

1 DANIEL F. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 251488
daniel@gaineslawfirm.com
2 ALEX P. KATOFISKY, ESQ. SBN 202754
alex@gaineslawfirm.com
3 EVAN S. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 287668
evan@gaineslawfirm.com
4 **GAINES & GAINES, APLC**
4550 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Suite 100
5 Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: (818) 703-8985
6 Facsimile: (818) 703-8984

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Nathan Arellano, on behalf of himself and all “aggrieved employees”
8 pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF MERCED**

11 NATHAN ARELLANO, on behalf of
12 himself and all “aggrieved employees”
pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 ALL AMERICAN LOCK
16 CORPORATION, a California corporation,
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

17 Defendants.

Case No. 22CV-02461

Assigned to the Hon. Brian McCabe, Courtroom 8

**DECLARATION OF DANIEL GAINES IN
SUPPORT OF STIPULATION AND
[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING
SETTLEMENT OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT CLAIMS, AND ENTRY OF
JUDGMENT DISMISSING ACTION WITH
PREJUDICE**

Complaint Filed: August 3, 2022

1 I, DANIEL F. GAINES, hereby declare and state as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney duly admitted to the practice of law in the State of California. I am
3 a shareholder of Gaines & Gaines, APLC, counsel for Plaintiff Nathan Arellano (“Plaintiff”) in this
4 action. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and if called as a witness to testify
5 to them, I could and would do so competently.

6 2. I obtained my BS degree from the University California at Berkeley in 2003. I
7 majored in Business Administration at the Haas School of Business.

8 3. Thereafter, I attended the University of Virginia School of Law. At Virginia, I was
9 a member of the editorial board of the Virginia Tax Review. I was also the recipient of the Lacy
10 Armour Scholarship, awarded to recognize academic excellence. At Virginia, I focused my studies
11 on tax and real estate. I earned my JD and became a member of the California Bar in 2007.

12 4. After becoming a member of the Bar, and until his recent retirement, I practiced law
13 with my father, Kenneth, at Gaines & Gaines, APLC. Our practice specializes in litigation, with an
14 emphasis in business, real estate, and employment disputes like this one. Over 95% of my practice
15 is devoted to complex employment litigation similar to the instant action.

16 5. My firm has represented employees in employment matters such as this one, with
17 an emphasis in wage and hour issues. I have participated in and have been certified as Court-
18 approved class counsel in dozens of class and representative action matters since my admission to
19 the Bar. A true and correct list of the cases in which I have been appointed as class counsel is
20 attached hereto as **Exhibit “A”**.

21 6. On February 23, 2022, Plaintiff complied with the requirements set forth in Labor
22 Code § 2698 *et seq.*, the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act (hereinafter, “PAGA”) by
23 sending a letter, by online submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
24 (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendant ALL AMERICAN LOCK CORPORATION
25 (“Defendant”) (hereinafter Plaintiff and Defendant are collectively referred to as the “Parties”),
26 setting forth the facts and theories of the violations alleged against Defendant. A true and correct
27 copy of the letter submitted to the LWDA is attached hereto as **Exhibit “B”**.

28 \\\

1 7. Plaintiff filed his Representative Action Complaint on August 3, 2022 seeking
2 penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f) for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 221, 226(a),
3 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, and 2802 and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a) for violations of
4 Labor Code §§ 225.5, 226.3, and 558 (“the Action”).

5 8. Prior to filing the Representative Action Complaint, the Parties engaged in informal
6 discovery, which provided my office sufficient information to ascertain the size of the aggrieved
7 employee group, the number of affected pay periods at issue among them, and the strength of
8 Plaintiff’s claims.

9 9. Defendant denied and continues to deny any liability to Plaintiff or any other
10 allegedly aggrieved employee for any violations alleged in the Action.

11 10. The Parties directly negotiated the settlement without the assistance of a mediator
12 in the interest of avoiding unnecessary costs that would have inevitably been borne from the PAGA
13 Settlement Sum and the Aggrieved Employees.

14 11. Based on the information and documents obtained through informal discovery, my
15 office assessed the value of the PAGA claims (without stacking) to be approximately \$175,500 (at
16 the rate of a \$100 penalty for 1,755 pay periods at issue).

17 12. The amount of the settlement is \$90,000, which represents a recovery of over 51%
18 of the possible discretionary penalties and includes an apportionment of attorneys’ fees and costs
19 and a modest general release payment to Plaintiff Arellano. This discount was warranted based on
20 the risk inherent in continued litigation.

21 13. Based on my extensive experience litigating representative employment actions, I
22 believe that the settlement amount represents a fair compromise of the claims.

23 \\

24 \\

25 \\

26 \\

27 \\

28 \\

14. Attached hereto as **Exhibit “C”** is a true and correct copy of the parties’ Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*) Settlement Agreement.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 22nd day of August, 2022 at Westlake Village, California.

Daniel F. Gaines
DANIEL F. GAINES

EXHIBIT A

Adams v. Newell Rubbermaid, USDC – Central District of California (Los Angeles), Case No. EDCV 08-1499 JTM (CTx)

Adams v. Sam's West, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1403987

Agredano v. GS Brothers, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC445561

Allen v. Toms Sierra Company, Nevada County Superior Court, Case No. CU18-082823

Allen v. Valley Inventory Service, Inc., Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS034682

Alvarez v. Pilot Travel Centers, LLC, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2018-4605

Alonzo v. Camblin Steel Service, Inc., Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0034165

Amenhotep v. Google, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV311528

Anaya v. Progressive Logistics Services, LLC, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC1308270

Andre v. Newell Rubbermaid, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVVS1200282

Anduha v. ABC Phones of North Carolina, Inc., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2022729

Anslow v. Wellington Energy, Inc., USDC – Northern District of California (San Francisco), Case No. CV11-1596-JCS

Aranda, et al. v. Universal Lumpers of California, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-UOE-2017-7826

Armendariz v. Integrated Pain Management Medical Group, Inc., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-19-100267-SDS

Barrow, et al. v. Desmond Foods, L.P., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00187227

Batmanghelich v. Sirius XM Radio Inc., USDC – Central District of California (Los Angeles), Case No. CV 09-9190 VBF (JCx)

Bosser v. Hooked on Solar, Yolo County Superior Court, Case No. CVCV-2016-876

Bourland v. Horizon Personnel Services, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00161365-CU-OE-GDS

Bowen v. IMI Material Handling Logistics, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2016-0000192

Branson v. Mladen Buntich Construction, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1609129

Brandt v. Sacramento Auto Insurance Center, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2009-00202938-CU-OE-STK

Brown v. 22nd District Agricultural Association, United States District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 15-cv-2578-DHB

Brown v. Sierra Central Credit Union, Sutter County Superior Court, Case No. CVCS18-0002161

Burgess v. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of South Carolina, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2012-00277449-CU-BT-STK

Burgess v. Strategic Retail Solutions, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC413791

