 **PROOF OF SERVICE — CCP §§ 1013a and 2015.5**
4 **and California Rules of Court, Rule 1.21 and Rule 2.150**

5 I, Erika F. Collazo, declare that:

6 I am a citizen of the United States and am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the
7 within above-entitled action.

8 On January 4, 2022, I served the following documents on the party below:

- 9
 - 10 • First Amended Class Action Complaint

11 Brian Coggins (SBN: 239481) 12 COGGINS LAW 13 9001 Foothills Blvd., Ste. 110 14 Roseville, CA 95747 15 Telephone: (916) 270-2895 16 Facsimile: (916) 270-2894 17 Email: blc@cogginslawoffice.com	
--	--

18 [XXX] [By Mail] I am familiar with my employer's practice for the collection and
19 processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal
20 Service and that each day's mail is deposited with the United States Postal
21 Service that same day in the ordinary course of business. On the date set forth
22 above, I served the aforementioned document(s) on the parties in said action
23 by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage
24 thereon fully prepaid, for collection and mailing on this date, following
25 ordinary business practices, at Elk Grove, California, addressed as set forth
26 above.

27 [] [By Personal Service] By personally delivering a true copy thereof to the
28 office of the addressee above.

[] [By Electronic Mail] I e-mailed the documents(s) to the person(s) shown
above. No error was reported by the e-mail service that I used.

[] [By Overnight Courier] By causing a true copy and/or original thereof to be
personally delivered via the following overnight courier service: _____.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on January 4, 2022, at Elk Grove, California.

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
20

EXHIBIT C



Shimoda Law Corp.
9401 East Stockton Blvd.
Suite #200
Elk Grove, CA 95624
Ph. (916) 525-0716
Fax (916) 760-3733
www.shimodalaw.com

August 10, 2021

For Online Filing:

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

Re: *Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvement, Inc.*

Dear Labor Commissioner,

As counsel for Silviano Vasquez ("Plaintiff"), I am writing to provide you and the following "employers" notice pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3:

Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.
3628 Madison Avenue Suite 5
North Highlands, CA, 95660

Paul C. Cromwell
3628 Madison Avenue Suite 5
North Highlands, CA, 95660

Chris J. Mesunas
3628 Madison Avenue Suite 5
North Highlands, CA, 95660

We are setting forth the "facts and theories" to support each of the counts found within this complaint. Please notify us of your intent to investigate any or all of the claims alleged herein against Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc., Paul Cromwell, and Chris Mesunas ("Defendants"). Should you decide not to investigate, we request that you allow us to bring the following action on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a). Specifically, Aggrieved Employees shall include, but is not limited to the following: all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendants in California as non-exempt employees from one year prior to the date of this notice to the present. Plaintiff is clearly entitled to bring a Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") claim for civil penalties on behalf of these individuals pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.*, 23 Cal.App.5th 745, 757 (2018) (finding a plaintiff has PAGA standing if affected by one of the alleged violations; the plaintiff need not have personally experienced all the violations pursued in PAGA action).



A. FACTS

Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately March 15, 2021 to June 1, 2021 as an hourly, non-exempt employee. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not fully compensated due to Defendants' multiple Labor Code violations.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for all hours spent working. Defendants used phone applications to coordinate employees' schedules and for timekeeping. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees received nightly texts they were required to review and respond to regarding shift scheduling during hours that they were not clocked in. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were also required to clock in and out using a phone app. After Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were done working for the day, they would submit their time entries through the app. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees routinely found that their submitted times were rounded in a way that reduced working hours prior to the entries being approved by management. Defendants used this rounding policy to reduce labor costs and avoid compensating employees for all time worked. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are owed unpaid minimum and overtime wages due to Defendants rounding policy.

Defendants did not consistently provide Plaintiff and similarly situated employees with the required thirty (30) minute lunch break every five hours of work or ten (10) minute rest breaks every four hours. To reduce labor costs and increase profits, Defendants mandated that construction projects were completed as fast as possible, even if that meant foregoing meal and rest breaks. Defendants often instructed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to continue working through meal and rest breaks to complete construction jobs as quickly as possible. Despite Plaintiff and similarly situated employees not entering meal breaks through the timekeeping app, Defendants would change employee submissions to reflect that a meal break had occurred before approving the entries. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are owed unpaid meal and rest period premiums, as well as unpaid minimum wages and overtime that would have resulted had there been no unlawful deduction of thirty (30) minutes from Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' hours worked.

Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for work-related uses of personal items. Defendants required that employees have their own cell phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools for work purposes. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees used their personal cell phones while working to enter their hours, update management on project progress and completion, coordinate worksite duties, and coordinate work schedules. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees used their personal vehicles to transport materials and travel to and in between jobsites. Employees were forced to spend their own money on gas and maintenance costs related to work-related use of their personal vehicles. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were also required to purchase and use tools needed to complete construction projects without being reimbursed or being paid two times the minimum



wage. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are owed reimbursement for personal expenditures and work-related usage of personal items required by Defendants.

Defendants failed to properly calculate overtime and paid sick time wages at Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' regular rate of pay. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees received non-discretionary remuneration in addition to basic rate of pay that was not included in calculating regular rate of pay for overtime and paid sick leave purposes. This included, but was not limited to, bonuses and commissions. Due to Defendants' failure to include the additional remuneration in the overtime and paid sick leave regular rate of pay calculations, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees are owed unpaid wages.

Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and similarly situated employees with accurate wage statements. Defendants improperly excluded missed or delayed meal and rest period premiums owed to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees. Defendants also failed to properly account for unpaid minimum, overtime, and paid sick leave wages as a result of their time rounding policy and improper regular rate of pay calculations. Defendants distributed wage statements with inaccurate gross wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned, and applicable hourly rates in effect. Due to Defendants failure to accurately account for all wages owed to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees, Defendants owe penalties for distributing inaccurate wage statements.

At the time of Plaintiff's and similarly situated employees' termination and/or separation, Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were owed minimum wages, regular wages, paid sick leave wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premiums. To date, Defendants have not paid Plaintiff and similarly situated employees these unpaid wages.

Paul Cromwell and Chris Mesunas are the owners, directors, officers, and/or managing agents of Cromwell Home Improvements, Inc. and caused each and every one of the aforementioned Labor Code violations.

B. ALLEGATIONS AND CHARGES

Count #1 – Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197.1; IWC Wage Order No. 16, § 4 (Failure to Pay Minimum Wages)

During the period Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were employed by Defendants they were entitled to be paid at least the State's minimum wage rate for each hour that they worked. See, *e.g.*, IWC Wage Order MW-2019; IWC Wage Order No. 16 § (4); Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197.1. For the reasons stated above, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. Thus, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not paid at least the applicable state minimum wage for those hours worked. This is against the law.



