

James R. Hawkins, SBN 192925
Isandra Y. Fernandez, SBN 220482
Anthony L. Draper, SBN 344391
JAMES HAWKINS APLC
9880 Research Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 387-7200
FAX: (949) 387-6676
james@jameshawkinsaplc.com
isandra@jameshawkinsaplc.com
anthony@jameshawkinsaplc.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs DEMETRIA CHRISTINE PRITCHETT
and ELIZABETH ROJAS, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated

BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, LLP
Marcus J. Bradley, Esq. (SBN 174156)
Kiley L. Grombacher, Esq. (SBN 245960)
31355 Oak Crest Drive, Suite 210
Westlake Village, California 91361
Telephone: (805) 270-7100
Facsimile: (805) 270-7589
mbradley@bradleygrombacher.com
kgrombacher@bradleygrombacher.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ALISSA BAKER, on behalf of
herself and all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF TULARE

DEMETRIA CHRISTINE PRITCHETT,
ELIZABETH ROJAS, and ALISSA
BAKER, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FAMILY HEALTHCARE NETWORK, a
California corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. VCU290948

[Assigned for all purposes to the
Hon. Nathan Ide, Dept. 7]

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

Date: October 5, 2026
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Dept.: 7

Complaint Filed: March 22, 2022
Trial Date: None Set

1 the proposed Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement Release (“Settlement Agreement,”
2 “Settlement,” or “Agreement”), and the risks and uncertainties confronting the Plaintiffs and us in
3 achieving the Settlement.

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

6 7. Finally, I provide a summary of the contributions of Ms. Baker in support of the
7 service award she is seeking.

8 SUMMARY OF FEES AND COSTS SOUGHT

9 8. Plaintiff Baker’s attorneys are seeking reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket costs
10 of \$2,511.94.¹ As of September 10, 2026, the total lodestar for Bradley/Grombacher, LLP in
11 prosecuting and resolving the class and PAGA claims in this action is \$214,840.00.

12 9. In addition, our lodestar of \$214,840.00 does not include the work we will perform
13 after September 9, 2026, such as attending the hearing on the Motion for Final Approval,
14 effectuating the settlement, working with the Administrator, and communicating with Class
15 Members.

16 EXPERIENCE OF COUNSEL

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

20 11. Bradley/Grombacher, LLP is a national firm with extensive experience litigating
21 wage and hour class and representative actions as well as complex consumer class actions. Details
22 on the work, experience, and accomplishments of the firm can be found at
23 www.bradleygrombacher.com. In just the past few months, two federal district courts have
24 commented on excellent results obtained by Bradley/Grombacher LLP, attributable to our skilled
25 advocacy and determination. *See, In re Johnson & Johnson Aerosol Sunscreen Mktg., Sales*
26 *Pracs. & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, (S.D. Fla. Feb. 28, 2023) 2023 WL 2284684, at *9 (“The Court has

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

1 observed class counsel's diligence, ability, and experience in pleadings and motion practice; in
2 their presentation of the settlement to this Court; and in their attention to matters of notice and
3 administration after the announcement of the settlement. The excellent job Class Counsel have
4 done for the class is also demonstrated in the benefits afforded by the Settlement."); *Razo v.*
5 *AT&T Mobility Servs., LLC*, (E.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2023) 2023 WL 3093845, at *24, *26
6 (commenting on the skill class counsel displayed faced with complex issues and significant
7 uncertainty as to the viability of the claims throughout much of the case).

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

9 12. I have been counsel for Plaintiff Baker and the putative class members throughout
10 this case. I am a partner at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, which has extensive experience litigating
11 wage and hour class and representative actions as well as complex consumer class actions. Details
12 on the work, experience, and accomplishments of the firm can be found at
13 www.bradleygrombacher.com.