Calhoun v. Celadon Trucking Services, Inc., USDC – Central District of California (Los Angeles), Case No. 5:16-cv-01351-PSG-FFM

Caporicci v. Owens & Minor Distribution, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2013-00295662-CU-OE-STK

Carl v. Advanced Call Center Technologies, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2013-00148310

Carlisle, et al. v. Professional Technical Security Services, Inc., Case No. CGC18569791

Carrete v. Gamestop, Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU08501

Carrillo v. Bimbo Bakeries, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1606813

Caudillo v. Aegis Treatment Centers, LLC, Merced County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV-0744

Cerami v. Metlife, Inc., USDC – Central District of California (Orange County), Case No. 11-CV-00681-CJC (MLGx)

Charles v. Aaron's Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC431468

Charles v. Nursefinders, LLC, Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU07422

Cheifer v. JetBlue Airways Corporation, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC451887

Cheifer, et al. v. WHGM, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. LC104900

Chong, et al. v. Crescent Northwoods Inn, Inc., Del Norte County Superior Court, Case No. CVUJ-2018-1133

Church v. GameStop, Inc., et. al., USDC – Central District of California (Los Angeles), Case No. 11-CV-00132-VAP-RZ

Clothier v. Spar Marketing Services, Inc., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No: RG12-639317

Coleman v. Wireless Lifestyle, Inc., USDC – Western District of Missouri, Case No. 4:12-cv-00855-ODS

Colombo-Beyeler, et al. v. Viking River Cruises, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1611608

Conlee v. Clark Pacific Corporation, Yolo County Superior Court, Case No. CV14-1409

Contreras v. Osmose Utilities Services, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1513998

Contreras v. West American Service Corporation, Kings County Superior Court, Case No. 14C0280

Corona v. Yosemite Meat & Locker Service, Inc., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2006828

Cortellessa v. Dotnext, Inc., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09429971

County v. Ingram Mirco, Inc., San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVRS 1304445

Covarrubias, et al. v. Petersendean Builder Group, Inc., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-16-101122

Cowen, et al. v. Evergreen Alliance Golf Limited, L.P., d/b/a Arcis Golf, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1719283

Cruz-Garcia v. Lemonade Restaurant Group, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC478205

Cunningham v. Performance Contracting, Inc., Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C16-02157

Dabney v. Coneybeare, LLC, et al., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00999989-CU-OE-CXC

Dabney, et al. v. Panera, LLC., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1516030

Diaz, et al. v. Seaworld Entertainment, Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU10046

Diggs v. Western Waterproofing Company, Inc., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-539281

Dismuke v. Rhodes Retail Services, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2011-00105001

Dorsette v. TA Operating, LLC, USDC – Central District of California (Los Angeles), Case No. EDCV 09-1350 PA (RZx)

Duran v. The Image of California, Inc., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-284056 DRL

Edwards v. Trans World Entertainment Corp., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2010-00095123-CU-OE CTL

Esakhani v. Central Valley Gaming, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2020667

Escobar v. SMSSI of California, Inc., San Francisco Superior Court, JCCP No. 4776

Espinosa v. Taltech Construction, et al., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC590176

Espinosa v. Bodycote Thermal Processing, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC501617

Espinoza v. Pabco Building Products, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. VC065660

Estrada v. Net Source Communications, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC431169

Estrada v. OS Restaurant Services, LLC, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV293249

Estupinan v. Global Development Strategies, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 110CV178898

Fadhl. v. Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00209518

Fernandez v. The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC656256

Ferrer v. Dish Network Corporation, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC441354

Findora v. Barry Callebaut USA LLC, Napa County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV000219

Flores v. Cintas Corporation, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC400422

Friel v. Midwest Construction Services, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2015-00329204-CU-OE-STK

Gagnon v. Banc of California, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C 15-00196

Galarza v. Bayou Well Services, LLC, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-279372 DRL

Galarza v. C & H Testing Service LLC, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-15-100008 SPC

Garcia v. Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1404636

Geer v. Applied Aerospace Structures Corp., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2014-00313702-CU-OE-STK

Getz v. California Cinema Investments, Inc., Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 56-2013-00437706-CU-MC-VTA

Gibbs v. M. Lehmann Enterprises, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00678538-CU-OE-CXC

Gilles v. Schaefer Ambulance Service Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU07970

Goldman, et al. v. Defender's, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2018-0009973

Gomez v. Low Desert Empire Pizza, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVVS900392

Gomez v. Pizza Hut of Southeast Kansas, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVVS900679

Gonzalez v. Harris Farms, Inc., USDC – Eastern District of California (Fresno), Case No. 1:14-cv-00038-LJO-SAB

Guerrero v. Main Electric Supply Company LLC, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 56-2019-00525427-CU-OE-VTA

Gutierrez v. Asset Management Specialists, Inc., Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 12CECG03577

Gutierrez v. Linkus Enterprises, Inc., Madera County Superior Court, Case No. MCV065774

Gutierrez v. Shiekh, LLC, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case Nos. CIVRS1206525, CIVRS1303408

Hairston v. Stanislaus Surgical Hospital, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-19-000651

Hindman v. Service Quick, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1724229

Hogan v. iMobile of CA LLC, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1409263

Hogan v. Wireless Evolution Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. MCC1300669

Hogan v. Wireless That's It! LLC, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC1201997

Holmes v. Bottling Group, LLC, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2022584

Hooper, et al. v. URS Midwest, Inc., et al., San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1607489

Humphrey v. Freedomroads, LLC, Shasta County Superior Court, Case No. 178228

Hurtado v. Rush Truck Centers of California, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC427672

Hyde v. Dent Wizard International Corporation, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00173882

Ibrihim v. Imperfect Foods, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-VI-UOE-2019-0000846

Id-deen v. Educational Services of America, Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS040803

Isherwood v. Mason Dixon Intermodal, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2012-00279891-CU-OC-STK

Jahanbin v. Pacific Mercantile Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00480705CU-OE-CXC

Jenkins v. Sedgwick Claims Management Services, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. LC101648

Job v. California Security Services, Yuba County Superior Court, Case No. 14-0000820

Johnson v. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, USDC – Northern District of California (San Francisco), Case No. 3:13-cv-01069-MMC

Jolin v. Bay Cities Recovery, Inc., El Dorado County Superior Court, Case No. PC20100458

Jordan v. Sutter Memorial Hospital, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2023344

Keebaugh v. Mike Thompson Recreational Vehicles, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIV-DS-1500718

Kelly v. Robin's Enviro Vac, Inc., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-282277
DRL

King v. Levy Premium Foodservice Limited Partnership, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG15786353

Kunsman v. Punch Bowl Sacramento, LLC, et al., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2018-00243175

LaFear v. Encore Education Corporation, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1802251

Lanzarin v. AWI Management Corporation, Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS041809

Lee, et al. v. Foster Dairy Farms, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case Nos. 2006542, 2015679

