BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
Keaton Mendoza (SBN 321172)
kmendoza@tomorrowlaw.com
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated and aggrieved

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY

RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA, an individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC., a California Stock Corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 25CV002099
Consolidated Case No. 25CV006542

[*Assigned for rotational assignment among three judicial officers: Judge Thomas W. Wills; Judge Carrie M. Panetta, Judge Ian A. Rivamonte*]

DECLARATION OF KEATON D. MENDOZA IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT AND PROVISIONAL CLASS CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES ONLY

HEARING INFORMATION:

DATE: November 6, 2026
TIME: 8:30 a.m.
DEPT: 15

DECLARATION OF KEATON MENDOZA

1. I am an attorney at law, duly licensed to practice before all the Courts of the State of California and I am an attorney at Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., counsel for plaintiff Rafael Lara Zavala ("Plaintiff"), and all others similarly situated. As such, I am familiar with the file in this matter and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the following facts of my own personal knowledge.

2. On or around April 22, 2025, Plaintiff commenced this Action by filing a class action complaint against Defendant Naturipe Berry Growers, Inc. ("Defendant") in Monterey County, Case No. 25CV002099, alleging: (1) failure to pay overtime; (2) failure to pay minimum wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to provide rest periods; (5) failure to pay all wages due upon termination; (6) wage statement violations; (7) failure to timely pay wages; (8) Violation of Labor Code § 2802; (9) Violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and (10) unfair competition. (the "Class Action")

3. On or around January 28, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and served on Defendant a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (First)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (First)").

4. On or around February 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (Second)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (Second)").

5. On or around April 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (Third)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (Third)").

6. On or around October 13, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (Fourth)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of

the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (Fourth)").

7. On or around February 18, 2026, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (Fifth)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (Fifth)"). A true and correct copies of the PAGA Notices are attached to the Declaration as Exhibit "2."

8. On or around December 18, 2025, Plaintiff filed a representative action against Defendant, in Monterey Superior Court, Case No. 25CV006542, seeking civil penalties under the Private Attorney Generals Act of 2004. ("PAGA Action")

9. Thereafter, Plaintiff obtained, through informal and formal discovery: (a) time and payroll records for 18% of putative Class Members; (b) a class list of hire dates and separation dates for all putative Class Members; and (c) wage and hour policy documents.

10. Plaintiff's investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1801 and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 116, 129-130 ("Dunk/Kullar").

11. On or around June 18, 2026, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Stephanie S. Chow. The mediation was successful, and the Parties agreed to globally resolve all class and PAGA claims asserted in the Operative Complaint.

12. Class Counsel have conducted significant investigation of the law and facts relating to the claims asserted in the Action and the PAGA Notices, and have concluded that the Settlement set forth herein is fair, reasonable, adequate and in the best interests of the Settlement Class, taking into account the sharply contested issues involved, the expense and time necessary to litigate the Action through trial and any appeals, the risks and costs of further litigation of the Action, the risk of an adverse outcome, the uncertainties of complex litigation, the information learned through discovery regarding Plaintiff's allegations, and the substantial benefits to be received by Settlement Class Members.

///

The Proposed Settlement

13. Subject to Court approval pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, rule 3.679, *et seq.*, the Parties have agreed to settle the Action by agreement upon the terms and conditions, and for the consideration set forth in the Agreement, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "1."

14. The Settlement Agreement attached hereto is a partially executed version of the Agreement. The fully executed version of the Agreement, with Plaintiff's signature, will be filed supplementally under separate cover.

15. A summary of the terms of the settlement is as follows:

Defendant will stipulate, for purpose of this settlement only, as follows:

- Certification of a class ("Settlement Class," "Settlement Class Members" or "Class Members") defined as: all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant Naturipe Berry Growers, Inc. ("Defendant"), either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the period from April 22, 2021, through September 18, 2026, or Preliminary Approval, whichever is later, except that, in the event that the escalator clause in Section 8.1 of Settlement Agreement is triggered because the number of workweeks worked increases by more than 10% or an additional 577 workweeks worked, then the end of the Class Period shall be through the date that the 10% escalator is triggered ("Class Period") in the State of California.
- Defendant will pay $200,000.00 ("Gross Settlement Amount") to resolve the matter.
- Defendant represents that its best estimate is that there are no more than 5,769 workweeks worked during the Class Period. In the event that the number of workweeks worked increases by more than 10% or an additional 577 workweeks worked, the release period shall be cut off as of the date that the 10% escalator clause is triggered. In no event shall Defendant pay more than the GSA to fully and finally resolve all of Plaintiff's known and unknown claims, the Class Action, and the PAGA Action, and any other actions.

- Defendant will pay the employer's share of taxes separate and apart from the Gross Settlement Amount.
- Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. 20% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form, which the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for administering and issuing. The Administrator shall be responsible for making all deductions and withholdings required under law. The 80% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be evenly allocated to settlement of claims for interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"), meaning that 40% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for interest, and 40% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for penalties. The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms, which the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for administering and issuing. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.
- This is a non-reversionary settlement.
- Class Members will be paid their *pro rata* share of the class action settlement based on the total number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period.
- "Workweek" means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendant, for at least one day during the Class Period, based on hire dates, re-hire dates (as applicable), and termination dates (as applicable).
- The Settlement Administration costs, estimated not to exceed $7,250.00, will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.
- Class Counsel, comprised of David D. Bibiyan and Sarah Cohen of Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., may apply for, and Defendant will not oppose, attorneys' fees of not more than thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which, unless

escalated pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, amounts to $70,000.00, and actual costs, not to exceed $30,000.00, all of which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.