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

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

1 more notable cases:

- 2 a. *Gutierrez v. State Farm Mutual*, Los Angeles Superior Court (BC236552). Class
3 action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for approximately
4 2,600 insurance claims adjusters employed by State Farm. The class was certified
5 and summary adjudication was granted as to liability in favor of the class. The case
6 settled for \$135 million just prior to trial, with final approval granted with no
7 objections filed.
- 8 b. *Bednar v. Allstate Insurance Company*, Los Angeles Superior Court (BC240813).
9 Class action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for
10 approximately 1,200 insurance claims adjusters employed by Allstate. The class
11 was certified and summary adjudication was granted as to liability in favor of the
12 class. The case settled for \$120 million just prior to trial, with final approval
13 granted with no objections filed.
- 14 c. *Roberts v. Coast National Insurance*, Orange County Superior Court
15 (01CC08478). Class action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation
16 for insurance claims adjusters employed by Coast National Insurance. Certification
17 granted, and then the matter was tried before a binding arbitrator. The case settled
18 during the arbitration for an excess of \$18 million.
- 19 d. *CNA Class Action Litigation*, Los Angeles Superior Court Class (JCCP 4230).
20 Class action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for insurance
21 claims adjusters employed by Defendant. Case settled for \$33 million, with final
22 approval granted with no objections filed.
- 23 e. *Dotson v. Royal Sun Alliance*, Orange County Superior Court (02CC01787). Class
24 action mis-classification case seeking overtime compensation for insurance claims
25 adjusters employed by Royal Sun Alliance. Case settled for \$12.3 million, with
26 final approval granted with no objections filed.
- 27 f. *Parris v. Lowe's Home Improvement*, Los Angeles County Superior Court
28 (BC260702). Class action seeking payment of "off-the-clock" hours worked by all

1 hourly employees of Lowe's Home Improvement stores in the State of California.
2 The class was certified by the Court of Appeal and remanded to the trial court for
3 further proceedings. Shortly thereafter, a \$29.5 million settlement was reached and
4 approved without objection.

5 g. *Pardo v. Toyota Motor Sales, et al.* Los Angeles County Superior Court (BC372781).
6 Class action mis-classification of workers with claims for overtime and missed meal
7 and rest breaks. The case settled for \$7.75 million and was approved with no
8 objections.

9 h. *Smith/Ballard v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.* United States District Court for the Northern
10 District of California (Case No. 4:06-cv-05411-SBA). Wage and hour class action
11 seeking unpaid vacation and personal time, unpaid wages, and related penalties on
12 behalf of over 245,000 employees. The action was certified and settled for \$86 million
13 while Defendant's appeal of the certification was pending in the Ninth Circuit Court
14 of Appeals.

15 i. *Hoyng v. AON*, Los Angeles County Superior Court (BC377184). Wage and hour
16 class action seeking overtime and related compensation for mis-classification on
17 behalf of Relationship and Account Specialists. The case settled for \$10.5 million
18 which was approved with no objections filed.

19 j. *In RE Bank of America Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litigation*, MDL
20 2138, United States District Court for the District of Kansas. California state and
21 FLSA wage and hour litigation for various violations including unpaid overtime and
22 "off-the-clock" work. Settled for \$73 million.

23 k. *Lemus v. H & R Block Litigation*, United States District Court for the Northern
24 District of California (Case No. 3:09-cv-03179-SI) Class certified, and settlement
25 reached prior to trial. Total settlement of \$35 million.

26 l. *Harris v. Vector Marketing Corporation*, United States District Court for the Northern
27 District of California (Case No. 3:08-cv-05198-EMC). Class action case on behalf of
28 approximately 70,000 employees misclassified as "trainees."