Lemus, et al. v. Eastridge Workforce Technology, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIV-DS-1611470

Lewis v. American Casino & Entertainment Properties LLC, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1719094

Lemus v. On Assignment Staffing Services, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIV-DS-1600497

Leon v. Piercey West Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC656874

Lopez v. Creative Communication Technologies, Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU07851

Lopez v. Go Green Auto Spa Franchise, Inc., et al., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 562212

Lopez v. Truck Accessories Group, LLC, Yolo County Superior Court, Case No. CV13798

Ludlow v. Prince Telecom, LLC, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 684239

Luna v. Express Locations, LLC, Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU09779

Macias v. American Tire Distributors, Inc., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-101586

Maldonado v. Hardwood Flooring Liquidators, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC642170

Mansfield v. Cambridge Real Estate Services, Inc., Butte County Superior Court, Case No. 160175

Martinez v. DPI Specialty Foods West, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2015-00327311-CU-OE-STK

Martinez v. Styles For Less, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVVS1203057

Mayne v. John Muir Behavioral Health, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C17-00998

Maze v. Bulldog Freightway, Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU08716

McCormick v. G & O Body Shop, Inc., El Dorado Superior Court, Case No. PC20130291

McCrary v. Campbell Soup Supply Company, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2013-00297698-CU-OE-STK

McDaniel v. Vancary, Inc., Tulare County Superior Court, Case No. 268036

Melgar-Farela v. Guardian Compliance, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC481865

Mendiola v. Tyco Electronics Corporation, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC1400721

Mettler v. Les Schwab Tire Centers of California, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2018-476

Miller v. California Subshine, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC637754

Miller v. Southwest Airlines Co., USDC – Northern District of California (San Francisco), Case No. 3:12-cv-05978-CRB

Mitchell v. Crossmark, Inc., USDC – Central District of California (Los Angeles), Case No. CV 11-2818-JAK (FMOx)

Moghrabi v. Vitaligent, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2018-1650

Molina v. Berkshire Hathaway Energy Company, et al., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU000522

Moore v. Horizon Solar Power, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1410001

Murray v. Select Media Services, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC424506

Myles v. Central Transport LLC, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1401434

Navarro v. Mariana Packing Co., Inc., Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS045935

Nehrlich, et al. v. RPM Mortgage, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00666783-CU-OE-CXC

Overton v. Hat World, Inc., USDC – Eastern District of California (Sacramento), Case No. 2:11-CV-01645-LKK-KJN

Perez v. Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU07977

Perez v. Major Gloves and Safety, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1710445

Perry v. Cardinal Health 200, LLC, Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS035303

Phraxayavong-Briones v. RSM, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00117524

Pugh v. Wi Spa, LLC, Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU07932

Quist v. Knight Transportation, Inc., San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS 1615414

Quitco v. Aviation Fuel Systems Repair, Inc., San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVRS1302311

Rambeau v. C.C.M. Corporation, et al., Sacramento County Court, Case No. 34-2018-00244842

Rankins v. Roman Empire Living Skills, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC713399

Rees v. Advantel, Incorporated, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 16-CV-292219

Renfrow v. Janra Enterprises, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 3402010-00080471

Reynolds v. Diamond Pet Food Processors of Ripon, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2014-00310818

Richard v. A-Para Transit Corp., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG17870373

Richardson v. TEC Equipment, Inc., et al., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. VC065536

Robles v. North County Health Project Incorporated, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00001751-CU-OE-NC

Rodas v. Monetary Management of California, Inc., USDC – Eastern District of California (Sacramento), Case No. 2:14 cv 01389 TLN AC

Rodriguez v. 20/20 Plumbing & Heating, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1705362

Rodriguez v. Commerce Distribution Company, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC656259

Rodriguez v. Valley Oak, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2016-7980

Roden v. Service Champions, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1613183

Russell v. Bradshaw International, Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU00853

Rutledge, et al. v. Healthport Technologies, LLC, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG16835813

Sabala v. Econtactlive, Inc., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 684981

Sabatier v. Picture Perfect Installation, Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC10004953

Salameh v. Sonomaidence OPCO, LLC, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SVC264228

Salazar v. Tag-3 Medical Investment Group, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC527698

Salbeck v. Ingredion Incorporated, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-UOE-2017-0012622

Sampson v. Healthnet of California Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00183785-CU-OE-GDS

Sanchez v. Don Roberto Jewelers, Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU06819

Sanders v. Lionakis, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00223601

Santana v. United Staffing Associates, LLC, Tulare County Superior Court, Case No. 249338

Schrader v. Adidas Promotional Retail Operations, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC414168

Sebrell v. Pomeroy IT Solutions, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1721560

Seymour v. Quest Service Group, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00206917

Silva v. Trical, San Benito County Superior Court, Case No. CU-16-00218

Simler v. Polly's Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC 1117862

Sipin, Scott v. Salesforce.com, Inc., San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2019-0004629

Skuro v. BMW of North America, LLC, USDC – Central District of California (Los Angeles), Case No.: CV 10-8672-GW (FFMx)

Smith v. Steelcase, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1725850

Sohal v. Foster Poultry Farms, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2026605

Solomon v. City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC570345

Solano v. Vozzcom, Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU09519

Smith, et al. v. Sente Development, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-00196614

Solorzano v. FDS Manufacturing Corporation, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC542532

Solowitz v. BakeMark USA LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC467838

Spampinato v. Wind & Sea Restaurants, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVVS1205154

Spitzer, et al. v. FRHI Hotels & Resorts (Canada) Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. C IVDS1712220

Stephens v. C.S., Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. PSC1301224

Stevenson v. Harvest Management Sub LLC, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 56-2011-00397420-CU-OE-SIM

Thompson v. Continental Labor Resources, Inc. d/b/a Continental Labor & Staffing Resources, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-278751-DRL

Thompson v. Sidhu Truck Line, Inc., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-15-101308-DRL

Tigas v. Ajilon Communications, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC409737

Torres v. Coastal Employment Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC529207

Tran v. CSP Fiber Services, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS172758

Tripp v. California Guest Services, Inc., Plumas County Superior Court, Case No. CV16-00036

Valdez v. Diamond Landscaping, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497097

Valencia v. American Team Managers, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00857365-CU-CR-CXC

Van Son v. Rush Truck Centers of California, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC494747

Vasquez v. Schurman Fine Papers, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-LMC-2015-10035

Velasquez v. Modesto Ventures, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 32-2012-00126159

Victoria v. Bali Limousines Inc., San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV507774

Victorian v. Vision X, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC400333

Wade v. Frito Lay, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-17-102014

Walls v. E. & J. Gallo, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2015874

Warner v. Waterdrops Express Car Wash, LLC, Tulare County Superior Court, Case No. 265708

Waybright v. EAH, Inc., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 2011677

Weiss v. C.A.R. Enterprises, Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC1113165

White v. Sally Beauty Supply, LLC, Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU08177

Williams v. Dennis Dillon RV, LLC, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS 16006879