- Class Counsel hereby apply for, and Defendant will not oppose, a service award of up to $6,000.00 to Plaintiff, which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.
- "Aggrieved Employees" means all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant Naturipe Berry Growers, Inc. ("Defendant"), either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the period from January 28, 2024, through the end of the Class Period ("PAGA Period") in the State of California.
- Defendant has agreed to pay $30,000.00 as PAGA penalties, sixty-five percent (65%) or $19,500.00 of which will be paid to the LWDA out of the Gross Settlement Amount, and thirty-five percent (35%) or $10,500.00 of which will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees.
- Participating Class Members will receive an Individual Settlement Payment. Individual Settlement Payment checks shall remain valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the date of their issuance. Thereafter, checks for such payments shall be canceled and funds associated with such checks shall be considered unpaid, unclaimed or abandoned cash residue pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 384 ("Unpaid Residue"). The Unpaid Residue plus accrued interest, if any, as provided in Code of Civil Procedure section 384, shall be transmitted as follows: to the Cy Pres Recipient, which is Rancho Cielo located at 710 Old Stage Road, Salinas, CA 93908. The P.O. Box designated for donations is: P.O. Box 6948, Salinas, CA 93912.

Settlement Agreement and Accompanying Documents

16. Attached hereto as Exhibit "1" is a true and correct copy of the Agreement fully executed by the Parties.

17. Attached to the Agreement as Exhibit "A" thereto is the proposed Notice of

Proposed Settlement ("Class Notice") to be distributed to Class Members in English and Spanish.

18. The Parties have agreed to use Phoenix Settlement Administrators ("Phoenix"), an experienced settlement administrator, to administer the settlement.

19. On or about October 15, 2026, my office submitted a copy of the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA in compliance with Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (1)(2). A true and correct copy of each confirmation with the LWDA in connection with Plaintiff is attached hereto as Exhibit "3."

The Settlement was Negotiated at Arms-Length and not Collusive

20. The Settlement that has been reached, subject to this Court's approval, is a product of substantial efforts by the Parties and their counsel. The Settlement was reached after extensive factual and legal investigation and research; the exchange of informal discovery; substantial negotiation regarding the scope of informal discovery; exchange of documents and information that included review of time and pay records and analysis thereof with the aid of Plaintiff and expert consultants; analysis of shifts and Workweeks worked by Class Members in the Class Period, analysis of the number of pay periods and number of Aggrieved Employees in the PAGA Period for calculating PAGA penalties, number of Class Members eligible for wage statement penalties and waiting time penalties; an analysis of Plaintiff's employment records; extensive correspondence and communication between counsel; a review of pleadings, evidence and rulings in similar actions litigated elsewhere in the state; a review of similar cases in the same industry elsewhere in the country; and preparation for and attendance at a full-day mediation, followed by further discussions and coordination to finalize the terms and conditions of the general settlement parameters agreed to by the Parties.

21. While Class Counsel believes in the chance of success of certifying the claims, Class Counsel recognized the potential risk, expense and complexity posed by further litigation. Moreover, litigating Plaintiff's claims in this litigation—claims that involve approximately 138 Class Members during the Class Period—would require substantial preparation and discovery, and ultimately would involve the deposition and presentation of numerous more witnesses (including Class Members and expert witnesses), as well as the consideration, preparation and analysis of

expert reports. Therefore, should litigation have progressed any further, there would have been significant expense incurred by each side (above and beyond the expense already incurred).

The Settlement Amount is Well Within the Range of Reasonableness

22. The settlement amount reached in this case provides significant recovery to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees and easily falls within the range of reasonableness. Based on documents and information provided by Defendant, Class Counsel understands there are no more than 5,678 Workweeks during the Class Period.

Recovery of Damages for Failure to Pay Wages for All Time Worked

23. Class Counsel theorized at mediation that Defendant failed to pay wages to Class Members for all hours worked because Defendant required Class Members to work off-the-clock by requiring them to moving electronic equipment, taking out the garbage, processing trucks and fruit, and waiting in line to clock in. Class Counsel also theorized that around 60%-time sheets were entirely synthetic, and Class Members were required to be in their workstation by the beginning of their shift. Class Counsel also theorized, based on Defendants evidence that Defendant permitted unlawful rounding policy and rounded time entries to nearest half an hour.

24. Class Counsel theorized based on documents produced by Defendant and Plaintiff's narrative evidence that Class Members have spent extensive amounts of uncompensated time under Defendant's control. Class Counsel also theorized that Defendant's time records were entirely synthetic, false, and did not accurately track Class Members' time worked.

25. One theory advanced by Class Counsel alleged, based on Plaintiff's narrative evidence, that Class Members worked off-the-clock for approximately eight (8) minutes each shift throughout the Class Period, without pay. Class Counsel understand, based on time and payroll records produced by Defendant and analysis thereof by expert data consultants retained by Class Counsel, that there were approximately 32,079 shifts during the Class Period, 48.8% of which were over eight (8) hours in length, and Class Members had an average hourly rate of pay of $26.79. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel at mediation resulted in Defendant's exposure for unpaid off-the-clock work in an approximate amount of **$200,710** ([32,079 shifts x 0.488 shifts over eight hours x 0.133 hour x $26.79 x 1.5 overtime rate] + [32,079 shifts x 0.512 shifts under

eight hours x 0.133 hour x $26.79 x 2 in liquidated damages]).

26. Class Counsel understand that Defendant explicitly denies these contentions and make the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendant contends that their policies specifically prohibit off-the-clock work. Defendant contends that they did not require Class Members to work off-the-clock, they were paid for all time suffered or permitted to work. Defendant contends that any allegations that Class Members were required to be under Defendant's control off-the-clock would necessitate an individualized inquiry into when and why, making this claim not subject to class treatment and any trial in this litigation unmanageable. Thus, Defendant contends that no damages can be recovered here, and, even if, *arguendo*, they could, an estimate of eight (8) minutes of unpaid work off-the-clock of Class Members for *every single shift* during the Class Period is a wild exaggeration of time spent working off-the-clock if *any* such time was spent.