Count #2 – Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194; IWC Wage Order No. 16, § 3 (Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 require employers to pay employees 1 ½ times their regular rate of pay for any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday and any work in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek. Employers must also pay employees 1 ½ times their regular rate of pay for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek. Finally, employers must pay employees 2 times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh day of work in any one workweek. As stated above, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees worked over eight (8) hours per day and forty (40) hours per week and were not paid all overtime wages owed. Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover all unpaid overtime wages. Failure to pay such wages is against the law.

Count #3 - Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and Wage Order No. 16, §§ 11(A) and 11(B) (Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Pay Premiums in Lieu Thereof)

Labor Code section 226.7 and Wage Order No. 16, section 11(A) require employers to provide employees meal periods of thirty (30) minutes per five (5) hours worked, which is to be taken before the completion of the fifth hour. Labor Code section 512 and Wage Order No. 16, section 11(B) further provide that employers may not employ employees for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of thirty (30) minutes; however, if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived so long as there was no waiver as to the first meal period. For the reasons stated above, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not authorized and permitted to take legally compliant meal periods pursuant to California law. Defendants also failed to pay any meal period premiums for their failure to provide meal periods. This was in violation of the law.

Count #4 – Violation of Labor Code § 226.7 and Wage Order No. 16, § 12(A) (Failure to Provide Rest Periods or Pay Premiums in Lieu Thereof)

Labor Code section 226.7 and Wage Order No. 16, section 12(A) require employers to provide employees paid off-duty rest periods of ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked. For the reasons stated above, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not authorized and permitted to take legally compliant rest periods pursuant to California law. Defendants also failed to pay any rest period premiums for their failure to provide rest periods. This was in violation of the law.



Count #5 – Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3 (Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements)

Labor Code section 226 requires employers to furnish to employees with “an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, . . . (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer . . . and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee” For the reasons stated above, Defendants failed to comply with these requirements with respect to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees. This is in violation of the law.

Count #6 – Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203, 256 (Failure to Pay Final Wages)

Labor Code sections 201-203 require that all wages, including minimum and overtime wages, be paid to employees upon separation and/or termination of employment. Here, for the reasons stated above, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees did not receive all final wages due and owing to them at the time of termination or seventy-two (72) hours thereafter as required by Labor Code sections 201-203. This is in violation of the law.

Count #7 – Violation of Labor Code § 2802 (Failure to Pay Reimbursements for Expenses)

Labor Code section 2802(a) states that “An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful.” Defendants failed to pay any reimbursements for work use of personal cell phones, vehicles, and tools by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees. This was in violation of the law.

Count #8 – Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.3, 1174 (Failure to Maintain Accurate Records)

Labor Code section 226.3 provides that any employer who fails to maintain records required by Labor Code section 226(a) or provide records required by 226(a) shall be subject shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation. Labor Code section 1174(d) provides that employers must keep and maintain accurate payroll records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages



paid to, employees. Defendants failed to maintain the accurate records required by law and, instead, maintained incomplete, inaccurate records regarding Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' wage records and hours worked. This was against the law.

Count #9 – Violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 246.5, 248.5 (Failure to Provide Paid Sick Leave)


Labor Code sections 246, *et seq.*, mandate that employers must provide California employees, who work thirty (30) or more days within a year for the employer, paid sick leave of at least one (1) hour for every thirty (30) hours worked that begins to accrue at the commencement of employment. An employer may use a different accrual method, other than providing one hour per every 30 hours worked, provided that the accrual is on a regular basis so that an employee has no less than twenty-four (24) hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month period. An employer may limit the use of sick leave to either twenty-four (24) hours or the equivalent of three (3) days, whichever is greater, during a year period. However, employers using an accrual method rather than a lump sum method must allow employees to accrue up to forty-eight (48) hours or the equivalent of six (6) days at any given time. Employers must authorize employees to take paid sick leave under the conditions set forth in the Healthy Workplaces, Healthy Families Act of 2014 ("HWHFA") for the diagnosis, care, or treatment of an existing health condition of, or preventive care for, an employee or an employee's family member. Any sick leave taken must be paid at the employee's regular rate of pay. For the reasons stated above, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with sick leave meeting the requirements set forth in HWHFA. Plaintiff will be seeking equitable, injunctive, and restitutionary relief to remedy these violations.

If you have any questions or require any further information regarding the facts and theories to support these claims, do not hesitate to contact our office.

Very truly yours,

Shimoda Law Corp.

By:


Justin P. Rodriguez

JR

cc: Client via e-mail

Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.

**PROOF OF SERVICE — CCP §§ 1013a and 2015.5
and California Rules of Court, Rule 1.21 and Rule 2.150**

I, Erika F. Collazo, declare that:

I am a citizen of the United States and am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within above-entitled action.

On August 10, 2021, I served the following documents on the party below:

- Private Attorney General Act Letter

Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc. 3628 Madison Avenue Suite 5 North Highlands, CA, 95660	Paul C. Cromwell 3628 Madison Avenue Suite 5 North Highlands, CA, 95660
Chris J. Mesunas 3628 Madison Avenue Suite 5 North Highlands, CA, 95660	

☒ [XXX] [By Certified Mail] I am familiar with my employer's practice for the collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service and that each day's mail is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business. On the date set forth above, I served the aforementioned document(s) on the parties in said action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, for collection and mailing on this date, following ordinary business practices, at Elk Grove, California, addressed as set forth above.

☐ [] [By Personal Service] By personally delivering a true copy thereof to the office of the addressee above.

☐ [] [By Overnight Courier] By causing a true copy and/or original thereof to be personally delivered via the following overnight courier service: _____.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on August 10, 2021, at Elk Grove, California.



Erika F. Collazo

EXHIBIT D

ILYM | GROUP, Inc.

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION EXPERTS

Case Name: Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.