Williams v. Closet World, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC400178

Williams v. Progress Rail Services Corporation, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-280236 DRL

Wing v. Three Group, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC643883

Wilson v. ALSCO, Inc., Imperial County Superior Court, Case No. ECU07406

Wilson v. Michael C. Stead, Inc., Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C1400135

Winningham v. Storer Transportation Service, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. 39-2015-00324708-CU-STK

Woody v. WBN Home Design, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1613367

Woods, et al. v. F&B Innovations, LLC, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1717765

Woodyard v. Bellus ALC Acquisition, LLC, USDC – Central District of California (Los Angeles), Case No. 2:13-cv-05285 SJO AGRx

Wright v. Social Vocational Services, Inc., Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-15-101264

Ybarra v. New Legend, Inc., Sutter County Superior Court, Case No. CVCS-16-2097

Zaragoza v. Center Automotive, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC505194

EXHIBIT B

GAINES & GAINES

A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

WWW.GAINESLAWFIRM.COM

27200 AGOURA ROAD, SUITE 101
CALABASAS, CALIFORNIA 91301

PHONE (818) 703-8985
FAX (818) 703-8984

February 23, 2022

Via Certified Mail

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
By online submission

All American Lock Corporation
7575 Reynolds Circle
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Defendant mailed certified # 70190700000201201862

Agent for Service of Process for All American Lock Corporation
Ruth E Bear
7575 Reynolds Circle
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Agent mailed certified # 70190700000201201879

Re: ***Labor Code Violations of All American Lock Corporation – Compliance Letter of
California Labor Code § 2698 - Private Attorneys General Act***

Dear LWDA:

This office represents Nathan Arellano, a former non-exempt California employee of All American Lock Corporation (“Defendant”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Our client was employed by Defendant in Central California. Herein, we set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to our client and other of its non-exempt California employees (“Aggrieved Employees”).

Our client alleges that Defendant failed to pay all wages due to him and other Aggrieved Employees by making unlawful deductions from their wages, in violation of Labor Code §§ 221, 225.5, 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order No. 16-2001. Defendant improperly deducted the cost of tools from our client’s wages. Labor Code § 221 states that it is “unlawful for any employer to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee.” Defendant’s practice of unlawfully deducting wages from our client and other Aggrieved Employees violates Labor Code §§ 221, 225.5, 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order No. 16-2001, section 7.

Our client alleges that Defendant failed to pay premium wages to him and other Aggrieved Employees who were denied rest periods, in violation of Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 16-2001. Our client and Aggrieved Employees were routinely unable to take a 10-minute rest

period for every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, but were not paid premium wages of one hour's pay for each missed rest period. When they were able to take a rest period, they were oftentimes late, cut short, or on duty. This violates Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 16-2001.

Defendant failed to pay premium wages to our client and other Aggrieved Employees who were denied proper meal periods, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558 and IWC Wage Order 16-2001. Our client and Aggrieved Employees were routinely denied, and not authorized to take, a proper, timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded five hours, or a second proper, timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded ten hours, but were not paid premium wages of one hour's pay for each missed first or second meal period. When they were able to take a meal period, they were late or short or they would be required to clock out and continue working without compensation. This violates Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 512, 558, and 1194 and IWC Wage Order 16-2001.

Defendant also failed to reimburse our client and other Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, in violation of Labor Code § 2802, including, but not limited to, power tools required to perform their job. Labor Code § 2802 requires that an employer must indemnify its employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, and Defendant's failure to do so has violated this section.

Our client further alleges that Defendant failed to provide him and other Aggrieved Employees with wage statements that fully and accurately itemized the requirements set forth in Labor Code § 226(a). Our client and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due, as stated above. As such, the wage statements provided by Defendant failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(1) and 226.3, total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(2) and 226.3, net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(5) and 226.3, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(9) and 226.3.

Our client alleges that Defendant failed to pay him and other Aggrieved Employees all wages due at the separation of their employment based on the time frames required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As stated above, our client and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due during the course of their employment and, as a result of this failure, they were not timely paid all wages due at the separation of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-202 and is alleged on behalf of our client and certain Aggrieved Employees no longer employed by Defendant.

The \$75 PAGA filing fee has been mailed to the LWDA concurrently with the transmission of this letter.

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
NCRC, Inc. dba Nationwide Construction and Repair Company
David Marabella
February 23, 2022
Page 3


We invite Defendant or its attorney to contact our office to discuss this matter, including whether an early resolution of the claims can be reached.

Our office awaits your response.

Very truly yours,

GAINES & GAINES
A Professional Law Corporation

By:



EVAN S. GAINES

EXHIBIT C

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT (LABOR CODE § 2698 ET SEQ.)
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Nathan Arellano v. All American Lock Corporation
Merced County Superior Court
Case Number 22CV-02461

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and among the undersigned Parties, subject to the approval of the Court, that the settlement of this action with respect to all claims brought in a representative capacity pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) (Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*) shall be effectuated upon and subject to the following terms and conditions. Capitalized terms used herein shall have the meanings set forth in Article I or elsewhere in this PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”).

This Agreement is made by and between Defendant All American Lock Corporation (“Defendant”), Plaintiff Nathan Arellano (“Plaintiff”), for himself, Aggrieved Employees (defined below), on behalf of the State of California, and the law firms defined below as “Plaintiff’s Counsel” and “Defense Counsel.” (Defendant, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as defined herein, are sometimes collectively referred to as the “Parties.”) This Agreement shall be effective upon the last date upon which it is signed by the Parties.

The Parties agree that all representative claims brought pursuant to PAGA in Merced County Superior Court case number 22CV-02461 (the “Litigation” or “Action”) shall be, and hereby are, ended, settled, resolved, and concluded by agreement of Defendant to pay the sum of Ninety Thousand Dollars (\$90,000) (hereinafter referred to as the “PAGA Settlement Sum”) for settlement of the PAGA claims and penalties sought in the Litigation, which shall be inclusive of Plaintiff’s Counsel attorneys’ fees and costs in connection with this Agreement and a general release payment to Plaintiff Arellano. The Parties further agree that this Agreement is a compromise of disputed claims and that nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as an admission of liability.

Article I.

Definitions.

Section 1.01 Definitions.

Unless otherwise defined herein, the following terms used in this Agreement shall have the meanings ascribed to them as set forth below:

- (a) “Aggrieved Employees” means all individuals who worked for Defendant All American Lock Corporation in California, as a non-exempt employee at any time between February 23, 2021 and June 22, 2022. Defendant represents that the total number of Aggrieved Employees is approximately 70 individuals.