Recovery of Damages for Non-Compliant Meal Periods

27. Class Counsel theorized that Defendant's meal period practices throughout the Class Period were non-compliant. Class Counsel theorized that Defendant's meal period practices were non-compliant because, based on Plaintiff's narrative evidence and Defendant's records, Class Members did not receive full thirty (30) minute meal periods, were late, or missed. Class Counsel also theorized that many meal periods were synthetic, or fictional because they rounded to exactly thirty (30) minutes.

28. Class Counsel understand from Defendant's records, and analyzed by expert data consultants, that there are 4,672 unique facial meal period violations (*i.e.* meal periods that are missed, short, or late) in the Class Period through mediation. Thus, one theory advanced by Class Counsel, based solely on facial violations, resulted in Defendant's maximum exposure for non-compliant meal periods in an amount of **$125,163** (4,672 meal period violations x $26.79/hour).

29. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendant makes the following defenses in connection with this claim. Defendant argued that it had compliant meal period policies and practices and that its policy requires their employees to take timely and full meal periods. Defendant argued that Class Members took timely and full meal periods or received the required meal period premium for each instance of meal period violations.

Defendant further contends that any instance of a Class Member failing to take a compliant meal period was voluntary, in violation of its meal period policy, would necessitate an individualized inquiry and would not lend itself to a manageable trial. Thus, Defendant contends that *no* monies are owed for this account but, even if any amounts were due, the amount calculated by Class Counsel is excessive.

Recovery of Damages for Non-Compliant Rest Periods

30. Class Counsel theorized, based on documents and information produced by Defendant and Plaintiff's narrative evidence, that Defendant's rest period policies and practices throughout the Class Period were non-compliant. Class Counsel understand from Defendant's policy documents that rest periods were not provided every four hours or major fraction thereof and failed to state that Class Members were entitled to rest period premiums for missed rest periods, giving rise to a rebuttable presumption that all rest periods throughout the Class Period were non-compliant. Notably, there were no rest period premiums ever issued throughout the Class Period.

31. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel at mediation resulted in, assuming a 40% violation rate for the 32,037 rest-eligible shifts, Defendant's exposure for failure to provide compliant rest periods in a conservative amount of **$343,308** (32,037 shifts x 0.40 violation rate x $26.79/hour).

32. Class Counsel understand that Defendant makes the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendant argued that it had compliant rest break policies and practices and that its policy requires their employees to take timely and full rest breaks. Defendant argued that Class Members took timely and full rest periods. Defendant further contends that any instance of a Class Member failing to take a compliant rest break was voluntary and therefore would necessitate an individualized inquiry and would not lend itself to a manageable trial. Defendant also argued that Class Members were provided a reasonable opportunity to take uninterrupted rest breaks, and the employer is not required to "police" such rest breaks. Thus, Defendant contends that *no* monies are owed for this account but, even if any amounts were due, the amount calculated by Class Counsel is excessive.

Wage Statement Violations

33. Class Counsel theorized that Class Members are entitled to recover penalties for Defendant's alleged failure to issue compliant wage statements under Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e) for the derivative impact of the failure to pay all wages owed on providing accurate information on wage statements. Specifically, Class Counsel theorized that penalties are owed under Labor Code section 226 due to, at minimum, Defendant's failure to pay wages for off-the-clock work and premiums for meal periods and rest periods. A non-exempt employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars ($50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars ($100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period. Class Counsel understand from the data provided by Defendant that there were approximately 2,351 pay periods in the wage statement liability period. Thus, Defendant's maximum exposure for wage statement violations, assuming a 40% violation rate, would be $**94,040** (2,351 pay periods x $100/pay period x .4 violation rate).

34. Class Counsel understand that Defendant makes the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendant contends that the wage statements issued to the employees fully complied with Labor Code section 226. Defendant contends that because they believe no wages are unpaid that, thus, there can be no derivative penalties. Class Counsel also had to factor in, and did factor in, the risk that a Court would find there was no injury to Class Members even if the wage statements were inaccurate or that Defendant's conduct was not intentional, both of which are requirements of Labor Code section 226 before penalties can issue. Class Counsel also note that the calculation used does not take into account the first pay period violation only being $50 and the fact that all Class Members did not work all pay periods.

Waiting Time Penalties

35. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 203, each employee in the relevant statutory period (*i.e.*, three years before the filing of the initial Complaint) is entitled to 30 days' worth of wages as waiting time penalty for not being paid all wages due upon separation of employment. Class Counsel theorized at mediation, based on relevant documents provided by

Defendant, that, under Labor Code section 203, Defendant is liable to pay each Class Member, who was terminated during the relevant statutory period, a full 30-day worth of wages as waiting time penalty for failure to pay failure to pay compensation in lieu of compliant meal and rest periods, and failure to timely pay all wages due at the time of termination or resignation.

36. Based on relevant documents provided by Defendant, there were approximately 97 separated Class Members during the relevant statutory period. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel, assuming a 40% violation rate, resulted in **Defendant's maximum exposure for waiting time penalties to be $249,468.** (97 separated employees x $26.79/hour x 8 hours x 30 days x .4 violation rate).

37. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendant contends that there is no credence to Plaintiff's off-the-clock theory and that, thus, no waiting time penalties are owed based on that theory. Additionally, Defendant contends that its actions were not "willful" and that, thus, waiting time penalties cannot be awarded. Finally, Defendant contends that many Class Members signed enforceable arbitration agreements and thus no class action is even tenable here. Thus, Defendant argued that no waiting time penalties are owed.

PAGA Penalties

38. Class Counsel understand from the time and payroll data provided by Defendant that there are approximately 93 Aggrieved Employees who collectively worked 2,533 pay periods in the PAGA Period. Plaintiff's claims in the Action under PAGA are substantially similar to those described herein. PAGA penalties include penalties for initial violations and subsequent violations. Defendant contends that only initial violation rates may be used instead of the subsequent violation rates initially used by Class Counsel. With this in mind and because Class Counsel through investigation and discovery did not come to the conclusion that Defendant at any time was notified by any governmental entity that they violated any Labor Code sections presented in the PAGA Notice and PAGA claims, Class Counsel adjusted the exposure model for Defendant to include only initial violation rates.