Requesting Attorneys Name:

Brittany Berzin

E-Mail:

bberzin@shimodalaw.com

ILYM Contact:

Jonathan Paul

E-Mail:

Jonathan@ilymgroup.com

Contact Number:

310.948.7117

ESTIMATE FOR ADMINISTRATION SOLUTIONS

ASSUMPTIONS	
Total Number of Class Members	175
Estimated Mail Returned as Undeliverable	20%
Estimated Claims Rate	N/A
NCOA	Yes
Certified Spanish Translation	No
Case Duration (Year(s))	1

Activity	Rate Type	Unit Cost	Volume	Amount
CASE STARTUP				
Initial Setup - Import and Formatting of Data*	Hourly	\$150.00	2	\$300.00
Programming of Class Database	Hourly	\$175.00	1	\$175.00
Subtotal				\$475.00

*ILYM assumes that data will be in a standard format. Client will be notified immediately if not in standard format to correct data or ILYM can convert to standard format @ \$150.00 per hour.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT & NOTICING				
Project Manager (Case notification and maintenance)	Hourly	\$120.00	5	\$600.00
Staff Hours for Processing Returned Mail	Hourly	\$70.00	3	\$210.00
Staff Hours for Processing Opt-Outs, Disputes & Objections	Hourly	\$70.00	3	\$210.00
Report Processing	Hourly	\$70.00	5	\$350.00
NCOA	Flat Rate	\$50.00	1	\$50.00
Toll Free Customer Service Representatives	Flat Rate	\$250.00	1	\$250.00
Subtotal				\$1,670.00

NOTIFICATION/MAILING				
Fulfillment of Notice, English Only	Per Piece	\$4.00	175	\$700.00
USPS First Class Postage	Per Piece	\$0.60	175	\$105.00
Re-Mails (Forward/Skip trace Undeliverables)	Per Piece	\$8.00	11	\$84.00
Storage, Photocopies, Deliveries	Flat Fee	\$366.00	1	\$366.00
Subtotal				\$1,255.00

ILYM | GROUP, Inc.

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION EXPERTS

Activity	Rate Type	Unit Cost	Volume	Amount
----------	-----------	-----------	--------	--------

DISTRIBUTION (Includes EIN, Bank Acct * /QSF Setup)				
Distribution Setup & Management	Hourly	\$150.00	5	\$750.00
Account Reconciliation & Distribution Reporting	Hourly	\$125.00	5	\$625.00
Check, Stub & Release - Print & Mail (1099)	Per Check	\$4.00	175	\$700.00
USPS First Class Postage	Per Piece	\$0.60	175	\$105.00
Re-Mails (Forward/Skip trace Undeliverables up to 10%)	Per Piece	\$10.00	11	\$105.00
Preparation of Taxes	Hourly	\$120.00	6	\$720.00
Annual Filing of Tax Return	Per Year	\$750.00	1	\$750.00

**Additional Bank fees may apply*

Subtotal \$3,755.00

CASE CONCLUSION				
Data Manager Final Reporting	Hourly	\$100.00	1	\$100.00
Project Manager Final Reporting	Hourly	\$120.00	1	\$120.00
Declaration	Hourly	\$125.00	1	\$125.00

Subtotal \$345.00

TOTAL CASE ESTIMATE - NOT TO EXCEED: \$7,500.00

Terms and Conditions

All services to be provided by ILYM Group, Inc. (hereinafter, "ILYM") to Client shall be subject to the following terms and conditions:

Services: Subject to the terms hereof, ILYM agrees to provide the Client with Administration Services (hereinafter, "services") as specified in the Proposal provided to Client to which these Terms and Conditions are attached. The estimate is in good faith and does not cover any applicable taxes and fees. The estimate does not make provision for any services or class members/size not delineated in the request for proposal or stipulations. Such services do not in any way constitute legal services or advice. ILYM is performing its services as an Independent Contractor and neither it nor its employees shall be deemed to be employees of the Client.

Mailing and Data Conversion: ILYM's database administration assumes the Client will provide complete data that includes all information required to send notifications and complete the administration process. Data must be provided in a complete, consistent, standardized electronic format. ILYM's standard format is Microsoft Excel, however, ILYM may accept other formats at its discretion. Further developments or enhancements to non-standardized data will be billed to Client by ILYM on a time and materials basis, according to ILYM's Standard Rates.

Charges for Services: Charges to the Client for services shall be on a time and materials basis at our prevailing rates, as the same may change from time to time. Any fee estimates set forth in the proposal are estimates only, based on information provided by Client to ILYM. Actual fees charged by ILYM to Client may be greater or less than such estimate, and Client shall be responsible for the payment of all such charges and expenses in accordance with Section 5 hereof. Charges incurred related to resolving post distribution withholdings and related corrective files due to voids and re-issues of payments and related correspondence with state and federal taxing authorities will not be charged to the Client to the extent that funds are received from the taxing authorities offset these charges. ILYM may derive financial benefits from financial institutions in connection with the deposit and investment of settlement funds with such institutions, including without limitation, discounts on eligible banking services and fees, and loans at favorable rates.

Indemnification: Client will indemnify and hold ILYM (and the officers, employees, affiliates and agents harmless against any Losses incurred by ILYM, arising out of, in connection with, or related to (i) any breach of the terms by Client; (ii) the processing and handling of any payment by ILYM in accordance with Client's instructions, including without limitation, the imposition of any stop payment or void payment on any check or the wrongful dishonor of a check by ILYM pursuant to Client's instructions.

Payment of Charges: ILYM reserves the right to request payment of postage charges and 50% of the final administration charges at the start of the case. ILYM bills are due upon receipt unless otherwise negotiated and agreed to with the Client. In the event settlement terms provide that ILYM is to be paid out of the Settlement Fund, ILYM will request that Counsel endeavor to make alternate payment arrangements for ILYM charges that are due at the onset of the case. The entire remaining balance is due and payable at the time the Settlement Account is funded by, or no later than the time of disbursement. Decisions of the court and actions of the parties, including disapproval or withdrawal of a settlement, do not affect the Client's liability to ILYM for payment of services. Services are not provided on a contingency fee basis.

Confidentiality: ILYM maintain reasonable and appropriate security measures and safeguards to protect the security and confidentiality of Client data provided to ILYM by Client in connection herewith. Should ILYM ever be notified of any judicial order or other proceedings in which a third party seeks to obtain access to the confidential data created by or for the Client, ILYM will promptly notify the Client, unless prohibited by applicable law. The Client shall have the option to (1) provide legal representation at the Client's expense to avoid such access or (2) promptly reimburse ILYM for any of its costs, including attorneys' fees, reasonably incurred in avoiding, attempting to avoid or providing such access and not paid by the entity seeking the data. If ILYM is required, pursuant to a court order, to produce documents, disclose data, or otherwise act in contravention of the obligations imposed by this Agreement, or otherwise, with respect to maintaining the confidentiality, proprietary nature and secrecy of the produced documents or disclosed data, ILYM will not be liable for breach of said obligation.

Data Rights: ILYM does not convey nor does the Client obtain any right in the programs, system data, or materials utilized or provided by ILYM in the ordinary course of business in the performance of this Agreement.