- (b) “Complaint” means the operative Complaint filed by Plaintiff on or about August 3, 2022 which asserts claims under PAGA predicated on underlying violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 221, 225.5, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, and 2802.
- (c) “Court” means the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Merced.
- (d) “Defense Counsel” or “Counsel for Defendant” is:

Barbra A. Arnold, Esq.
Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLP | JMBM
1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
- (e) “Effective Date” means the date the Court approves the settlement of the PAGA penalties as described in this Agreement and dismisses the Action with prejudice.
- (f) “Plaintiff’s Counsel” is:

Daniel F. Gaines, Esq.
Alex P. Katofsky, Esq.
GAINES & GAINES, APLC
4550 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Suite 100
Westlake Village, California 91362
- (g) “Release Period” means the time period February 23, 2021 through June 22, 2022.

Article II.

Background.

Section 2.01 Background.

- (a) On August 3, 2022, Plaintiff Arellano filed a complaint in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Merced, entitled *Nathan Arellano v. All American Lock Corporation*, Case No. 22CV-02461. The Litigation is brought by Nathan Arellano, on behalf of himself, the State of California and other aggrieved employees, as a single representative cause of action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Cal. Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*) based on alleged violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 221, 225.5, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, and 2802 premised on Defendant’s alleged failure to pay all wages due and owing during employment, provide all meal and rest periods or premium compensation in lieu thereof, reimburse all necessary business expenses, timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment, and issue complete and accurate wage statements.
- (b) Through this litigation, the Parties have engaged in basic informal discovery to determine the total number of aggrieved employees and implicated pay periods at issue and a review

of the pertinent policies and procedures. The Parties reached this PAGA Settlement only after such discovery and investigation was performed.

- (c) This PAGA Settlement contemplates the entry of an order by the Court approving the payment allocated for settlement of the PAGA claims and dismissing the Action with prejudice.

Article III.

Approval and Implementation of Settlement.

Section 3.01 Cooperation.

The Parties will cooperate in obtaining, through a stipulation and order, or an unopposed motion, if required, an Order from the Court approving the payment of the PAGA Settlement Sum as described in this Agreement at the earliest possible date. Concurrently with the submission of this Agreement to the Court, Plaintiff shall submit it to the LWDA as required by PAGA. The Parties agree to use their best efforts to expedite the preparation and submission of the settlement documents. The Parties further agree to fully cooperate in the drafting and/or filing of any further documents or filings reasonably necessary to be prepared or filed, shall take all steps that may be requested by the Court relating to, or that are otherwise necessary to, the approval and implementation of the payment of the PAGA Settlement Sum as described in this Agreement.

The Court's approval of the payment of the PAGA Settlement Sum as described in this Agreement shall be embodied in a written Order, which shall be transmitted to the LWDA promptly upon entry, as required by PAGA. Should the Court not grant approval of the payment of the PAGA Settlement Sum as described in this Agreement or decline to dismiss the Action, this Agreement shall be null and void and have no further effect, and all sums paid by Defendant, if any, shall be promptly returned to it.

Section 3.02 Settlement Payment Procedures.

(a) Payment of PAGA Settlement Sum and Notice to Aggrieved Employees.

- (1) Defendant agrees to pay a total amount of Ninety Thousand Dollars (\$90,000) to settle this matter. This amount, *i.e.*, the PAGA Settlement Sum, shall cover, resolve, and fully satisfy any and all amounts owed to Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, the State of California, and Plaintiff's Counsel, including all amounts allocated to attorneys' fees and costs, in settlement of all claims asserted in the Complaint, or that could have been asserted in the Complaint, by Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Aggrieved Employees. The Parties agree that there are no circumstances that would require Defendant to pay any amount greater than the PAGA Settlement Sum in connection with this Agreement unless the escalator clause in paragraph 6.12 herein is invoked. In the event that this Agreement is canceled, rescinded, terminated, voided or nullified, however that may occur as permitted herein, or the settlement is barred by operation of law, invalidated, or ordered not to be carried out by a court of competent jurisdiction, Defendant shall have no obligation to pay any of the PAGA Settlement Sum and the

Parties' respective positions shall be restored to positions prior to the settlement. Further, in that event, nothing in this Agreement, the negotiations leading to this settlement, nor any papers prepared in connection with this Agreement shall be admissible in any proceeding for any purpose whatsoever.

- (2) The "Net Settlement Fund" shall be calculated by deducting from the PAGA Settlement Sum up to \$31,500 for the payment of Plaintiff's Counsel's fees, up to \$1,000 for the payment of Plaintiff's Counsel's costs, up to \$7,500 to Plaintiff as a general release payment, and up to \$3,000 to compensate the parties' chosen Settlement Administrator. The Net Settlement Fund will be comprised of approximately \$47,000. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the Net Settlement Fund, or approximately \$35,250, shall be distributed to the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) of the Net Settlement Fund, or approximately \$11,750, shall be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees.
- (3) The twenty-five percent (25%) of the Net Settlement Fund to be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees will be divided by the total number of pay periods worked by all of them in California during the Release Period to yield the Pay Period Value. Each Aggrieved Employee will be paid an amount equal to their individual number of pay periods worked in California during the Release Period multiplied by the Pay Period Value.
- (4) Defendant shall deposit the PAGA Settlement Sum into a Qualified Settlement Fund to be established by the Settlement Administrator, in two equal payments, as follows: (a) \$45,000, no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the Effective Date and (b) \$45,000, no later than one hundred (100) calendar days after the Effective Date.
- (5) Defendant will provide the Settlement Administrator with a confidential list of the names and addresses of the Aggrieved Employees, together with the number of their individual pay periods, within fifteen (15) calendar days after the Effective Date. This information will be provided confidentially to the Settlement Administrator only, and the Settlement Administrator will treat the information as private and confidential and take all necessary precautions to maintain the confidentiality of such information. This information is to be used only to carry out the Settlement Administrator's duties as specified in this Agreement.
- (6) No later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the initial deposit of the PAGA Settlement Sum has been paid, the Settlement Administrator shall transmit the Notice of PAGA Settlement (attached hereto as Exhibit "A"), together with settlement checks containing their individual settlement amounts, with no claims process required, to all Aggrieved Employees by first-class United States mail, postage prepaid, to the last known address of each recipient with directions to the Postmaster to forward the Notice of PAGA Settlement and return all undeliverable Notices. Concurrently, Plaintiff shall be issued his full general release payment. Any remaining balance from the initial deposit of the PAGA Settlement Sum shall be paid to Plaintiff's Counsel for its award of fees and costs. The second installment of the PAGA Settlement Sum shall be paid to Plaintiff's Counsel, the Settlement Administrator, and the LWDA to satisfy their payments herein, no later

than fifteen (15) calendar days after the payment of the second installment of the PAGA Settlement Sum.

- (7) For each settlement check and Notice of PAGA Settlement that is returned as undeliverable, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly attempt to locate the Aggrieved Employee by using an address refresher database. The value of checks uncashed more than 180 days after issuance shall be paid to the Office of the California State Controller – Unclaimed Property Fund, to be held in the name of the respective Aggrieved Employees.
- (8) 100% of the PAGA Settlement Sum is considered penalties and will not be subject to local, state or federal tax withholdings. All recipients of payments under this Agreement will have their payments reported on an IRS Form 1099. The Settlement Administrator shall issue IRS Form 1099s (if required) to the Aggrieved Employees.

