

Miriam L. Schimmel (State Bar No. 185089)
mschimmel@blackstonepc.com
Joana Fang (State Bar No. 309623)
jfang@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiff Cristo Hernandez and the Class

[Additional counsel listed on next page]

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

CRISTO HERNANDEZ, individually and on
behalf of others similarly situated, and as an
aggrieved employee and Private Attorney
General,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ELDORADO NATIONAL (CALIFORNIA),
INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

JOSE ARMANDO MATA, on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ELDORADO NATIONAL CALIFORNIA,
INC., a subsidiary of the REV GROUP,
a California corporation; and DOES 1 through
10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CVRI2201056 (lead)
(consolidated with CVRI2303500)

Honorable Harold W. Hopp
Department 1

**DECLARATION OF MARCUS J.
BRADLEY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Date: August 20, 2025
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Dept.: 1

Hernandez Action Filed: March 14, 2022
Hernandez FAC Filed: January 19, 2023
Mata Action Filed: July 10, 2023
Mata FAC Filed: October 9, 2023
Trial Date: Not Set

1 **BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, LLP**

2 Marcus J. Bradley, Esq. (SBN 174156)

3 Kiley Grombacher, Esq. (SBN 245960)

4 31365 Oak Crest Drive, Suite 240

5 Westlake Village, CA 91361

6 Telephone: (805) 270-7100

7 Facsimile: (805) 270-7589

8 Email: mbradley@bradleygrombacher.com

9 Email: kgrombacher@bradleygrombacher.com

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Jose Armando Mata and the Class

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

I, Marcus J. Bradley, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, counsel of record for Plaintiff Jose Armando Mata (“Plaintiff Mata” or “Mr. Mata”) in the above-captioned case. I am submitting this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, Plaintiff’s request for reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, and for a service award. I am familiar with the file, the documents, and the history related to this case. The following statements are based on my personal knowledge and review of the files. If called on to do so, I could and would testify competently thereto.

CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE OF THIS DECLARATION

2. This declaration is organized into several parts.

3. In the first part, I provide a summary of the total lodestar of Plaintiff Mata's counsel in this case and the total out-of-pocket costs incurred. I then go on to provide a summary of our experience and expertise in wage and hour class actions. I also provide a discussion of our billing rates showing that they are within the market range of hourly rates charged by attorneys of comparable skill and experience working on similar matters. I then provide a summary breakdown of the lodestar by individual biller.

4. Next, I discuss the real and practical need for law firms, such as ours, to receive their full lodestar and an appropriate multiplier in cases such as this. I further discuss the value of the proposed Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement Release (“Settlement Agreement,” “Settlement,” or “Agreement”), and the risks and uncertainties confronting the Plaintiff and us in achieving the Settlement.

5. I then provide documentation to account for the out-of-pocket costs we incurred in this case.

6. Finally, I provide a summary of the contributions of Mr. Mata in support of the service award he is seeking.

SUMMARY OF FEES AND COSTS SOUGHT

7. Plaintiff Mata's attorneys are seeking reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket costs

1 of \$1797.10.¹ As of July 28, 2025, the total lodestar for Bradley/Grombacher, LLP in
2 prosecuting and resolving the class and PAGA claims in this action is \$103,175.

3 8. In addition, our lodestar of \$103,175 does not include the work we will perform
4 after July 28, 2025, such as attending the hearing on the Motion for Final Approval, effectuating
5 the settlement, working with the Administrator, and communicating with Class Members.

6 **EXPERIENCE OF COUNSEL**

7 9. Below is a chart detailing our lodestar. Before presenting this chart, I first provide
8 background on the primary attorneys from my firm who were assigned to this case and the basis
9 for the billing rates we are seeking for their work.