Document Retention: Unless directed otherwise in writing by Client, ILYM will destroy undeliverable mail on the effective date of the settlement or the date that the disposition of the case is no longer subject to appeal or review, whichever is later. ILYM will maintain claim forms and other correspondence for one year after final distribution of funds or benefits, or until the date that the disposition of the case is no longer subject to appeal or review, whichever is later.

Limitation of damages: ILYM is not responsible to the Client for any special, consequential or incidental damages incurred by Client. Any liability of ILYM to the Client shall not exceed the total amount billed to the Client for the particular services that give rise to any loss.

Termination: The services to be provided under this Agreement may be terminated, at will by the Client upon at least 30 calendar days' prior written notice to ILYM. The Client's obligation to pay for services or projects in progress at the time of notice of withdrawal shall continue throughout that 30 day period. ILYM may terminate this Agreement (i) with 10 calendar days' prior written notice, if the Client is not current in payment of charges or (ii) in any event, upon at least 3 months' prior written notice to the Client.

Notice: Any notice required or permitted hereunder shall be in writing and shall be delivered personally, or sent by registered mail, postage prepaid, or overnight courier service to the responsible officer or principal of ILYM or the Client, as applicable, and shall be deemed given when so delivered personally, or, if mailed, five days after the date of deposit in United States mail, or, if sent by courier, one business day after delivery to such courier service.

Force Majeure: To the extent performance by ILYM of any of its obligations hereunder is substantially prevented by reason of any act of God or by reason of any other matter beyond ILYM's reasonable control, then such performance shall be excused and this Agreement, at ILYM's option, be deemed suspended during the continuation of such condition and for a reasonable time thereafter.

Waiver of Rights: No failure or delay on the part of a party in exercising any right hereunder will operate as a waiver of, or impair, any such right. No single or partial exercise of any such right will preclude any other or further exercise thereof or the exercise of any other right. No waiver of any such right will be effective unless given in a signed writing.

Jurisdiction: The parties hereto submit to the jurisdiction of the Court of the applicable case for purposes of any suit, action or proceeding to enforce any provision of, or based on any right arising out of, this Agreement. The parties hereto hereby waive any objection to the laying of venue of any such suit, action or proceeding in the Court.

Entire Agreement: These terms and conditions and the proposal embody the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof, and cancels and supersedes all prior negotiations, representations, and agreements related thereto, either written or oral, except to the extent they are expressly incorporated herein. No changes in, additions to, or waivers of, the terms and conditions set forth herein will be binding upon any party, unless approved in writing by such party's authorized representative.

EXHIBIT E

Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC Costs

<u>Date</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
8/10/21	Service Fee to Court - Complaint, Civil Case Cover Sheet, and Summons	\$40.00
8/10/21	Payment to Court - Complaint	\$435.00
8/11/21	Payment to LWDA - PAGA Filing Fee	\$75.00
8/11/21	Postage - Certified PAGA Letter to Employers	\$12.90
8/26/21	ALS Service Fee - Complaint to Chriswell Home Improvements Invoice 166443	\$50.00
8/31/21	Service Fee to Court - Notice of Depositing Complex Fees	\$40.00
8/31/21	Payment to Court - Complex Fees	\$1,000.00
8/31/21	Service Fee to Court - Proof of Service of Summons	\$40.00
9/1/21	Administration/Copy Fee - Class Action - Phone, Fax, Scan, Copying, Westlaw Legal Research Fees	\$500.00
9/8/21	Priority Mail - Discovery Set One	\$7.40
9/9/21	Service Fee to Court - Case Management Statement	\$40.00
12/6/21	Service Fee to Court - Stipulation and Proposed Order to Amend	\$40.00
12/6/21	Payment to Court - Stipulation and Proposed Order to Amend	\$20.00
1/4/22	Service Fee to Court - First Amended Complaint to Court	\$40.00
1/19/22	Payment for Records - PRA Records	\$28.88
3/17/22	Priority Mail - Motion to Compel to OC	\$7.75
3/21/22	Payment to Court - Motion to Compel	\$120.00
4/7/22	Payment to Court - Jury Fees	\$150.00
4/7/22	Service Fee to Court - Notice of Depositing Jury Fees	\$40.00
4/13/22	Service Fee to Court - Case Management Statement	\$40.00
4/14/22	Mediation Fee	\$3,000.00
8/9/22	Service Fee to Court - Case Management Statement	\$40.00
Anticipated	Payment to Court - Preliminary Approval Motion	\$60.00
Anticipated	One Legal Filing Fee - Preliminary Approval Motion	\$300.00
Anticipated	Payment to Court - Final Approval Motion	\$60.00
Anticipated	One Legal Filing Fee - Final Approval Motion	\$300.00
Anticipated	One Legal Filing Fee - Compliance Declarations	\$70.00
		\$6,556.93

EXHIBIT F

CALIFORNIA SUPERIOR COURT
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on behalf of all
other similarly situated employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS, INC., A
California Corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION AND
PAGA SETTLEMENT, AND HEARING DATE FOR
FINAL COURT APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

ATTENTION: all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendant in California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2017 up to September 26, 2022 (the “Class Members”).

PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY. THIS NOTICE RELATES TO A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION LITIGATION AND POTENTIAL DISBURSEMENT OF SETTLEMENT FUNDS TO YOU. IF YOU ARE A CLASS MEMBER, IT CONTAINS IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE OR TO OPT OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT ACCORDING TO THE PROCEDURES DESCRIBED BELOW.

Pursuant to an order from the Sacramento County Superior Court (“Court”) granting preliminary approval of this class action settlement, entered on [REDACTED], you are receiving notice of a proposed class action and Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) settlement between Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez (“Plaintiff” or “Class Representative”) and Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc. (“Defendant”) and its owners Paul C. Cromwell (“Cromwell”) and Chris J. Mesunas (“Mesunas”) on behalf of Class Members as defined above. You are receiving this notice because Defendant’s records indicate you fall within the definition of “Class Member.” Defendant’s records also indicate that you worked [REDACTED] weeks during the applicable Class Period (as defined below), which means your share of the settlement proceeds is estimated to be [REDACTED]. Your actual share of the settlement proceeds will vary depending on the total number of Class Members that choose to participate and the resolution of any workweek disputes as described in this notice.

The terms of the Agreement and a description of the case are identified in this notice. Pursuant to the Court’s order, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:

I. BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

On August 10, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Complaint against Defendant in the Sacramento County Superior Court of California on behalf of himself and Class Members. The term “Action” means this putative class action pending in Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2021-00305938. The Class Period is August 10, 2017 up to September 26, 2022 (the “Class Period”).