Article IV.

Limitations On Use Of This Settlement.

Section 4.01 No Admission.

This Agreement and compliance with this Agreement shall not be construed as an admission by Defendant of any liability whatsoever, or as an admission by Defendant of any violations of Plaintiff's or Aggrieved Employees' rights, violation of any order, law, statute, duty or contract whatsoever. Defendant specifically disclaims any liability to Plaintiff or any other allegedly aggrieved employee for any alleged violation of his/her rights, or for any alleged violation of any order, law, statute, duty or contract. Defendant further denies that, for any purpose other than settling these matters, that this action is appropriate for representative treatment.

Section 4.02 Non-Evidentiary Use.

Neither this Agreement, nor any of its terms, nor any of the negotiations connected with it or proceedings relating to this Agreement, payouts or anything else associated with it, shall be offered or used as evidence by any of the Parties, or their respective counsel in the Litigation or in any other action or proceeding, including to establish any liability or admission on the part of Defendant or any Released Parties or to establish the existence of any condition constituting a violation of, or noncompliance with, federal, state, local or other applicable law; provided, however, this shall not prevent this Agreement from being used, offered, or received in evidence in any proceeding to enforce, construe, or finalize this Agreement. Neither this Agreement, nor any of its terms or provisions, nor any of the negotiations connected with it or proceedings relating to this Agreement, payouts or other events associated with it, shall be construed as an admission or concession by Defendant or any Released Parties or establishment of any such violation(s) or failure(s) to comply with any applicable law. Defendant specifically retains the right to defend, on the merits, against any non-settled claims brought by any Aggrieved Employees.

Section 4.03 Nullification.

Invalidation of any material provision of this Agreement shall invalidate this Agreement in its entirety unless the Parties shall subsequently agree in writing that the remaining provisions shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 4.04 No Advice on Tax Obligations.

Nothing in this Agreement is intended to constitute legal advice regarding federal, state, and/or local tax obligations. Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California shall be deemed to acknowledge that they have not obtained any tax advice from Defendant, counsel for Defendant, or Plaintiff's counsel, and that neither Defendant, Plaintiff, nor their respective counsel have made any representation concerning the tax consequences, if any, of any payments made pursuant to this Agreement. To the extent that this Agreement or its attachment(s) are interpreted to contain or constitute advice regarding any U.S. or Federal tax issue, such advice is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any person for the purpose of avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 4.05 No Effect on Employee Benefits.

The payments made to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant to this Agreement are not intended to count as earnings by Plaintiff or the Aggrieved Employees, and will not entitle Plaintiff or the Aggrieved Employees to any additional compensation and/or benefits under any retirement, benefit, bonus, incentive, pension, welfare, and/or any other plan of or sponsored by Defendant. Defendant shall not make as part of this Agreement, nor be required to make, any deductions, nor pay any monthly contributions for any insurance, retirement, bonuses, 403(b), or profit sharing plans related to monies paid as a result of this Agreement. The individual settlement payments paid to the Aggrieved Employees shall not have any effect on the eligibility for, or calculation of, any of the employee benefits (e.g., bonuses, vacation, holiday pay, retirement plans, etc.) of Aggrieved Employees. The Parties agree that any individual settlement payments paid to the Aggrieved Employees under the terms of this Agreement do not represent any modification of the Aggrieved Employees' previously credited hours of service or other eligibility criteria under an employment benefit plan sponsored by Defendant. Further, any payments made to Aggrieved Employees under this Agreement are penalties and thus shall not be considered "compensation" in any year for purposes of determining eligibility for, or benefit accrual within, any employee benefit plan or bonus plan sponsored by Defendant.

Article V.**Release and Waiver of Claims.****Section 5.01 Limited Release By Aggrieved Employees.**

Upon the Effective Date and subject to Defendant's full payment of the PAGA Settlement Sum, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, his heirs, executors, and assigns, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, fully releases and discharges Defendant, and each of its present and former affiliates, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, successors, predecessors, and assigns,

and each of its respective past and present shareholders, officers, partners, directors, current and former employees, agents, attorneys, insurers, successors, assigns, representatives, accountants, and all persons acting under, by, through, or in concert with any of them (collectively, “Released Parties”) from any and all claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action of every nature and description, under PAGA, which were alleged or which could have been alleged based on the facts or arising from the facts asserted in the operative complaint in the Action and/or in Plaintiff’s PAGA notice to the LWDA (“PAGA Released Claims”) that accrued during the Release Period, including without limitation, claims for failure to pay all wages due, provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof, authorize or permit lawful rest breaks or provide compensation in lieu thereof, reimburse necessary business expenses, provide accurate itemized wage statements, and timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment, and for violation and/or based on California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 221, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 2802, IWC Wage Order No. 16-2001, and all claims for attorneys’ fees and costs in connection therewith. The Aggrieved Employees’ PAGA Released Claims include all such claims, whether known or unknown by the releasing party. Thus, even if an Aggrieved Employees discovers facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe to be true with respect to the subject matter of the Aggrieved Employees’ PAGA Released Claims, e.g. the claims brought in Plaintiff’s operative complaint in the Action or that could have been brought based on the facts therein, those claims will remain released and forever barred. Therefore, with respect to those PAGA Released Claims, Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California expressly waive and relinquish the provisions, rights and benefits of California Civil Code section 1542, which provides:

A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release and that, if known by him or her, would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party.

Section 5.02 General Release by Plaintiff Arellano.

Upon the Effective Date and subject to Defendant’s full payment of the PAGA Settlement Sum, Plaintiff Arellano shall be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released the Released Parties from any and all claims, obligations, demands, actions, rights, causes of action, and liabilities against the Released Parties, of whatever kind and nature, character, and description, whether in law or equity, whether sounding in tort, contract, federal, state and/or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, common law, or other source of law, whether known or unknown, and whether anticipated or unanticipated, including unknown claims covered by Civil Code Section 1542, arising through the date of his signature hereon, for any type of relief, including, without limitation, claims for wages, damages, unpaid costs, penalties, liquidated damages, punitive damages, interest, attorneys’ fees, litigation costs, restitution, or equitable relief. These claims include, but are not limited to, the PAGA Released Claims, as well as any other claims under any provision of the California Labor Code or any applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and claims under local, state, or federal discrimination statutes, including, without limitation, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, California Government Code §§ 12940 *et seq.*; the Unruh Civil Rights Act, California Civil Code §§ 51 *et seq.*; the California Constitution; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000 *et*

seq.; the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 *et seq.*; the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 29 U.S.C. §§ 1001 *et seq.*; and all of their implementing regulations and interpretive guidelines ("Plaintiff Released Claims"). With respect to these Plaintiff Released Claims as described in this Section, Plaintiff Arellano shall be deemed to have expressly waived and relinquished, to the fullest extent permitted by law, the provisions, rights, and benefits he may otherwise have had pursuant to Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release and that, if known by him or her, would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party.