- 1 m. *Bickley v. Schneider National Trucking*, United States District Court for the Northern
2 District of California (Case No. 4:08-cv-05806-JSW). Wage and hour class action on
3 behalf of approximately 6,000 truck drivers. Settled for \$29.5million.
- 4 n. *Roberts v. TJX*, United States District Court for the Northern District of California
5 (Case No. 13-CV-04731-MEJ). Wage and hour violations on behalf of approximately
6 82,000 employees. Settled for \$8.5 million.
- 7 o. *Opyrchal v. New York Life Insurance*, United States District Court for the Central
8 District of California (Case No. 2:07-cv-00518-VBF). Class action for the failure to
9 pay commissions pursuant to a compensation plan. Settled for \$10 million.
- 10 p. *Neuvenheim v. Gamestop Corp.*, United States District Court for the Central District
11 of California (Case No. 2:09-cv-06799-ODW). Class action on behalf of nonexempt
12 employees for wage and hour violations.
- 13 q. *Hightower v. JP Morgan Chase*, United States District Court for the Central District
14 of California (Case No. 2:11-cv-01802-PSG). Class action on behalf of nonexempt
15 employees for wage and hour violations. Settled for \$12 million.

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

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

25 17. I have also been honored as a Super Lawyer in the area of class actions by Los
26 Angeles Magazine for multiple years including 2026. I was also selected as a Top 100 Leading
27 Commercial Litigator by the Los Angeles Daily Journal for 2024 and 2025. I am also a member of a
28 number of professional organizations, including the Consumer Attorneys of Los Angeles, the

1 Consumer Attorneys of California, the California Employment Lawyers Association, and the
2 American Association for Justice. I have also been named a Los Angeles Times 2025 Consumer
3 Attorney Visionary and a Daily Journal Top Plaintiff Lawyer for 2025. My 2025 billing rate is \$1200
4 an hour.

5 **Experience of Kiley L. Grombacher, Esq.**

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

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

16 20. Ms. Grombacher has been selected by Super Lawyers Magazine as a “Rising Star”
17 in the field of complex litigation since 2015 and as a Super Lawyer since 2017. She has published
18 articles on the field of class action litigation, including “A Class-Action Primer,” which appeared
19 in The Advocate, the Journal of Consumer Attorneys of Southern California.

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

24 **Experience of Leslie Joyner, Esq.**

25 22. Leslie Joyner is a former associate at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP who also worked
26 on this case. Ms. Joyner focused her practice on complex employment litigation, including wage-
27 and hour and class action matters. During her time at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, Ms. Joyner
28 assisted with various aspects of litigation, including legal research, drafting pleadings and

1 motions, reviewing and analyzing case-related materials, and assisting with the prosecution and
2 resolution of complex employment matters. Ms. Joyner's experience and contributions were
3 valuable to the firm and to the prosecution of this case.

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

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

12 **Experience of Corey Smith, Esq.**

13 24. Corey Smith is a former associate at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP who also worked
14 on this case. Mr. Smith focused his practice on employment litigation, including wage-and-hour
15 and class action matters. During his time at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, Mr. Smith assisted with
16 various aspects of litigation, including legal research, drafting pleadings and motions, reviewing
17 and analyzing case-related materials, and assisting with the prosecution and resolution of complex
18 employment matters. Mr. Smith's experience and contributions were valuable to the firm and to
19 the prosecution of this case.

20 **Experience of Kasra B. Ramez, Esq.**

21 25. Kasra B. Ramez is a former associate at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP who also
22 worked on this case. Mr. Ramez focused his practice on employment litigation, including wage-
23 and-hour and class action matters. During his time at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, Mr. Ramez
24 assisted with various aspects of litigation, including legal research, drafting pleadings and
25 motions, reviewing and analyzing case-related materials, and assisting with the prosecution and
26 resolution of complex employment matters. Mr. Ramez's experience and contributions were
27 valuable to the firm and to the prosecution of this case.

28 ///

1 **Experience of Simone White, Esq.**

2 26. Simone White is a former associate at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP who also worked
3 on this case. Ms. White focused her practice on employment litigation, including wage-and-hour
4 and class action matters. During her time at Bradley/Grombacher, LLP, Ms. White assisted with
5 various aspects of litigation, including legal research, drafting pleadings and motions, reviewing
6 and analyzing case-related materials, and assisting with the prosecution and resolution of complex
7 employment matters. Ms. White's experience and contributions were valuable to the firm and to
8 the prosecution of this case.