In the Action, Plaintiff sought to obtain unpaid wages, interest, statutory penalties, civil penalties, fees, and costs on behalf of himself, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiff alleged that Defendant failed to pay overtime, failed to pay minimum wages, failed to provide meal periods, failed to provide rest periods, failed to provide accurate wage statements, failed to pay final wages, failed to reimburse expenses, and engaged in unfair competition. Defendant has denied Plaintiff’s allegations. The Action has been actively litigated. There have been on-going investigations, and there has been an exchange of extensive documentation and information. Furthermore, the Parties have participated in a full day mediation facilitated by a neutral third party. Based upon the negotiations, and all known facts and circumstances, including the various risks and uncertainties related to legal actions, the Parties reached a class-wide settlement. By settling, the Parties will avoid the risks associated with a lengthy litigation process. Despite agreeing to and supporting the Agreement, Defendant continues to deny all allegations and claims. Defendant has entered into this Settlement to fully, finally, and forever resolve this Action, based on the terms set forth in the Agreement, in order to avoid the burden and expense associated with ongoing litigation.

The Parties have entered into a Joint Stipulation of Regarding Class Action PAGA Settlement and Release (“Agreement” or “Settlement”), which has been preliminarily approved by the Court. The Agreement applies to any and all Class Members as defined above. “Class Member” does not include persons who submit valid request to opt out (as explained below). If you are a Class Member,

you have the opportunity to participate in the Settlement, or to exclude yourself (“opt out”) from the settlement. This notice is to advise you of how you can either participate in the Settlement or be excluded from the Settlement.

II. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

A. The Amount of the Settlement

Under the terms of the Agreement, Defendant, Cromwell and Mesunas have agreed to pay a total sum of One Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$110,000) (“Gross Settlement Amount”). Deducted from this Gross Settlement Amount will be sums approved by the Court for attorneys’ fees not to exceed 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount which equals \$38,500, attorneys’ costs not to exceed \$10,000, Claims Administrator Costs estimated not to exceed \$10,000, Class Representative’s Enhancement Payment of \$10,000, and \$2,500 for alleged PAGA penalties (the “PAGA Payment”), which will result in a “Net Settlement Amount” for distribution to all Class Members. Any employer side taxes attributable to payments allocated as wages will be paid by Defendant, Cromwell or Mesunas in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. As explained further below, the amount of each Class Member’s share of the Net Settlement Amount will depend on the number of weeks worked by participating Class Members during the Class Period. Of the \$2,500 allocated to resolving the PAGA claims, 75% of the PAGA Payment will be paid to the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency and 25% of the PAGA Payment will be divided among Aggrieved Employees, which are defined as all individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendant in California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2020 up to September 26, 2022.

The number of weeks you worked during the Class Period and your estimated share of the Net Settlement Amount and PAGA Payment (“Claim Amount”) is stated on the first page of this notice. The actual amount received may be more or less than the amount stated depending on the actual number of weeks worked by participating Class Members, the resolution of any disputes regarding workweeks, and on the distributions finally approved and allocated by the Court. However, whether Class Members opt out will have no effect on Aggrieved Employees’ allocations for the PAGA claims.

B. Claim Amounts and Allocation Between Class Members and Aggrieved Employees

Defendant will pay Claim Amounts through the Claims Administrator, as described below, to each Class Member who does not opt out of the settlement and to Aggrieved Employees. All Claim Amounts will be subject to appropriate taxation. The Parties have agreed, based on the allegations in the Action that all Claim Amounts payable to eligible Class Members will be allocated from the Net Settlement Amount and paid as 2/3 for disputed interest, statutory penalties, and other non-wage damages for which IRS Forms 1099-MISC and 1099-INT will issue and 1/3 for disputed wages for which IRS Forms W-2 will issue. The PAGA Payment to Aggrieved employees will be paid as 100% for civil penalties.

Payment to Class Members who do not opt out and Aggrieved Employees will not require the submission of a claim form. Each Class Member’s share will be determined by dividing their total weeks worked within the Class Period by the total weeks worked by all Class Members within the Class Period. That fraction will then be multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to arrive at the Class Member’s individual share of the Net Settlement Amount. Each Aggrieved Employee’s share of the 25% portion of the PAGA Payment will be determined by dividing their total weeks worked within the PAGA Claim Period by the total weeks worked by all Aggrieved Employees within the PAGA Claim Period. That fraction will then be multiplied by the 25% portion of the PAGA Payment to arrive at the Aggrieved Employee’s individual share. Receipt of the Claim Amounts will not entitle any Class Member or Aggrieved Employee to additional compensation or benefits under any compensation, retirement or benefit plan or agreement in place during the period covered by the Settlement.

C. Calculations to Be Based on Defendant’s Records and Resolution of Workweek Disputes

For each Class Member, the amount payable will be calculated by the Claims Administrator from Defendant’s records. Defendant’s records will be presumed correct unless evidence to the contrary is provided to the Claims Administrator. Defendant’s records and any additional evidence will be reviewed by the Claims Administrator in the event of a dispute about the number of workweeks worked by an individual Class Member. If a Class Member disputes the accuracy of Defendant’s records, all supporting documents evidencing additional workweeks must be submitted by the Class Member. The dispute must (a) identify the nature of the dispute; (b) provide any information or documentation supporting the dispute; (c) be signed; and (d) be post-marked no later than [REDACTED]. The dispute will be resolved by the Claims Administrator based on the records and evidence provided. The Claims Administrator’s decision on all disputes will be final and binding.

D. Release of Claims

For those Class Members who do not opt out and Aggrieved Employees, the Agreement contains the following releases:

Class members who do not opt out will be deemed to have released all claims contained in the operative Complaint, and any additional wage and hour claims that could have been brought based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint, through the Class Period. This release excludes the release of claims not permitted by law. This release exclude claims for workers' compensation or unemployment insurance benefits. This release will cover all Class Members who do not opt out.

Aggrieved Employees will be deemed to have released any all Private Attorneys General Act claims for civil penalties contained in Plaintiff's letter to the LWDA and/or operative Complaint, through the PAGA Claim Period. Aggrieved Employees cannot opt out of this waiver of claims.

The individuals released ("Released Parties") include Defendant, Cromwell, and Mesunas as well as their officers, shareholders, directors, agents, employees, attorneys, and insurers.

Class Members can talk to one of the lawyers appointed as Class Counsel (listed below) for free or talk to their own lawyer if Class Members have questions about the released claims and what they mean.