10 10. Bradley/Grombacher, LLP is a national firm with extensive experience litigating
11 wage and hour class and representative actions as well as complex consumer class actions.
12 Details on the work, experience, and accomplishments of the firm can be found at
13 www.bradleygrombacher.com. In just the past few months, two federal district courts have
14 commented on excellent results obtained by Bradley/Grombacher LLP, attributable to our skilled
15 advocacy and determination. *See, In re Johnson & Johnson Aerosol Sunscreen Mktg., Sales*
16 *Pracs. & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, (S.D. Fla. Feb. 28, 2023) 2023 WL 2284684, at *9 (“The Court has
17 observed class counsel’s diligence, ability, and experience in pleadings and motion practice; in
18 their presentation of the settlement to this Court; and in their attention to matters of notice and
19 administration after the announcement of the settlement. The excellent job Class Counsel have
20 done for the class is also demonstrated in the benefits afforded by the Settlement.”); *Razo v.*
21 *AT&T Mobility Servs., LLC*, (E.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2023) 2023 WL 3093845, at *24, *26
22 (commenting on the skill class counsel displayed faced with complex issues and significant
23 uncertainty as to the viability of the claims throughout much of the case).

24 **Experience of Marcus J. Bradley, Esq.**

25 11. I have been counsel for Plaintiff Mata and the putative class members throughout
26 this case. I am a partner at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, which has extensive experience litigating

27 ¹ The costs report submitted as **Exhibit 1** to this declaration.
28

1 wage and hour class and representative actions as well as complex consumer class actions.
2 Details on the work, experience, and accomplishments of the firm can be found at
3 www.bradleygrombacher.com.

4 12. I personally have represented plaintiffs in employment and consumer class
5 actions since I began practicing law in 1994. In 2000, I joined Mazursky, Schwartz & Angelo as
6 an associate and became a partner in January 2005 at which time the firm was renamed
7 Schwartz, Daniels & Bradley. I remained as a partner at Schwartz, Daniels & Bradley handling
8 primarily wage and hour class actions until the dissolution of the firm effective December 31,
9 2008. In January 2009, I moved my existing practice transferring a number of wage and hour
10 cases and became a partner with the law firm of Marlin & Saltzman, a long-established firm with
11 whom I had been co-counsel on dozens of wage and hour class actions during my tenure at
12 Schwartz, Daniels & Bradley. On September 1, 2016, I formed Bradley/Grombacher, LLP along
13 with a former associate at Marlin & Saltzman, Kiley L. Grombacher.

14 13. I have been responsible for all facets of class action employment and other
15 complex litigation, from pre-filing investigation through trial and appeal. Since approximately
16 May 2000, I have spent most of my time representing workers in wage and hour matters. I, along
17 with my current and former partners, have litigated these issues in class actions to favorable
18 settlements that have recouped over \$800,000,000.00 in unpaid wages, including the following
19 more notable cases:

- 20 a. *Gutierrez v. State Farm Mutual*, Los Angeles Superior Court (BC236552). Class action
21 mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for approximately 2,600
22 insurance claims adjusters employed by State Farm. The class was certified and summary
23 adjudication was granted as to liability in favor of the class. The case settled for \$135
24 million just prior to trial, with final approval granted with no objections filed.
- 25 b. *Bednar v. Allstate Insurance Company*, Los Angeles Superior Court (BC240813). Class
26 action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for approximately 1,200
27 insurance claims adjusters employed by Allstate. The class was certified and summary
28 adjudication was granted as to liability in favor of the class. The case settled for \$120

- 1 million just prior to trial, with final approval granted with no objections filed.
- 2 c. *Roberts v. Coast National Insurance*, Orange County Superior Court (01CC08478). Class
3 action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for insurance claims
4 adjusters employed by Coast National Insurance. Certification granted, and then the
5 matter was tried before a binding arbitrator. The case settled during the arbitration for an
6 excess of \$18 million.
- 7 d. *CNA Class Action Litigation*, Los Angeles Superior Court Class (JCCP 4230). Class
8 action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for insurance claims
9 adjusters employed by Defendant. Case settled for \$33 million, with final approval
10 granted with no objections filed.
- 11 e. *Dotson v. Royal Sun Alliance*, Orange County Superior Court (02CC01787). Class action
12 mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for insurance claims adjusters
13 employed by Royal Sun Alliance. Case settled for \$12.3 million, with final approval
14 granted with no objections filed.
- 15 f. *Parris v. Lowe's Home Improvement*, Los Angeles County Superior Court (BC260702).
16 Class action seeking payment of "off-the-clock" hours worked by all hourly employees of
17 Lowe's Home Improvement stores in the State of California. The class was certified by
18 the Court of Appeal and remanded to the trial court for further proceedings. Shortly
19 thereafter, a \$29.5 million settlement was reached and approved without objection.
- 20 g. *Pardo v. Toyota Motor Sales, et al.* Los Angeles County Superior Court (BC372781).
21 Class action mis-classification of workers with claims for overtime and missed meal and
22 rest breaks. The case settled for \$7.75 million and was approved with no objections.
- 23 h. *Smith/Ballard v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.* United States District Court for the Northern
24 District of California (Case No. 4:06-cv-05411-SBA). Wage and hour class action
25 seeking unpaid vacation and personal time, unpaid wages, and related penalties on behalf
26 of over 245,000 employees. The action was certified and settled for \$86 million while
27 Defendant's appeal of the certification was pending in the Ninth Circuit Court of
28 Appeals.