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

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

16 28. The number of hours that Plaintiffs' Counsel devoted to this case is reasonable.
17 See, e.g., *Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1133 (fee award should be "fully
18 compensatory [and] absent circumstances rendering the award unjust, an attorney fee award
19 should ordinarily include compensation for *all* the hours reasonably spent."); *Serrano III* (1977)
20 20 Cal.3d 25, 49 (counsel are entitled to compensation for all hours reasonably expended);
21 *Hensley v. Eckerhart* (1983) 461 U.S. 424, 435-36.

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

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

28 30. This portion of my declaration documents the reasonableness of the billing rates

1 charged by my firm in this case.

2 31. Our lodestar for this case is based on our law firm's billing rates for 2025. We set
3 the billing rates of our attorneys and paralegals/law clerks through a process of continual
4 monitoring of prevailing market rates charged by both defense and plaintiffs' law firms, for
5 individuals with similar levels of skill and experience who are doing comparable work as our
6 attorneys and staff. We gather this information from surveys, the review of other fee applications,
7 and conversations with attorneys in the relevant billing market. We set the billing rates for our
8 firm to be consistent with the prevailing market rates in the private sector for attorneys and staff
9 of comparable skill, qualifications, and experience.

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

21 BILLING PRACTICES AND LODESTAR

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

25 34. The following chart provides a summary of the billing rates and hours worked by
26 the attorneys at our firm through September 10, 2026:

27 ///

28 ///

Name and Title of Professional	Bar Admission Date	Hours	Rate (2026)	Lodestar
<i>Partners</i>				
Marcus Bradley	1994	160.5	\$1200	\$192,600.00
<i>Associates</i>				
Lirit King	2007	28	\$850	\$16,240.00
Emilie MacLean	2023	12	\$500	\$6,000.00
TOTAL HOURS AND LODESTAR FOR BRADLEY GROMBACHER		200.5		\$214,840.00

35. 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

36. 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 Baker 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 office has to date incurred \$2,511.94 in out-of-pocket costs, which we have not yet recouped. During the course of this litigation, we also had to forego requests by other prospective clients to bring other cases with merit to ensure that we could continue to adequately and successfully represent Plaintiff Baker and the putative class in this matter.

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

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

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

40. Our risks in this case were further compounded by the vigorous and skillful manner in which Defendant's counsel represented its clients. Defendant and its counsel also negotiated hard throughout the negotiation process. All of this contributed to our risk of recovering nothing or close to nothing for our commitment and investment in the case. Given these uncertainties, we undertook significant risk to finally resolve the case for the substantial value ultimately secured.

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

COSTS

42. Plaintiff Baker has incurred costs of the suit of approximately \$2,511.94 as of September 9, 2026. **Exhibit 1** is a ledger identifying each individual charge incurred by our firm in this action. The date corresponding to each individual charge may reflect the date the charge was entered into our accounting system, rather than the date when the charge occurred.

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

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

45. These expenses were necessary to the prosecution and successful resolution of the case.

PROPOSED SERVICE AWARD

46. Ms. Baker devoted her time and provided an invaluable service to the prosecution of this case. She worked with us regularly, providing important information, documents, and insight regarding Defendant's policies and practices. She was also actively involved in discussions regarding the resolution of this matter and approved the settlement terms on behalf of herself and the putative class members.

47. Ms. Baker has also submitted a declaration attesting to her service in support of the service award she is seeking and in support of approval of the settlement generally.

48. In light of Ms. Baker's specific efforts and the favorable impact on the litigation that resulted from those efforts, we are proposing a \$10,000 service award for her.

49. We believe that the service award to Ms. Baker fairly reflects the time, risks, and contributions she made to achieve this settlement on behalf of herself and the putative class.

50. Moreover, as part of the settlement agreement, Ms. Baker released any and all claims she had against Defendant, not just those relating to this case. This release is broader than that which applies to the other putative class members.