E. Attorneys' Fees and Costs

Defendant, Mesunas and Cromwell agreed to pay Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs to be approved by the Court, up to a maximum of 35% of the Gross Settlement Amount which equals \$38,500, and attorneys' costs not to exceed \$10,000. Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs will be paid and deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount.

III. WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS AS A CLASS MEMBER

A. Participating in the Settlement

If you wish to participate in the settlement and believe your workweek information is accurate, **you do not need to take any further action**. Payment will be automatically made to you consistent with the terms of the Agreement and Court Order. If you wish to dispute the workweek calculation, you may follow the procedures outlined in Section II.C above. California law protects Class Members from retaliation based on their decision to participate in the Settlement.

B. Excluding Yourself from the Settlement

If you do not wish to participate in the settlement, you may be excluded (*i.e.*, "opt out") by submitting a timely written request to the Claims Administrator. The request to opt-out must (a) state your full name and date of birth; (b) a statement that you do not want to be a Class Member, do not want to participate in the settlement, and/or wants to be excluded from this settlement; (c) identify the case name and number (*i.e.* *Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.*, 34-2021-00305938); (d) be signed; and (e) be post-marked no later than [REDACTED]. The request to opt out must be signed, dated and mailed by First Class U.S. Mail or the equivalent, to:

[admin info]

The request to opt out must be postmarked no later than [REDACTED]. If you submit a request to opt out which is not postmarked by [REDACTED], your request to opt out will be rejected, and you will be bound by the release and all other terms of the Agreement. If the request to opt out is sent from within the United States it must be sent through the United States Postal Service by First Class Mail, or the equivalent. Do not use a postage meter as that may not result in a postmark appearing on the envelope containing your request to opt out. Any Class Member who submits a complete and timely request to opt out shall, upon receipt by the Claims Administrator, no longer be a Class Member and not received their share of the class settlement payment. Aggrieved Employees cannot opt out of this Agreement and will receive their share of the PAGA Payment regardless of whether they opt out of being a Class Member.

C. Objection to Settlement

If you do not opt out of the settlement, you can object to the terms of the Agreement. However, if the Court rejects your objection, you will still be bound by the terms of the Agreement. You can ask the Court to deny approval by filing an objection. You

cannot ask the Court to order a larger settlement; the Court can only approve or deny the settlement. If the Court denies approval, no settlement payments will be sent out and the lawsuit will continue. If that is what you want to happen, you must object. The objection must (a) state your full name and date of birth; (b) provide evidence that you are, in fact, a Class Member; (c) state the reasons for the objection(s), including any legal analysis and/or supporting documentation; (d) identify the case name and number (i.e. *Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.*, 34-2021-00305938) (e) be signed; and (f) be post-marked no later than [REDACTED]. The objection must be sent to the Claims Administrator at the address identified in section III.B and to counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant at the addresses identified in section VI of this notice.

If you have submitted a written objection as outlined above, you may also appear at the Final Approval Hearing, either in person or through your own attorney, to state your objection. However, you must file a notice of intent to appear with the Court and serve the notice on counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant. If you appear through your own attorney, you are responsible for paying that attorney.

IV. EFFECT OF THE SETTLEMENT: RELEASED RIGHTS AND CLAIMS

After final approval of the settlement has been granted by the Court, each and every Class Member who does not opt out of the settlement and Aggrieved Employee, will release Defendant and the Released Parties from the released claims described above. In other words, if you were employed as a Class Member by Defendant in California during the Class Period, and you do not exclude yourself from the settlement, you will be deemed to have entered into this release and to have released the above-described claims. In addition, you will be barred from ever suing Defendant and the Released Parties with respect to the claims covered by this settlement. If the settlement is not approved by the Court or does not become final for some other reason, the litigation will continue.

V. FINAL SETTLEMENT APPROVAL HEARING

The Court will hold a hearing in Department 28, 720 9th Street, Sacramento, California 95814, on [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] to determine whether the Agreement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate. The Court also will be asked to approve Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs. The hearing may be continued without further notice to Class Members. It is not necessary for you to appear at this hearing, unless you wish to object to the settlement.

VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Copies of all documents filed in this lawsuit may be accessed online at [REDACTED]. If you want additional information about this lawsuit and its proceedings, you can contact Class Counsel or Defendant's Counsel as follows:

Justin P. Rodriguez
Brittany V. Berzin
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
9401 East Stockton Blvd., Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733
On behalf of Plaintiff

Brian Coggins
Coggins Law
9001 Foothills Blvd., Ste. 110
Roseville, CA 95747
Telephone: (916) 270-2895
Facsimile: (916) 270-2894
On behalf of Defendant

PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR THE COURT CLERK'S OFFICE TO INQUIRE ABOUT THIS SETTLEMENT OR THE CLAIM PROCESS. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, CALL [REDACTED]

BY ORDER OF THE COURT

EXHIBIT G

Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
9401 East Stockton Boulevard, Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated
employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
INC., A California Corporation; and DOES 1
to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Reservation No.: 2676526

Date: December 2, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 28

Judge: Hon. Lauri Damrell

Filed: August 10, 2021

FAC Filed: January 5, 2022

Trial Date: None Set

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD:

2 The Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Motion”) in the
3 above referenced case came before this Court, on December 2, 2022 at 9:00 a.m., in Department 28
4 before the Honorable Lauri Damrell, presiding. Named Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez (“Plaintiff”) filed
5 this putative class action on August 10, 2021. The operative Complaint alleges that Defendant
6 Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc. (“Defendant”) violated California law by failing to pay overtime,
7 failing to pay minimum wages, failing to provide meal periods, failing to provide rest periods, failing
8 to provide accurate wage statements, failing to pay final wages, failing to reimburse expenses, and
9 engaging in unfair competition. Plaintiff has also alleged Defendant is liable for a civil penalties under
10 the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) based on these violations. Plaintiff sought attorneys’
11 fees and costs as part of this Action. Defendant denied all of Plaintiff’s claims and denied that this
12 case was appropriate for class treatment. No class has been certified.

13 The parties have agreed to settle the class and PAGA claims. Defendant and its owners, Paul
14 C. Cromwell (“Cromwell”) and Chris J. Mesunas (“Mesunas”), will provide monetary consideration in
15 exchange for a release of claims consistent with the terms of the proposed settlement as set forth in the
16 Joint Stipulation Regarding Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release (“Agreement”). Any
17 capitalized terms herein shall have the same meaning as set forth in the Agreement. The Court, having
18 received and considered Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA
19 Settlement, the declarations in support, the Agreement, the proposed Notice of Settlement, and other
20 evidence, HEREBY ORDERS AND MAKES DETERMINATIONS AS FOLLOWS:

21 **I. PRELIMINARILY CERTIFYING A SETTLEMENT CLASS; APPOINTMENT OF**
22 **CLASS REPRESENTATIVES; APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL**

23 The Court finds that certification of the following class for settlement purposes only is
24 appropriate under the California Code of Civil Procedure and related case law:

25 All individuals who have, or continue to, perform work for Defendant in
26 California as non-exempt employees from August 10, 2021 up to
September 26, 2022.