39. While Class Counsel are informed and believe that reasonable minds differ with

regard to calculation of PAGA penalties, Class Counsel believe it is reasonable to calculate Defendant's maximum exposure in PAGA penalties as follows:

40. Overtime Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations, and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $126,650 (2,533 pay periods x $50).

41. Minimum Wage Violations: Labor Code section 1197.1 prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $250 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $253,300 (2,533 pay periods x $100).

42. Meal Period Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $126,650 (2,533 pay periods x $50).

43. Rest Period Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $126,650 (2,533 pay periods x $50).

44. Wage Statement Violations: According to *Gunther v. Alaska Airlines, Inc.* (2021) 287 Cal.Rptr.3d 229, in this instance, Labor Code section 2699 would be the appropriate penalty for wage statement violations that are inaccurate, which prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $200 for each subsequent violation (*Id.* at 247-248). Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $253,300 (2,533pay periods x $100).

45. Waiting Time Penalties: Labor Code section 2699 prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $200 for each subsequent violation. Because this violation is merited only at separation of employment, a 100% violation rate would likely include just one violation per

employee. The data produced by Defendant indicate that there were 56 Aggrieved Employees whose employment was separated during the PAGA Period. This amounts to a maximum exposure of $5,600 (56 Aggrieved Employees x $100).

46. Conclusion: In sum, Class Counsel calculated Defendant's total maximum exposure for PAGA violations if the Court were to find a 100% violation rate for every Aggrieved Employee every pay period and not exercise its discretion to reduce any of those penalties to be $892,150.00. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendant argued the following in connection with this claim: Defendant contends that no PAGA penalties are likely to be awarded and, even if they were, the maximum exposure calculated by Class Counsel is vastly overstated. First, Defendant defends that PAGA penalties cannot and should not be stacked. Second, Defendant asserts that individualized issues predominate the PAGA claims, making the claims unmanageable for trial. Third, Defendant denies that a violation for each pay period can be established. Fourth, Defendant contends that a Court is unlikely to exercise its discretion to award civil penalties under PAGA where, as here, there is no conduct shown by Plaintiff that would show any Labor Code violation by Defendant is knowing and intentional. Defendant insists that this is especially true in this Action where class action damages are available to Class Members, rendering an award of PAGA penalties in addition to class action damages to be double recovery.

47. Class Counsel maintain that it is possible to recover the subsequent violation rate for penalties, that stacking is permissible, and that there is no manageability requirement under PAGA (citing *Estrada v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc.*). As such, Class Counsel believe a 90% discount of this claim to be reasonable, resulting in a valuation of **$**89,215.00 as a reasonable estimate of the likelihood of what Plaintiff may recover at trial for PAGA penalties ($892,150.00 x .10).

Conclusion

48. When including derivative penalties, such as waiting time penalties, wage statement violations, and discretionary PAGA penalties, Class Counsel theorized Defendant's maximum exposure to be approximately **$1,101,904**. In all, Class Counsel obtained a Gross

Settlement Amount of **$200,000.00**. Particularly in light of the risks involving obstacles to class certification, all issues and risks related to liability, the issues with manageability at trial, the discretionary nature of PAGA penalties, and considering the case law regarding fair, reasonable and adequate settlements, Class Counsel strongly believe that the settlement reached is fair, reasonable and adequate, and in the best interest of Class Members.

49. Moreover, $30,000.00 of the Gross Settlement Amount was attributed to PAGA penalties. This allocation was decided mutually by the Parties and the mutual decision was based on: (1) the fact that damages are available for the failure to pay wage claims while only penalties are available for the PAGA claims; (2) the risk that the Court may exercise its discretion to decline to stack PAGA penalties; (3) the risk that the Court may exercise its discretion to not award the full amount of PAGA penalties available; and (4) the risk that the Court may decline to award any PAGA penalties at all in light of the fact that damages are available for Class Members and it may find any further liability against Defendant unnecessarily punitive.

The Proposed Attorneys' Fees and Costs are Reasonable

50. Class Counsel seeks an attorneys' fees award of not more than thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which, unless escalated pursuant to this Agreement, would amount to $70,000.00 Class Counsel also seeks reimbursement of costs not to exceed $30,000.00.

The Requested Enhancement Award to the Named Plaintiffs and Class Representatives are Reasonable

51. I am informed and believe Defendant does not oppose the requested enhancement to Plaintiff. Class Counsel seeks a limited enhancement of $6,000.00 to Plaintiff for his service.

Conditional Certification for Settlement Purposes

Ascertainability

52. Here, the Class Members' definition (*i.e.*, all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant, either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the Class period in the State of California) is derived from the operative complaint. Based solely on Defendant's payroll records, which amount to approximately 138 persons.

Numerosity

53. Class Counsel understands from documents provided that Defendant identified at least 138 Class Members.

Commonality

54. This litigation is brought to resolve common issues that include whether Defendant failed to pay for all hours worked; whether Defendant provided full, timely and un-interrupted meal and rest periods; whether Class Members are entitled to premium pay for incomplete, untimely or interrupted meal or rest periods, among other claims as set forth above.

Typicality

55. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of other Class Members as Plaintiff: (1) is a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee like other Class Members; (2) complains of not being paid for all time under Defendant's control or suffered and/or permitted to work for Defendant; (3) did not receive full premium pay for meal periods that were not compliant with the Labor Code; (4) did not receive premium pay for rest periods that were not provided, among others as set forth above.

Adequacy of Keaton Mendoza

56. I graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration from San Diego State University in 2011.

57. I received my Juris Doctorate from California Western School of Law in 2016.

58. From 2018 to 2022, I practiced law in the General Counsel's office for Adventist Health, handling labor and employment matters for the health system, specifically in harassment, discrimination, retaliation, and wage and hour matters.

59. From 2023 through 2026, I practiced law as an attorney for Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith handling general liability defendant-side litigation.