Notwithstanding Section 1542, Plaintiff understands and agrees that this Agreement shall act as a release of all future claims that may arise from Plaintiff Arellano's employment or separation from employment with Defendant, or any other matters that existed between Plaintiff Arellano and the Released Parties up to the date of this Agreement, whether such claims are currently known or unknown, and that Plaintiff intentionally waives any rights he may have under the provisions of Section 1542, as well as under any other statutes or common law principles of similar effect in the State of California or in any other state.

Article VI.

Miscellaneous Provisions.

Section 6.01 Voluntariness.

This Agreement is executed voluntarily and without duress or undue influence on the part of or on behalf of any of the Parties, or of any other person, firm or other entity.

Section 6.02 Amendments.

The terms and provisions of this Agreement may be amended only by a written agreement that is both (a) signed by the Plaintiff, Plaintiff's Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel who executed this Agreement and (b) approved by the Court. Any waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any other provision of this Agreement unless expressly so indicated otherwise.

Section 6.03 Assignment.

None of the rights, commitments, or obligations recognized under this Agreement may be assigned by any Party, Aggrieved Employee, Plaintiff's Counsel, or Defense Counsel without the express written consent of each other Party and their respective counsel hereto. The representations, warranties, covenants, and agreements contained in this Agreement are for the sole benefit of the Parties under this Agreement, and shall not be construed to confer any right or

to avail any remedy to any other person. Plaintiff expressly warrants that he has not transferred to any person or entity any right or cause of action, or claim released by this Agreement.

Section 6.04 Governing Law.

This Agreement shall be governed, construed, and interpreted, and the rights of the Parties shall be determined, in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

Section 6.05 Entire Agreement.

This Agreement contains the entire understanding of the Parties hereto in respect of the subject matter contained herein. This Agreement supersedes all prior agreements and understandings among the Parties hereto with respect to the settlement of the Litigation.

Section 6.06 Waiver of Compliance.

Any failure of any Party, Defense Counsel, and/or Plaintiff's Counsel hereto to comply with any obligation, covenant, agreement, or condition herein may be expressly waived in writing, to the extent permitted under applicable law, by the Party or Parties and their respective counsel hereto entitled to the benefit of such obligation, covenant, agreement, or condition. A waiver or failure to insist upon strict compliance with any representation, warranty, covenant, agreement, or condition shall not operate as a waiver of, or estoppel with respect to, any subsequent or other failure.

Section 6.07 Counterparts.

This Agreement, and any amendments hereto, may be executed in any number of counterparts and any Party and/or their respective counsel hereto may execute any such counterpart, each of which when executed and delivered shall be deemed to be an original and all of which counterparts taken together shall constitute but one and the same instrument. It shall not be necessary in making proof of this Agreement or any counterpart hereof to produce or account for any of the other counterparts.

Section 6.08 Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

With respect to this Agreement, neither Plaintiff's Counsel nor any other attorneys acting for, or purporting to act for the Aggrieved Employees, or Plaintiff may recover or seek to recover any amounts for fees, costs, or disbursements from the Released Parties or the PAGA Settlement Sum except as expressly provided herein. Defendant shall bear its own attorney's fees and costs, and neither Plaintiff's Counsel, Aggrieved Employees nor the Plaintiff shall be responsible for Defendant's attorney's fees and costs. If any party moves the Court to enforce this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover from the other party all attorneys' fees and costs incurred to enforce this Agreement.

Section 6.09 Dispute(s).

Should any dispute(s) arise among the Parties or their respective counsel regarding the implementation or interpretation of this Agreement, the Parties agree to submit any such

dispute(s) to the Court. To the extent any Party seeks to enforce any of the terms of this Agreement in Court or before the Court, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover his/its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

Section 6.10 Binding.

This Agreement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the Parties hereto and to their respective successors, assigns, legatees, heirs, and personal representatives.

Section 6.11 Court's Retention of Jurisdiction.

The Court shall retain jurisdiction, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6 and otherwise as permitted by law, to enforce this Settlement.

Section 6.12 Escalator Provision.

This settlement is based on Defendant's representation that there are approximately 1,755 pay periods at issue worked by approximately 70 individuals from February 23, 2021 through June 22, 2022. If the number of pay periods or employees exceeds these amounts by 15% or more (i.e., more than 80 Aggrieved Employees or more than 2,018 pay periods) for that same period, Defendant shall pay an increased PAGA Settlement Sum proportionate to the increase over the 15% threshold, with the larger increase controlling. For example, if the final number of pay periods is 20% greater than 1,755, the PAGA Settlement Sum will increase by 5%, assuming the number of Aggrieved Employees increases by no more than 20%.

Section 6.13 Default; Notice; Cure; Acceleration; Time is of the Essence.

Time is of the essence with respect to all provisions of this Agreement. If Defendant fails to timely make any payment due hereunder, it shall be in default of its obligations. Plaintiff shall thereafter give notice of default and Defendant must cure said default within five (5) business days thereof. In the event of an uncured default, all unpaid amounts shall be accelerated and be all due and payable together with interest at the legal rate from the date of default.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have executed this Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement on the date set forth.

APPROVED AND ACCEPTED.

[SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

Dated: August __, 2022

ALL AMERICAN LOCK CORPORATION

By _____
Its _____

08 / 09 / 2022


Dated: August __, 2022

By  _____
NATHAN ARELLANO

**APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
ATTORNEY OBLIGATIONS ONLY**

Dated: August 10, 2022

GAINES & GAINES, ALPC

By  _____
Daniel F. Gaines, Esq.
Alex P. Katofsky, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: August 10, 2022

JEFFER MANGELS BUTLER & MITCHELL
LLP

By  _____
Barbra A. Arnold, Esq.
Attorneys for Defendant

Dated: August 12, 2022

ALL AMERICAN LOCK CORPORATION

By 
Its Chief Financial Officer

Dated: August __, 2022

By _____
NATHAN ARELLANO

**APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
ATTORNEY OBLIGATIONS ONLY**

Dated: August __, 2022

GAINES & GAINES, ALPC

By _____
Daniel F. Gaines, Esq.
Alex P. Katofsky, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: August __, 2022

JEFFER MANGELS BUTLER & MITCHELL
LLP

By _____
Barbra A. Arnold, Esq.
Attorneys for Defendant

EXHIBIT A

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF MERCED**

NATHAN ARELLANO, on behalf of
himself and all “aggrieved employees”
pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALL AMERICAN LOCK
CORPORATION, a California corporation,
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 22CV-02461

**NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT OF PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM
(CAL. LABOR CODE § 2698 *ET SEQ.*)**

You have been identified as an individual who worked for Defendant All American Lock Corporation (“Defendant”) in California, as a non-exempt employee at any time between February 23, 2021 and June 22, 2022. (“Aggrieved Employee”).