27 The Court recognizes that the foregoing definition is for Class Member identification purposes only and
28 is not intended to capture the claims at issue or limit or alter the released claims under the Agreement.

1 The Court finds that Class Members meet the ascertainability and numerosity requirements since
2 the parties can identify with a matter of certainty, based on payroll records, individuals who fall within
3 the definition and the number of Class Members would make joinder impractical. The commonality and
4 predominance requirements are met for settlement purposes since there are questions of law and fact
5 common to Class Members. The common questions of law or fact in this case all stem from Plaintiff's
6 contentions that Defendants caused the violations outlined above by 1) failing to pay Class Members for
7 all hours worked; and 2) failing to incorporate the value of nondiscretionary remuneration, such as
8 bonuses into Class Members' regular rates of pay for the purpose of calculating overtime and paid sick
9 time; 3) failing to authorize and permit all meal and rest periods and failing to keep track of whether
10 Class Members' took meal periods; and 4) failing to reimburse Class Members' for the use of personal
11 items for work, such as personal cellphones, vehicles, and tools. The PAGA, waiting time penalty, wage
12 statement violation, and unfair competition claims also derive from these violations. Additionally, Class
13 Members seek the same remedies under state law. The typicality requirement for settlement purposes is
14 also satisfied since the claims of the Class Representative is based on the same facts and legal theories as
15 those applicable to the class members.

16 The Court also finds that preliminarily and conditionally certifying the settlement class is
17 required to avoid each Class Member from litigating similar claims individually. This settlement will
18 achieve economies of scale for Class Members with relatively small individual claims and conserve the
19 resources of the judicial system.

20 The Court finds that Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez and Plaintiff's counsel, Galen T. Shimoda, Justin
21 P. Rodriguez and Brittany V. Berzin of Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC, to be adequate representatives
22 of the settlement class. The Court appoints them as Class Representative and Class Counsel,
23 respectively.

24 **II. PRELIMINARILY APPROVING CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

25 The Court has reviewed the Agreement, which was submitted with Plaintiff's Motion as Exhibit
26 A. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the Agreement falls within the range of reasonableness of
27 a settlement, which could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. The Court also
28

acknowledges that Class Members may object to the settlement at a fairness hearing approved by this Court or opt-out of being bound by the preliminarily approved Agreement.

Because the Court finds the Parties' settlement to have been agreed upon only after an extensive investigation and arms-length negotiations, and in an attempt to avoid further delays and costs, the Court preliminarily approves the Agreement and all terms therein as if stated here in full, including the \$110,000 Gross Settlement Amount.

The Court orders that Plaintiff Silviano Vasquez will receive \$10,000 as a Class Representative Enhancement Payment in addition to any amount Plaintiff may be entitled to under the Agreement's pro rata distribution formula for Plaintiff's time and effort on behalf of Class Members.

The Court orders and approves ILYM Group, Inc. to act as the Claims Administrator in this case. The Claims Administrator will take its fees out of the Gross Settlement Amount, which are not to exceed \$10,000. Any difference between the actual cost of the Claims Administrator and the approved payment will be added to the Net Settlement.

The Court finds that an award of fees under the common fund doctrine is appropriate in this case because there is a sufficiently identifiable class of beneficiaries (*i.e.* Class Members), the benefits can be accurately traced as set forth in the Agreement, Plaintiff and Class Counsel were able to negotiate on behalf of Class Members, and the fee can be shifted with exactitude to those benefiting as the fee request is a specific, lump-sum percentage of the Gross Settlement Amount. *See Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt v. Grauly*, 886 F.2d 268, 271 (9th Cir. 1989); *Serrano v. Priest*, 20 Cal.3d 25, 34-35 (1977); *Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat., Inc.*, 1 Cal.5th 480, 506 (2016). The Court finds the attorneys' fees request of thirty five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount, *i.e.*, \$38,500, to be appropriate compensation for Class Counsel. The attorneys' fees request is within the range that has been approved by other Courts in similar cases and is reasonable in light of the circumstances of this case, the substantial and beneficial results obtained on behalf of Class Members, and the contingent nature of the recovery over the course of this case, which included potential loss at summary judgment, certification, and/or trial proceedings. Additionally, the Court orders that up to \$10,000 of the settlement proceeds will be paid to Class Counsel for reasonable costs incurred in this case. Any difference between the actual costs incurred and the \$10,000 shall be added to the Net Settlement Amount.

1 The Court approves of the \$2,500 PAGA Payment, which shall be paid from the Gross
2 Settlement Amount, not in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount, to resolve the alleged PAGA
3 claims. Seventy-Five percent (75%) of the PAGA Payment will be paid to the Labor and Workforce
4 Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Twenty-Five percent (25%) will be paid to Aggrieved Employees
5 on a pro rata basis as described in the Agreement. The Court also finds that the Agreement provides a
6 recovery that creates an effective substantial deterrent to any potential future non-compliance, furthering
7 the purpose of the Labor Code and LWDA.

8 The Court approves of the identified *cy pres* distribution plan wherein any checks issued to
9 Qualified Claimants and/or Aggrieved Employees that are not cashed by the deadline to do so shall be
10 donated equally, *i.e.*, 50/50, to Capital Pro Bono, Inc., and the Center for Workers’ Rights. No portion
11 of the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendant for any reason.

12 The releases and waivers for Class Members who do not opt out of being bound by the
13 Agreement (*i.e.*, Qualified Claimants), Aggrieved Employees, and the Class Representative are also
14 approved by the Court as set forth in the Agreement.

15 **III. APPROVAL OF DISTRIBUTION TO THE CLASS, THE NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT,**
16 **OPPORTUNITY TO OPT OUT OF, AND OBJECT TO, THE SETTLEMENT**

17 The Court finds that the proposed Notice of Settlement, which was submitted with Plaintiff's
18 Motion as Exhibit F, fairly and adequately advises Class Members of the terms of the Agreement, the
19 rights being waived, their right to opt out, the ability to dispute the number of workweeks worked during
20 the Class Period, their pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount, how to participate in the settlement,
21 how to file documentation in opposition to the proposed settlement, and when to appear at the fairness
22 hearing to be conducted on the date set forth below. The Court further finds that the Notice of
23 Settlement and proposed distribution of such notice by first class mail to each identified Class Member
24 at his or her most recent address based on a National Change of Address database search from the Class
25 Members’ last known address and a skip trace on any Class Members who have the Notice of Settlement
26 returned as “undeliverable” or “not at this address” comports with all constitutional requirements,
27 including those of due process.