60. Thereafter, I joined Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., practicing law on behalf of plaintiffs in matters of employment law, and specifically on issues of unpaid wages and class action settlements. Among other tasks, I oversee and manage class action and PAGA action settlements at Bibiyan Law Group, P.C. I have led settlement negotiations and the approval process for class action and PAGA settlements, including some of those set forth in the declaration of David D.

Bibiyan, filed concurrently with this declaration.

Adequacy of Plaintiff

61. Class Counsel believe no conflicts, disabling or otherwise, exists between Plaintiff and Class Members because Plaintiff alleges to have been damaged by the same alleged conduct of Defendant (*i.e.*, Plaintiff is classified as non-exempt, hourly paid employees, not paid premium pay, etc.) and thus has the incentive to fairly represent all Class Members' claims to achieve the maximum possible recovery.

Superiority of Class Action

62. Class Counsel believe this wage and hour class action is a superior vehicle for resolution of the issues it seeks to resolve. It deals with common issues that are most efficiently adjudicated together, as indicated above. Moreover, with at least 138 Class Members, presentation of all of them before this Court may be problematic, impractical, and burdensome.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct this October 15, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Keaton D. Mendoza
KEATON D. MENDOZA

EXHIBIT 1

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
Keaton Mendoza (SBN 321172)
kmendoza@tomorrowlaw.com
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated and aggrieved

ANAIS MORA (SBN 312757)
HARRISON OSAKI (SBN 263924)
PATANE • GUMBERG • AVILA • , LLP
Attorneys at Law
4 Rossi Circle, Suite 231
Salinas, California 93907
Mailing: P.O. Box 3770, Salinas, CA 93912
Telephone: (831) 755-1461
Facsimile: (831) 755-1477
Email: *amora@pglawfirm.com*
hosaki@pglawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendant NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY

RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA, an individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC., a California Stock Corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 25CV002099
Consolidated Case No. 25CV006542

[*Assigned for rotational assignment among three judicial officers: Judge Thomas W. Wills; Judge Carrie M. Panetta, Judge Ian A. Rivamonte*]

CLASS AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Action Filed: April 22, 2025
Trial Date: None Set

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between plaintiff Rafael Lara Zavala ("Plaintiff") and defendant Naturipe Berry Growers, Inc. ("Defendant"). The Agreement refers to Plaintiff and Defendant collectively as "Parties," or individually as "Party."

1. DEFINITIONS

1.1. "Class Action" means the Plaintiff's lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations against Defendant, captioned *Zavala v. Naturipe Berry Growers Inc., et al.,* Case No. 25CV002099, initiated on April 22, 2025, and pending in Superior Court of the State of California, County of Monterey.

1.2. "Administrator" means Phoenix Settlement Administrators ("Phoenix"), the neutral entity the Parties have agreed to appoint to administer the Settlement.

1.3. "Administration Expenses Payment" or "Administration Expense" means the amount the Administrator will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount to reimburse its reasonable fees and expenses in accordance with the Administrator's "not to exceed" bid submitted to the Court in connection with Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

1.4. "Aggrieved Employee" means all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant, either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the PAGA Period in the State of California.

1.5. "Class" means all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant, either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the Class Period in the State of California.

1.6. "Class Counsel" means David D. Bibiyan and Sarah Cohen of Bibiyan Law Group, P.C.

1.7. "Class Counsel Fees Payment" and "Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment" mean the amounts allocated to Class Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses, respectively, incurred to prosecute the Class Action.

1.8. "Class Data" means Class Member identifying information in Defendant's custody, possession, or control, including the Class Member's (1) name; (2) last known address(es); (3) last known telephone number(s); (4) last known Social Security Number(s); and (5) the dates of

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

employment (i.e., hire dates, and, if applicable, re-hire date(s) and/or separation date(s)).

1.9. "Class Member" or "Settlement Class Member" means all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant, either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the Class Period in the State of California.

1.10. "Class Member Address Search" means the Administrator's investigation and search for current Class Member mailing addresses using all reasonably available sources, methods and means including, but not limited to, the National Change of Address database, skip traces, and direct contact by the Administrator with Class Members.

1.11. "Class Notice" means the NOTICE OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT AND DATE FOR FINAL APPROVAL HEARING, to be mailed to Class Members in English and Spanish in the form, without material variation, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.12. "Class Period" means the period from April 22, 2021, through September 18, 2026, or Preliminary Approval, whichever is later, except that, in the event that the escalator clause in Section 8.1 is triggered because the number of workweeks worked increases by more than 10% or an additional 577 workweeks worked, then the end of the Class Period shall be through the date that the 10% escalator is triggered.

1.13. "Class Representative" means the named Plaintiff in the operative complaint in the Class Action seeking Court approval to serve as a class representative.

1.14. "Class Representative Service Payment" means the payment to the Class Representative for initiating the Class Action and providing services in support of the Class Action.

1.15. "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of Monterey.

1.16. "Cy Pres Recipient" shall mean Rancho Cielo, Salinas, CA.

1.17. "Defendant" means named defendant Naturipe Berry Growers, Inc.

1.18. "Defense Counsel" means Anais Mora, and Harrison Osaki, of Patane, Gumberg, Avila, LLP.

1.19. "Effective Date" means the later date of: (a) the date on which the Court enters a Judgment

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

on its Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement; and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) if no Participating Class Member objects to the Settlement, 60 calendar days after the day the Court enters Judgment; (b) if one or more Participating Class Members objects to the Settlement, the day after the deadline for filing a notice of appeal from, or other challenge to, the Judgment (this time period shall not be less than 60 calendar days after the day the Court enters Judgment); (c) if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment; or (d) the date of final dismissal of any appeal from the Judgment or the final dismissal of any proceeding on review of any court of appeal decision relating to the Judgment.

1.20. "Final Approval" means the Court's order granting final approval of the Settlement.

1.21. "Final Approval Hearing" means the Court's hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement.