On August 3, 2022, Plaintiff Nathan Arellano (the “Plaintiff”) commenced a lawsuit in Merced Superior Court, case number 22CV-02461 (the “Lawsuit”) to recover civil penalties. Plaintiff alleges in the lawsuit that Defendant failed to pay all wages due, provide all meal and rest periods or premium compensation in lieu thereof, reimburse all necessary business expenses, timely pay wages due at separation of employment, and issue complete and accurate wage statements. For these alleged violations, Plaintiff seeks penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code’s Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* (“PAGA”).

Defendant denies Plaintiff’s allegations and disputes all of Plaintiff’s claims. Defendant further denies any wrongdoing of any kind associated with these allegations. The Lawsuit was litigated and following an investigation, a settlement was reached between Plaintiff and Defendant, on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and all Aggrieved Employees, which takes into account the uncertainties and risks of proceeding with litigation.

The Court approved the settlement on [REDACTED] and has determined that the settlement is fair and reasonable. The payment which accompanies this notice is made to you pursuant to the terms of the Settlement. Your individual settlement check is based on the total number of pay periods that you worked as an Aggrieved Employee during the period between February 23, 2021 through June 22, 2022 (“Release Period”). The individual settlement check is considered to be 100% penalties, which will be reported on an IRS Form 1099. You are responsible for paying any and all taxes that may be due as a result of any payment issued to you

under the settlement and should consult a tax advisor regarding the tax consequences of such payment.

The Court-approved settlement contains the following release of claims, to which you are bound:

Upon the Effective Date and subject to Defendant's full payment of the PAGA Settlement Sum, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, his heirs, executors, and assigns, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, fully releases and discharges Defendant, and each of its present and former affiliates, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, successors, predecessors, and assigns, and each of its respective past and present shareholders, officers, partners, directors, current and former employees, agents, attorneys, insurers, successors, assigns, representatives, accountants, and all persons acting under, by, through, or in concert with any of them (collectively, "Released Parties") from any and all claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action of every nature and description, under PAGA, which were alleged or which could have been alleged based on the facts or which arise from the facts asserted in the operative complaint in the Action and/or in Plaintiff's PAGA notice to the LWDA ("PAGA Released Claims") that accrued during the Release Period (from February 23, 2021 through June 22, 2022), including without limitation, claims for failure to pay all wages due, provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof, authorize or permit lawful rest breaks or provide compensation in lieu thereof, reimburse necessary business expenses, provide accurate itemized wage statements, and timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment, and for violation and/or based on California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 221, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 2802, IWC Wage Order No. 16-2001, and all claims for attorneys' fees and costs in connection therewith.

The Aggrieved Employees' PAGA Released Claims include all such claims, whether known or unknown by the releasing party. Thus, even if an Aggrieved Employees discovers facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe to be true with respect to the subject matter of the Aggrieved Employees' PAGA Released Claims, e.g. the claims brought in Plaintiff's operative complaint in the Action or that could have been brought based on the facts therein, those claims will remain released and forever barred. Therefore, with respect to those PAGA Released Claims, Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California expressly waive and relinquish the provisions, rights and benefits of California Civil Code section 1542, which provides:

A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release and that, if known by him or her, would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party.

Your individual settlement check is valid for 180 calendar days from the date of issuance, and if you do not cash, deposit, or otherwise negotiate the check within the 180-day timeframe, your individual settlement check will be cancelled, and the funds will be transmitted to the State Controller's Office Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Aggrieved Employee whose check is voided.

If you have any questions, please contact the Settlement Administrator, at [REDACTED]. **Do not call or write the Court or Office of the Clerk of the Court to ask questions about the settlement.**

TITLE	PAGA Settlement FINAL Arellano Sig
FILE NAME	Arellano - PAGA Settlement FINAL.pdf
DOCUMENT ID	c6d72c84ffac3c866e9563c35af84732da48e2de
AUDIT TRAIL DATE FORMAT	MM / DD / YYYY
STATUS	● Signed

Document History



SENT

08 / 09 / 2022

19:44:59 UTC

Sent for signature to Nathan Arellano

[REDACTED] from office@gaineslawfirm.com

IP: [REDACTED]



VIEWED

08 / 09 / 2022

20:29:00 UTC

Viewed by Nathan Arellano [REDACTED]

IP: [REDACTED]



SIGNED

08 / 09 / 2022

20:32:43 UTC

Signed by Nathan Arellano [REDACTED]

IP: [REDACTED]



COMPLETED

08 / 09 / 2022

20:32:43 UTC

The document has been completed.

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the County of Ventura, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the
3 within action. My business address is 4550 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Suite 100, Westlake Village, CA 91362.

4 _____ (For messenger) my business address is:

5 On August 22, 2022, I served the foregoing document described as **DECLARATION OF DANIEL GAINES**
6 **IN SUPPORT OF STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT OF PRIVATE**
7 **ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIMS, AND ENTRY OF JUDGMENT DISMISSING ACTION WITH**
8 **PREJUDICE** on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes
9 addressed as follows:

10 **Barbra A. Arnold, Esq.**
11 **JEFFER MANGELS BUTLER & MITCHELL LLP**
12 **1900 Avenue of the Stars 7th Floor**
13 **Los Angeles, CA 90067**

14 On the above date:

15 X (BY x U.S. MAIL/ BY ☐ CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED) The sealed envelope was
16 mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing
17 correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with United States postal service on that same day in the ordinary course of
18 business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage
meter date is more that one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

19 _____ (BY FEDERAL EXPRESS OR OTHER OVERNIGHT SERVICE) I deposited the sealed envelope in a box or
20 other facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier or delivered the sealed envelope to an authorized
21 carrier or driver authorized by the express carrier to receive documents.

22 _____ (BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION) On August 22, 2022, at _____ a.m./p.m., at Westlake Village,
23 California, I served the above-referenced document on the above-stated addressee by facsimile transmission pursuant to
24 Rule 2008 of the California Rules of Court. The telephone number of the sending facsimile machine was (818)703-
25 8984 and the telephone number(s) of the receiving facsimile machine was () - . A transmission report was
26 properly issued by the sending facsimile machine, and the transmission was reported as complete and without error.
27 Copies of the facsimile transmission cover sheet and the transmission report are attached to this proof of service.

28 _____ (BY PERSONAL DELIVERY) By causing a true copy of the within document(s) to be personally hand-
delivered to the office(s) of the addressee(s) set forth above, on the date set forth above.

 X (UPLOADED TO LWDA WEB PORTAL) I caused the above-described documents to be delivered to the
Labor & Workforce Development Agency via online process at the PAGA Filing website (www.dir.ca.gov) in
accordance with the procedure imposed by the LWDA.

I certify that the above document was printed on recycled paper.

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

Executed on August 22, 2022, at Westlake Village, California.

Beatriz Franco

BEATRIZ FRANCO