28 //

The Court also finds that because there is a strong interest in providing Class Members the opportunity to participate in the settlement, along with the Parties' efforts to minimize any intrusion to privacy rights, the sharing of employment information, including social security numbers, is not a serious intrusion on their privacy rights. Hence, the Court orders Defendant to provide first and last name, last known mailing address, social security number, and hire and termination dates, total number of workweeks during which the Class Member performed any actual work to the Claims Administrator only, and not to Plaintiff or Class Counsel, in order to process this settlement as contemplated within the Agreement and approved by this Order. The Claims Administrator shall only use this information for settlement purposes identified herein, and this information shall be kept confidential, not be shared with any third-party, and used only to administer the settlement.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Accordingly, with good cause shown, the Court hereby approves and orders that the following implementation schedule be adhered to:

Last day for Defendant to provide Claims Administrator with Class Member and Aggrieved Employee information	Within 14 calendar days after the Preliminary Approval Date
Last day for Claims Administrator to complete NCOA search, update Class Member and Aggrieved Employee mailing information, and mail Notice of Settlement	Within 14 calendar days after the Claims Administrators' receipt of Class Members' information from Defendant
Last day for Class Members to opt-out, submit disputes, submit objections, and submit data requests	60 calendar days after mailing of Notice of Settlement or within 10 days after Notice of Settlement is re-mailed, whichever is later
Last day for Claims Administrator to provide Parties with signed declaration reporting on settlement administration statistics	Within 14 calendar days after end of the Notice Period

1 2 3 4 5	Last day for Claims Administrator to calculate the final Net Settlement Amount, the final Claim Amounts for Qualified Claimants and/or Aggrieved Employees, any applicable taxes thereon, and report the results of these calculations to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel	Within 7 calendar days after the Effective Date
6 7	Last day for Defendant, Cromwell, and Mesunas to fund settlement	Within 30 calendar days after the Effective Date
8 9 10 11	Last day for Claims Administrator to deliver payment of Class Counsel's attorney's fees and costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Payment, Claims Administrator Costs, payment to Qualified Claimants, and payment to Aggrieved Employees	Within 7 calendar days after funding
12 13 14	Last day for Qualified Members and Aggrieved Employees to cash settlement checks	180 calendar days after issuance of checks to Qualified Members and Aggrieved Employees
15 16 17	Last day for Claims Administrator to deliver value of uncashed settlement checks to <i>cy pres</i> beneficiaries	Within 14 calendar days after settlement check cashing deadline
18 19	Last day for Claims Administrator to provide Parties with compliance declaration	Within 21 calendar days after settlement check cashing deadline

FINAL APPROVAL AND HEARING

The Court hereby grants Plaintiff's Motion and sets final approval hearing on the proposed date of April 14, 2023, at 9:00 a.m., with briefs and supporting documentation to be submitted according to the California Code of Civil Procedure, in this Department. Class Members who object in a timely manner, and in the manner set forth in the Agreement, may appear and present such objections at the fairness hearing in person or by counsel.

If for any reason the Court does not grant final approval of the Agreement, all evidence and proceedings held in connection therewith shall be without prejudice to the status quo and rights of the parties to the litigation, including all challenges to personal jurisdiction and to class certification for any

1 purpose other than approving a settlement class. The parties will revert to their respective positions as if
2 no settlement had been reached at all.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4
5 Date: _____

By: _____
Judge of the Superior Court

1 Galen T. Shimoda (Cal. State Bar No. 226752)
Justin P. Rodriguez (Cal. State Bar No. 278275)
2 Brittany V. Berzin (Cal. State Bar No. 325121)
Shimoda & Rodriguez Law, PC
3 9401 East Stockton Blvd., Suite 120
Elk Grove, CA 95624
4 Telephone: (916) 525-0716
Facsimile: (916) 760-3733

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff SILVIANO VASQUEZ
6
7

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**
10

11 SILVIANO VASQUEZ, individually and on
behalf of all other similarly situated
12 employees,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.
15

16 CHRISWELL HOME IMPROVEMENTS,
INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1 to
17 100, inclusive,

18 Defendants.
19
20
21

Case No. 34-2021-00305938

CLASS ACTION

PROOF OF SERVICE

Vasquez v. Chriswell Home Improvements, Inc.
Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2021-00305938

**PROOF OF SERVICE — CCP §§ 1013a and 2015.5
and California Rules of Court, Rule 1.21 and Rule 2.150**

I, Estefania Rodriguez, declare that:

I am a citizen of the United States and am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within above-entitled action.

On October 31, 2022, I served the following documents on the party below:

- Memorandum of Points and Authorities In Support of Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement
- Declaration of Brittany V. Berzin In Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement
- Declaration of Silviano Vasquez In Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement
- Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement
- [Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement
- Exhibit List and Exhibits In Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval and PAGA Settlement

Brian Coggins (SBN: 239481)

COGGINS LAW

9001 Foothills Blvd., Ste. 110

Roseville, CA 95747

Telephone: (916) 270-2895

Facsimile: (916) 270-2894

Email: blc@cogginslawoffice.com

David M. Daniels (SBN 170315)

ElGuindy, Meyer & Koegel, APC

2990 Lava Ridge Ct., Ste. 205

Roseville, CA 95661

Telephone: (916) 778-3310

Facsimile: (916) 330-4433

Email: ddaniels@emklawyers.com
sandrade@emklawyers.com

[] [By Mail] I am familiar with my employer's practice for the collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service and that each day's mail is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business. On the date set forth above, I served the aforementioned document(s) on the parties in said action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, for collection and mailing on this date, following ordinary business practices, at Elk Grove, California, addressed as set forth above.


[] [By Personal Service] By personally delivering a true copy thereof to the office of the addressee above.

//

1 [XXX] [By Electronic Mail] I e-mailed the documents(s) to the person(s) shown
2 above. No error was reported by the e-mail service that I used.

3 [] [By Overnight Courier] By causing a true copy and/or original thereof to be
4 personally delivered via the following overnight courier service: _____.

5 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
6 true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on October 31, 2022, at Elk Grove, California.

7 
8 _____
9 Estefania Rodriguez
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28