1.22. "Final Judgment" means the Judgment entered by the Court based upon the Final Approval.

1.23. "Gross Settlement Amount" or "GSA" means $200,000.00 (Two Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents) which is the total amount Defendant agrees to pay under the Settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees, Class Counsel Expenses, Class Representative Service Payment, and Administrator's Expenses. The GSA herein includes all wages, penalties, fees, and costs associated with the full and final settlement of Plaintiff's known and unknown claims arising from his employment with Defendant including, but not limited to, the class and representative allegations made in the Class Action and PAGA Action.

1.24. "Individual Class Payment" means the Participating Class Member's pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount calculated according to the number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period.

1.25. "Individual PAGA Payment" means the Aggrieved Employee's pro rata share of 35% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of Workweeks worked during the PAGA Period.

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

1.26. "Judgment" means the judgment entered by the Court based upon Final Approval.

1.27. "LWDA" means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the agency entitled under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).

1.28. "LWDA PAGA Payment" means the 65% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i), pursuant to this Settlement.

1.29. "Net Settlement Amount" means the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and Administration Expenses Payment. The remainder is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments.

1.30. "Non-Participating Class Member" means any Class Member who opts out of the Settlement by sending the Administrator a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.

1.31. "PAGA Action" means Plaintiff's representative action against Defendant, in Monterey Superior Court, Case No. 25CV006542, seeking civil penalties under the Private Attorney Generals Act of 2004, initiated on December 18, 2025.

1.32. "PAGA Pay Period" means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendants for at least one day during the PAGA Period, based on hire dates, re-hire dates (as applicable), and termination dates (as applicable).

1.33. "PAGA Period" means the period from January 28, 2024, through the end of the Class Period.

1.34. "PAGA" means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698. *et seq*.).

1.35. "PAGA Notice (First)" means plaintiff's January 28, 2025, letter to defendants and the LWDA, providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 subd. (a).

1.36. "PAGA Notice (Second)" means plaintiff's February 21, 2025, letter to defendants and the LWDA, providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 subd. (a).

1.37. "PAGA Notice (Third)" means plaintiff's April 1, 2025, letter to defendants and the LWDA, providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 subd. (a).

1.38. "PAGA Notice (Fourth)" means plaintiff's October 13, 2025, letter to defendants and the

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

LWDA, providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 subd. (a).

1.39. "PAGA Notice (Fifth)" means plaintiff's February 12, 2026, letter to defendants and the LWDA, providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 subd. (a).

1.40. "Plaintiff's PAGA Notices" means the PAGA Notice (First), PAGA Notice (Second), PAGA Notice (Third), PAGA Notice (Fourth), and PAGA Notice (Fifth)

1.41. "PAGA Penalties" means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 35% to the Aggrieved Employees ($10,500.00) and the 65% to the LWDA ($19,500.00) in settlement of PAGA claims.

1.42. "Participating Class Member" means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Settlement.

1.43. "Plaintiff" means Rafael Lara Zavala, the named plaintiff in the Class Action and the PAGA Action.

1.44. "Preliminary Approval" means the Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

1.45. "Released Class Claims" means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.2 below.

1.46. "Released PAGA Claims" means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.4 below.

1.47. "Released Parties" means: Defendant and each of its past and present parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, and agents and all of their respective employees, principals, managing agents, members, attorneys, officers, board members, directors, investors, shareholders, owners, partners, tax advisors, legal representatives, accountants, insurers, donors, trustees, administrators, real or alleged alter egos, real or alleged joint employers, predecessors, successors, purchasers, transferees, assigns, affiliates, and all other representatives of Defendant, individually and in their corporate or other representative capacities.

1.48. "Request for Exclusion" means a Class Member's submission of a written request to be excluded from the Class Settlement signed by the Class Member.

1.49. "Response Deadline" means forty-five (45) days after the Administrator mails Notice to

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

Class Members and Aggrieved Employees and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) mail Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) mail his or her Objection to the Settlement. Class Members to whom Notice Packets are resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have an additional 15 days beyond the date on which the Response Deadline originally expired with respect to that Class Member, to mail their Request for Exclusion from the Settlement, or mail their Objections to the Settlement.

1.50. "Settlement" means the disposition, including the dispositions of the Class Action and the PAGA Action, effected by this Agreement and the Judgment.

1.51. "Workweek" means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendant, for at least one day during the Class Period, based on hire dates, re-hire dates (as applicable), and termination dates (as applicable).

2. RECITALS

2.1. On April 22, 2025, Plaintiff filed a class action complaint against Defendant in Monterey County, Case No. 25CV002099, alleging: (1) failure to pay overtime; (2) failure to pay minimum wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to provide rest periods; (5) failure to pay all wages due upon termination; (6) wage statement violations; (7) failure to timely pay wages; (8) Violation of Labor Code § 2802; (9) Violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and (10) unfair competition. ("Class Action").

2.2. On January 28, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and served on Defendant a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (First)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (First)").

2.3. On February 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (Second)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (Second)").

2.4. On April 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (Third)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (Third)").

2.5. On October 13, 2025, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (Fourth)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (Fourth)").

2.6. On February 18, 2026, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice (Fifth)") stating that he intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties for Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations. ("PAGA Notice (Fifth)").

2.7. On December 18, 2025, Plaintiff filed a representative action against Defendant, in Monterey Superior Court, Case No. 25CV006542, seeking civil penalties under the Private Attorney Generals Act of 2004. ("PAGA Action")

2.8. As part of this agreement, the Parties agree to stipulate to Plaintiff filing a first amended complaint ("FAC" or "Operative Complaint") in the Class Action, to add causes of action to the Class Action under the Private Attorney General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") which will include the causes of action in the PAGA Action, after the execution of this Agreement but before seeking preliminary Court approval of this Settlement.