- 1 i. *Hoyng v. AON*, Los Angeles County Superior Court (BC377184). Wage and hour class
2 action seeking overtime and related compensation for mis-classification on behalf of
3 Relationship and Account Specialists. The case settled for \$10.5 million which was
4 approved with no objections filed.
- 5 j. *In RE Bank of America Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litigation*, MDL 2138,
6 United States District Court for the District of Kansas. California state and FLSA wage
7 and hour litigation for various violations including unpaid overtime and “off-the-clock”
8 work. Settled for \$73 million.
- 9 k. *Lemus v. H & R Block Litigation*, United States District Court for the Northern District of
10 California (Case No. 3:09-cv-03179-SI) Class certified, and settlement reached prior to
11 trial. Total settlement of \$35 million.
- 12 l. *Harris v. Vector Marketing Corporation*, United States District Court for the Northern
13 District of California (Case No. 3:08-cv-05198-EMC). Class action case on behalf of
14 approximately 70,000 employees misclassified as “trainees.”
- 15 m. *Bickley v. Schneider National Trucking*, United States District Court for the Northern
16 District of California (Case No. 4:08-cv-05806-JSW). Wage and hour class action on
17 behalf of approximately 6,000 truck drivers. Settled for \$29.5million.
- 18 n. *Roberts v. TJX*, United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Case
19 No. 13-CV-04731-MEJ). Wage and hour violations on behalf of approximately 82,000
20 employees. Settled for \$8.5 million.
- 21 o. *Opyrchal v. New York Life Insurance*, United States District Court for the Central District
22 of California (Case No. 2:07-cv-00518-VBF). Class action for the failure to pay
23 commissions pursuant to a compensation plan. Settled for \$10 million.
- 24 p. *Neuvenheim v. Gamestop Corp.*, United States District Court for the Central District of
25 California (Case No. 2:09-cv-06799-ODW). Class action on behalf of nonexempt
26 employees for wage and hour violations.
- 27 q. *Hightower v. JP Morgan Chase*, United States District Court for the Central District of
28 California (Case No. 2:11-cv-01802-PSG). Class action on behalf of nonexempt

employees for wage and hour violations. Settled for \$12 million.

14. On many of the above cases, I was either lead or co-lead counsel including cases in multi-district litigation or coordinated proceedings where I worked collaboratively and cooperatively with co-counsel to bring about an efficient and beneficial resolution for all class members as the above results demonstrate.

15. I have argued cases in trial courts as well as before courts of appeal. My writings on legal topics pertaining to litigating wage and hour class and representative actions have appeared in professional publications, and I have been called upon to speak at conferences and seminars for professional organizations, including a recent presentation titled “Planning for and Executing Trial in Class and Collective Wage & Hour Cases.”

16. I have also been honored as a Super Lawyer in the area of class actions by Los Angeles Magazine for multiple years including 2025. was also selected as a Top 100 Leading Commercial Litigator by the Los Angeles Daily Journal for 2024 and 2025. I am also a member of a number of professional organizations, including the Consumer Attorneys of Los Angeles, the Consumer Attorneys of California, the California Employment Lawyers Association, and the American Association for Justice. My 2025 billing rate is \$1050 an hour.

Experience of Kiley L. Grombacher, Esq.