EXHIBITS

51. Attached as **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration is a true and correct copy of a cost bill for the various costs that Bradley Grombacher, LLP has incurred in this case, which we ran on September 9, 2026 based on our firm's accounting records.

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

///

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

Executed on September 10, 2026, in Westlake Village, California.

Marcus Bradley
Marcus J. Bradley

EXHIBIT 1

B/G Cost Bill

BRADLEY GROMBACHER LLP
Transaction Report
All Dates

Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926										
Date	Transact ion Type	Num	Adj	Name	Memo/Description	Account	Split	Debit	Credit	Balance
10/03/2022	Expense	LWDA-CM4911548-22	No	LWDA	LWDA-CM4911548-22 / Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Kiley - VS 1305	75.00		75.00
10/04/2022	Bill	6515757	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	1,647.25		1,722.25
10/21/2022	Bill	6602633	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	14.70		1,736.95
10/25/2022	Bill	6612855	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	14.70		1,751.65
10/31/2022	Bill	19021581	No	Fast Legal Network	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	125.50		1,877.15
11/03/2022	Bill	6763623	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	14.70		1,891.85
01/18/2023	Bill	6987545	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	14.70		1,906.55
01/24/2023	Bill	11650286	No	CCALL	Case Management Conference - Case #22-C-0359 / Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Court Call	Accounts Payable	72.00		1,979.55
02/02/2023	Bill	7048274	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	11.95		1,990.50
03/31/2023	Bill	7341229	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	11.95		2,002.45
04/05/2023	Bill	7371666	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	36.30		2,038.75
04/07/2023	Bill	7362929	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	15.70		2,054.45
05/16/2023	Expense	23KCO0001865	No	King's County Superior Court	Family Healthcare Network - Plaintiff CMC Statement	Advances Costs Court Costs	Kiley - VS 1305	4.56		2,059.40
09/14/2023	Bill	8237375	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	14.32		2,073.72
09/15/2023	Expense		No	One Legal	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926 // Service of Case Management Statement	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Kiley - VS 1305	7.21		2,080.93
12/26/2023	Bill	8802307	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	14.32		2,095.25
01/03/2024	Bill	8851417	No	Commercial Process	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	15.35		2,110.60
06/05/2024	Bill	11632074	No	CCALL	Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Court Call	Accounts Payable	72.00		2,182.60
06/05/2024	Bill	9774229	No	Commercial Process	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	15.35		2,197.95
06/05/2024	Expense		No	One Legal	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926 - Service of CMC Statement // 246064 HDSW BEV/AH/Orel legal	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Kiley - VS 6077	8.24		2,206.19
09/12/2024	Bill	1032159	No	Commercial Process	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	16.94		2,223.13
09/17/2024	Bill	11982183	No	CCALL	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Court Call	Accounts Payable	72.00		2,295.13
03/20/2025	Bill	11570302	No	Commercial Process	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	37.54		2,332.67
08/20/2025	Bill	12695856	No	Commercial Process	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	13.34		2,346.01
08/20/2025	Bill	12700109	No	Commercial Process	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	37.54		2,383.55
11/04/2025	Bill	13273076	No	Commercial Process	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Filing Fees	Accounts Payable	37.54		2,421.09
11/07/2025	Expense	7716539	No	One Legal	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Court Costs	Kiley - VS 6077	31.44		2,452.53
02/13/2026	Expense	27146281	No	One Legal	Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926	Advances Costs Court Costs	Kiley - VS 6077	26.86		2,479.39
02/19/2026	Expense		No	One Legal	Baker v. (#20220926) Family Healthcare (2 Declarations)	Advances Costs Court Costs	Kiley - VS 6077	32.55		2,511.94
Total for Bakers v. Family Healthcare Network - 20220926								\$ 2,611.94		\$ 2,611.94
TOTAL								\$ 2,611.94		\$ 2,611.94

Wednesday, Sep 02, 2026 03:22:09 PM GMT-7 - Accrual Basis