2.9. Thereafter, the Parties exchanged informal and formal discovery and agreed to attend mediation.

2.10. Prior to mediation Plaintiff obtained, through informal and formal discovery: (a) time and payroll records for 18% of Class Members; (b) a class list of hire dates and separation dates for all Class Members; and (c) wage and hour policy documents; .

2.11. Plaintiff's investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 ("*Dunk/Kullar*").

2.12. On June 18, 2026, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Stephanie S. Chow. The mediation was successful, and the Parties agreed to globally resolve all

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

class and PAGA claims asserted in the Operative Complaint.

2.13. The Court has not granted class certification.

2.14. The Parties, Class Counsel, and Defense Counsel represent that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement besides the Class Action and the PAGA Action.

3. MONETARY TERMS

3.1. Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant promises to pay $200,000.00 as the Gross Settlement Amount, and to separately pay any and all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments. Employer payroll taxes shall be determined by the Administrator. Defendant has no obligation to pay the Gross Settlement Amount (or any payroll taxes) prior to the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.3 of this Agreement. The Administrator will disburse the entire Gross Settlement Amount without asking or requiring Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees to submit any claim as a condition of payment. None of the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendant.

3.2. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. The Administrator will make and deduct the following payments from the Gross Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in the Final Approval:

3.2.1. To Plaintiff: Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff of not more than $6,000.00 in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment Plaintiff is entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee. Defendant will not oppose Plaintiff's request for a Class Representative Service Payment that does not exceed this amount. As part of the motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment, Plaintiff will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payments prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves a Class Representative Service Payment less than the amount requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payment using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiff assumes full responsibility and liability for

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payment.

3.2.2. To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is estimated to be $70,000.00 and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than $30,000.00. Defendant will not oppose requests for these payments provided that the requested payments do not exceed these amounts. Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel will endeavor to file a motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiff's counsel arising from any claim to any portion of any Class Counsel Fee Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and holds Defendant harmless, and indemnifies Defendant, from any dispute or controversy regarding any payment of or division or sharing of any of these Payments. There will be no additional charge of any kind to either the Settlement Class Members or request for additional consideration from Defendant for such work unless Defendant materially breaches this Agreement, including any term regarding funding, and further efforts are necessary from Class Counsel to remedy said breach, including, without limitation, moving the Court to enforce the Agreement. Should the Court approve attorneys' fees and/or litigation costs and expenses in amounts that are less than the amounts provided for herein, then the unapproved portion(s) shall be a part of the Net Settlement Amount.

3.2.3. To the Administrator: An Administrator Expenses Payment not to exceed $7,250.00 except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Expenses are less or the Court approves payment less than

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

$7,250.00, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount.

3.2.4. To Each Participating Class Member: An Individual Class Payment, issued by the Administrator, calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by the Participating Class Member's Workweeks.

3.2.4.1. Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. 20% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form, which the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for administering and issuing. The Administrator shall be responsible for making all deductions and withholdings required under law. The 80% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be evenly allocated to settlement of claims for interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"), meaning that 40% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for interest, and 40% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for penalties. The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms, which the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for administering and issuing. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.

3.2.4.2. Effect of Non-Participating Class Members on Calculation of Individual Class Payments. Non-Participating Class Members will not receive any Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will retain amounts equal to their Individual Class Payments in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members on a pro rata basis.

3.2.5. To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

$30,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 65% ($19,500.00) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 35% ($10,500.00) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

3.2.5.1. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 35% share of PAGA Penalties $10,500.00 by the total number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by the Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Period Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

3.2.5.2. If the Court approves PAGA Penalties of less than the amount requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to the Cy Pres Recipient. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments on IRS 1099 Forms, which the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for administering and issuing.

4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS

4.1. Class Workweeks and Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods. Based on a review of its records to date, Defendant estimates there are 138 Class Members who collectively worked a total of 5,678 Workweeks, and 93 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 2,533 PAGA Pay Periods.

4.2. Class Data. Not later than 30 days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of this Agreement, Defendant will simultaneously deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of this Settlement and for no other purpose, and restrict access to the Class Data to Administrator employees who need access to the Class Data to effect and perform under this Agreement. Defendant has a continuing duty to immediately notify Class Counsel if it discovers that the Class Data omitted class member identifying information and to provide corrected or updated Class

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

Data as soon as reasonably feasible. Without any extension of the deadline by which Defendant must send the Class Data to the Administrator, the Parties and their counsel will expeditiously use best efforts, in good faith, to reconstruct or otherwise resolve any issues related to missing or omitted Class Data.

4.3. Funding of Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than 30 days after the Effective Date.

4.4. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Within 7 days after Defendant funds the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment. Disbursement of the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and the Class Representative Service Payment shall not precede disbursement of Individual Class Payments, and the Individual PAGA Payments.

4.4.1. The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and/or Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Class Members via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. The face of each check shall prominently state the date (not less than 180 days after the date of the check's issuance) when the check will be voided. The Administrator will cancel all checks not cashed by the void date. The Administrator will send checks for Individual Settlement Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator will send checks for Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as Aggrieved Employees (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. Before mailing any checks, the Settlement Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National Change

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

of Address Database.

4.4.2. The Administrator must conduct a Class Member Address Search for all other Class Members whose checks are returned undelivered without USPS forwarding address. Within 7 days of receiving a returned check the Administrator must re-mail checks to the USPS forwarding address provided or to an address ascertained through the Class Member Address Search. The Administrator need not take further steps to deliver checks to Class Members whose re-mailed checks are returned as undelivered. The Administrator shall promptly send a replacement check to any Class Member whose original check was lost or misplaced, if so requested by the Class Member prior to the void date.

4.4.3. Participating Class Members will receive an Individual Settlement Payment. Individual Settlement Payment checks shall remain valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the date of their issuance. Thereafter, checks for such payments shall be canceled and funds associated with such checks shall be considered unpaid, unclaimed or abandoned cash residue pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 384 ("Unpaid Residue"). The Unpaid Residue plus accrued interest, if any, as provided in Code of Civil Procedure section 384, shall be transmitted as follows: to the Cy Pres Recipient, which is Rancho Cielo located at 710 Old Stage Road, Salinas, CA 93908. The P.O. Box designated for donations is: P.O. Box 6948, Salinas, CA 93912.