17. My Partner, Ms. Grombacher, specializes her practice in complex litigation including consumer and employment class actions. She has litigated hundreds of employment and consumer class actions throughout her career which began at Arias, Ozzello & Gignac where she gained extensive experience litigating consumer cases.

18. Thereafter, Ms. Grombacher joined Marlin & Saltzman in 2010 where she focused her practice almost exclusively on wage and hour, collective, and representative actions, including the reported case, *Faulkinbury v. Boyd & Associates*, which clarified the holding in seminal case, *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, to establish that legality of certain company policies could be determined on a class-wide basis even if the application of the policies varies by individual.

19. Ms. Grombacher has been selected by Super Lawyers Magazine as a “Rising

1 Star” in the field of complex litigation since 2015 and as a Super Lawyer since 2017. She has
2 published articles on the field of class action litigation including “A Class-Action Primer” which
3 appeared in *The Advocate*, which is the Journal of Consumer Attorneys of Southern California.

4 20. Ms. Grombacher has also lectured on various topics involving complex case
5 management and recently spoke at the Beverly Hills Bar Association’s Class Action and
6 Complex Case Management Conference. She is also a member of a number of professional
7 organizations, including the Consumer Attorneys of Los Angeles and the American Association
8 for Justice.

9 **Experience of Lirit A. King, Esq.**

10 21. Lirit King is a eighteen-year associate formerly at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP who
11 also worked on this case. Ms. King earned her Juris Doctor from Southwestern University. Ms.
12 King focuses her practice on employment law and is a skilled litigator. Before joining Bradley
13 Grombacher, Ms. King worked at a national law firm as a staff attorney. Ms. King has also
14 worked at plaintiff employment law firms specializing in discrimination, wage and hour, and
15 ERISA violations, acting as associate counsel and as a second chair trial attorney in numerous
16 successful lawsuits. Ms. King has proven to be a strong asset to the firm.

17 **Experience of Emilie MacLean, Esq.**

18 22. Emilie MacLean is a former associate at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP who also
19 worked on this case. Ms. MacLean earned her Juris Doctor and Master of Dispute Resolution
20 from Pepperdine University, and her Master of Laws from the University of Toronto. For nearly
21 4 years, prior to receiving her license to practice law in California, Ms. MacLean worked as a
22 law clerk at our firm under my supervision, where she has drafted the briefing on a number of
23 complex legal issues.

24 23. The number of hours that Plaintiff Gonzalez’s Counsel devoted to this case is
25 reasonable. See, *e.g.*, *Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1133 (fee award should be
26 “fully compensatory [and] absent circumstances rendering the award unjust, an attorney fee
27 award should ordinarily include compensation for *all* the hours reasonably spent.”); *Serrano III*
28 (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 49 (counsel are entitled to compensation for all hours reasonably

1 expended); *Hensley v. Eckerhart* (1983) 461 U.S. 424, 435-36.

2 24. Counsel's work on this case included fact-intensive interviews with Plaintiff Mata
3 and the putative class members at the beginning, middle, and end of the case; the drafting and
4 filing of pleadings; legal research on complex issues; informal settlement negotiations; and
5 drafting of the settlement papers and approval motion.

6 **COUNSEL'S BILLING RATES ARE BASED ON THE PREVAILING MARKET RATES**
7 **AND HAVE BEEN REPEATEDLY APPROVED BY THE COURTS**

8 25. This portion of my declaration documents the reasonableness of the billing rates
9 charged by my firm in this case.

10 26. Our lodestar for this case is based on our law firm's billing rates for 2025. We set
11 the billing rates of our attorneys and paralegals/law clerks through a process of continual
12 monitoring of prevailing market rates charged by both defense and plaintiffs' law firms, for
13 individuals with similar levels of skill and experience who are doing comparable work as our
14 attorneys and staff. We gather this information from surveys, the review of other fee
15 applications, and conversations with attorneys in the relevant billing market. We set the billing
16 rates for our firm to be consistent with the prevailing market rates in the private sector for
17 attorneys and staff of comparable skill, qualifications, and experience.

18 27. Federal and state courts in California have consistently approved the rates
19 charged by Bradley/Grombacher, LLP. See, e.g., *Hector Avina v. Shultz Steel Company* (Los
20 Angeles County Super. Ct. August 4, 2022) Case No. 20STCV18569 (approving 2021 rates);
21 *Garcia v. XPO Logistics Freight, Inc.*, (San Bernardino County Super. Ct. April 19, 2021) Case
22 No. CIVDS2015538 (approving 2020 rates); *Smith v. Hoag Memorial Hospital* (Orange County
23 Super. Ct. Mar. 6, 2020) Case No. 30-2017-00952013 (approving 2019 rates); *Haro v.*
24 *Laboratory Corp. of America*, (C.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2020) Case No. 2:18-cv-09091-AB-RAO
25 (approving 2019 rates); *Maldonado v. Dayton Superior Corp.* (Riverside County Super Ct.
26 September 10, 2019) Case No. RIC1615240 (approving 2018 rates). Over the years, there have
27 been many other decisions approving our attorneys' billing rates using either a lodestar-
28 multiplier approach and/or a percentage of the recovery approach with a lodestar-multiplier

cross-check.

BILLING PRACTICES AND LODESTAR

28. We utilize billing software which records time in tenth-of-an-hour increments and train the lawyers and staff at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP to do so as contemporaneously as possible with the expenditure of the time.

29. The following chart provides a summary of the billing rates and hours worked by the attorneys at our firm through July 28, 2025:

Name and Title of Professional	Bar Admission Date	Hours	Rate (2025)	Lodestar
<i>Partners</i>				
Marcus Bradley	1994	64	\$1050	\$67,200
Kiley Grombacher	2006	3	\$975	\$2,925
<i>Associates</i>				
Lirit King	2007	22	\$850	\$19,250
Corey Smith	2016	8	\$675	\$5,400
Emilie MacLean	2023	14	\$600	\$8,400
TOTAL HOURS AND LODESTAR FOR BRADLEY GROMBACHER		111		\$103,175

30. The figures stated above were prepared and maintained by my firm in the ordinary course of business and reflect the hours of work performed on this matter.

CONTINGENT RISK

31. Bradley/Grombacher, LLP takes its cases on a contingent fee basis. We rely on awards for attorneys' fees and costs to continue our work for the enforcement of labor standards. Indeed, we did not charge Plaintiff Mata or the putative class members any fees or costs to litigate and bring this case to a successful conclusion. In addition to attorneys' fees, referenced above, our

1 office has to date incurred \$1,797.10 in out-of-pocket costs, which we have not yet recouped. During
2 the course of this litigation, we also had to forego requests by other prospective clients to bring other
3 cases with merit to ensure that we could continue to adequately and successfully represent Plaintiff
4 Mata and the putative class in this matter.

5 32. Like some other important and complex employment class and representative
6 actions, this case carried a risk of no recovery at all for either the putative class members or the
7 attorneys representing them. When we do succeed in vindicating statutory and employment
8 rights on behalf of employees, such as in this case, our firm depends upon the recovery of our
9 full lodestar plus an appropriate multiplier. Otherwise, we could not continue to represent
10 employees who are denied wages but whose cases may be time-consuming and difficult to
11 prove.

12 33. As discussed above, the road to success in this case was far from certain. While
13 we remained confident in, and committed to, the merits of the case throughout the litigation and
14 settlement process, we also were realistic regarding the risks at each stage going forward. First,
15 the parties would have engaged in lengthy and complex motion practice. This would have
16 included the risks of having the Court determine the PAGA claim was unmanageable. This case
17 was particularly risky given the difficulty of demonstrating manageability of claims based on
18 evidence of an unlawful “pattern and practice,” as well as of proving such claims at trial, without
19 evidence of facially unlawful policies.

20 34. Assuming we could demonstrate manageability, there would be further motion
21 practice, including motions for summary judgment. In addition, assuming Plaintiffs prevailed on
22 liability as to one or more of their claims, the measure of penalties would have been hotly
23 contested and presented further risk. Additionally, Defendant might appeal any number of
24 determinations regarding manageability, liability, evidentiary rulings, and the measure of
25 penalties, potentially causing years of further delay.

26 35. Our risks in this case were further compounded by the vigorous and skillful
27 manner in which Defendant’s counsel represented its clients. Defendant and its counsel also
28 negotiated hard throughout the negotiation process. All of this contributed to our risk of

1 recovering nothing or close to nothing for our commitment and investment in the case. Given
2 these uncertainties, we undertook significant risk to finally resolve the case for the substantial
3 value ultimately secured.

4 36. In sum, the result after trial and appeals was highly uncertain, except for the fact
5 that it would potentially mean years of delay. In the face of this uncertainty, we remained
6 committed to the cause and ultimately secured a strong settlement for the putative class.

7 **COSTS**

8 37. Plaintiff Mata has incurred costs of the suit of approximately \$1,797.10 as of July
9 28, 2025. **Exhibit 1** is a ledger identifying each individual charge incurred by our firm in this
10 action. The date corresponding to each individual charge may reflect the date the charge was
11 entered into our accounting system, rather than the date when the charge occurred.

12 38. The expenses incurred by our firm consist of filing fees, court fees, and service of
13 process. We do not bill for mail and copies and postage.

14 39. The charges correspond to the actual costs incurred in this case, rather than a pro-
15 rata or other share of our firm's generalized costs.

16 40. These expenses were necessary to the prosecution and successful resolution of the
17 case.

18 **PROPOSED SERVICE AWARD**

19 41. Mr. Mata devoted his time and provided an invaluable service to the prosecution
20 of this case. He worked with us regularly, providing important information, documents, and
21 insight regarding Defendant's policies and practices. He was also actively involved in
22 discussions regarding the resolution of this matter and approved the settlement terms on behalf
23 of himself and the putative class members.

24 42. Mr. Mata has also submitted a declaration attesting to his service in support of the
25 service award he is seeking and in support of approval of the settlement generally.

26 43. In light of Mr. Mata's specific efforts and the favorable impact on the litigation
27 that resulted from those efforts, we are proposing a \$10,000 service award for him.

28 44. We believe that the service award to Mr. Mata fairly reflects the time, risks, and

1 contributions he made to achieve this settlement on behalf of himself and the putative class.

2 45. Moreover, as part of the settlement agreement, Mr. Mata released any and all
3 claims he had against Defendant, not just those relating to this case. This release is broader than
4 that which applies to the other putative class members.

5 **EXHIBITS**

6 46. Attached as **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration is a true and correct copy of a cost bill for
7 the various costs that Bradley Grombacher, LLP has incurred in this case, which we ran on July 28,
8 2025, based on our firm's accounting records.

9 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
10 is true and correct and based on my personal knowledge.

11 Executed on July 29, 2025, in Westlake Village, California.


12
13 
14 _____
15 Marcus J. Bradley, Esq
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

BRADLEY GROMBACHER LLP
Transaction Report
All Dates

Transact		Date	ion Type	Num	Adj	Name	Memo/Description	Account	Split	Debit	Credit	Balance
Mate v. El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622												
		07/11/2023	Bill	7850542	No	Commercial Process	Court eFiling / El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	1,509.25		1,509.25
		08/02/2023	Bill	VN209895-01	No	Commercial Process	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	155.15		1,664.40
		09/08/2023	Bill	8195234	No	Commercial Process	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	36.82		1,701.22
PR-												
		09/09/2023	Expense	XVGX7KQEVHGR72VX	No	County of Riverside	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Court Costs	AMEX.CC - 4002(MB)	1.00		1,702.22
		09/19/2023	Bill	8255555	No	Commercial Process	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	12.31		1,714.53
		10/06/2023	Bill	8357695	No	Commercial Process	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	36.82		1,751.35
		10/06/2023	Bill	8348884	No	Commercial Process	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	12.31		1,763.66
		10/10/2023	Bill	8368564	No	Commercial Process	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	16.22		1,779.88
		11/08/2023	Bill	8554031	No	Commercial Process	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	16.22		1,796.10
PR-												
		01/29/2025	Expense	KCDJT7KDC74JUNYF3	No	County of Riverside	El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622	ADVANCED COSTS/Court Costs	Kiley - VS 6077	1.00		1,797.10
										\$ 1,797.10		
										\$ 1,797.10		\$ 1,797.10

Total for Mate v. El Dorado National California, Inc. - 20230622
TOTAL

Monday, Jul 28, 2025 10:46:22 AM GMT-7 - Accrual Basis