4.4.4. The payment of Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments shall not obligate Defendant to confer any additional benefits or make any additional payments to Class Members (such as 401(k) contributions or bonuses) beyond those specified in this Agreement.

5. RELEASE OF CLAIMS

Effective upon entry of Judgment, the Order granting Final Approval of this Settlement, and on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiff,

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

Class Members, and Class Counsel will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

5.1. Plaintiff's Release. As a condition to obtaining the Class Representative Service Payment provided for herein, Plaintiff and his or her respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns generally, release and discharge Released Parties from, settle with Released Parties on, compromise with Released Parties on, and relinquish all claims, rights, demands, damages, liabilities, causes of action, transactions, or occurrences, in law or in equity, including, but not limited to: (a) all claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged and/or pled, based on the facts contained, in the Operative Complaint, the Complaint in the Class Action, and/or the Complaint in the PAGA Action, and (b) all PAGA claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged and/or pled based on facts contained in the Operative Complaint, the Complaint in the PAGA Action, and/or Plaintiff's PAGA Notices, and (c) without limitation, all claims which in any way relate to his employment with Defendant, under State or Federal law, in tort, common law, statute, contract, or equity, whether pled in the Class Action, PAGA Action, or Operative Complaint, or not so pled, including but not limited to any claims under the FLSA, Title VII, ADA, FEHA, ADEA, PAGA, California Labor Code, or any Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order—now existing or arising in the future, based on any act, omission, event, occurrence, or nonoccurrence from the beginning of time to the date of execution hereof, except for those claims that may be prohibited by law. ("Plaintiff's Release.") Plaintiff's Release does not extend to any claims or actions to enforce this Agreement, or to any claims for vested benefits, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social security benefits, workers' compensation benefits that arose at any time, or based on occurrences outside the Class Period. Plaintiff acknowledges that Plaintiff may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiff now knows or believes to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that Plaintiff's Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiff's discovery of them.

5.1.1. Plaintiff's Waiver of Rights Under California Civil Code Section 1542. For purposes of Plaintiff's Release only, Plaintiff expressly waives and relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the California Civil Code,

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

which reads:

> A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect exists 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.

5.2. Release by Participating Class Members: For the duration of the Class Period, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release the Released Parties from, settle with Released Parties on, compromise with Released Parties on, and relinquish all claims, rights, demands, damages, liabilities, causes of action, transactions, or occurrences, in law or in equity, that were alleged and/or pled, or reasonably could have been alleged and/or pled, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint, and/or the Complaint in the Class Action, which claims, rights, demands, damages, liabilities, causes of action, transactions, or occurrences include but are not limited to: (1) failure to pay overtime; (2) failure to pay minimum wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to provide rest periods; (5) failure to pay all wages due upon termination; (6) wage statement violations; (7) failure to timely pay wages; (8) Violation of Labor Code § 2802; (9) Violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and (10) unfair competition.

5.3. Except as set forth in Section 5.2 of this Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period.

5.4. Release by Aggrieved Employees: For the duration of the PAGA Period, all Aggrieved Employees release, settle with Released Parties on, compromise with Released Parties on, and relinquish on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from all claims, rights, demands, damages, liabilities, causes of action, transactions, or occurrences, in law or in equity, for PAGA penalties that were alleged and/or pled, or reasonably could have

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

been alleged and/or pled, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint, the Complaint in the PAGA Action and the PAGA Notices.

6. MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

The Parties agree to jointly prepare and file a motion for preliminary approval ("Motion for Preliminary Approval") that complies with the Court's current checklist for Preliminary Approvals.

6.1. Parties' Declaration in Support of Preliminary Approval. The Parties agree that if the Court requires signed declarations from the Parties' Counsel disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with the Administrator and Cy Pres Recipient, the Parties will comply.

6.2. Plaintiff's Responsibilities. Plaintiff will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all documents necessary for obtaining Preliminary Approval, including: (i) a draft of the notice, and memorandum in support, of the Motion for Preliminary Approval that includes an analysis of the Settlement under *Dunk/Kullar* and a request for approval of the Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699, subd. (f)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of the Settlement; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from the Administrator attaching its "not to exceed" bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve; competency; operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data; amounts of insurance coverage for any data breach, defalcation of funds or other misfeasance; all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members; and the nature and extent of any financial relationship with Plaintiff, Class Counsel or Defense Counsel; (v) a signed declaration from Plaintiff confirming willingness and competency to serve and disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members; (v) a signed declaration from each Class Counsel firm attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members; its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (initial notice of violations (Labor Code section 2699.3, subd. (a)), Operative Complaint (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(1)), this Agreement (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(2)); and (vi) all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with Class

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

Members and the Administrator.

6.3. Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval after the full execution of this Agreement; complying with any existing hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and for appearing in Court to advocate in favor of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval to the Administrator.

6.4. Duty to Cooperate. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed Motion for Preliminary Approval and/or the supporting declarations and documents, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting and conferring, and in good faith, to resolve the disagreement. If the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval or conditions Preliminary Approval on any material change to this Agreement, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting and conferring, and in good faith, to modify the Agreement and otherwise satisfy the Court's concerns.

7. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

7.1. Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Phoenix Settlement Administrators ("Phoenix") to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Phoenix agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for payment of Administration Expenses. The Parties and their Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.

7.2. Employer Identification Number. The Administrator shall have and use its own Employer Identification Number for purposes of calculating payroll tax withholdings and providing reports state and federal tax authorities.

7.3. Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") under US Treasury Regulation section

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

468B-1.

7.4. Notice to Class Members

7.4.1. No later than three (3) business days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and state the number of Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, Workweeks, and Pay Periods in the Class Data.

7.4.2. Using best efforts to perform as soon as possible, and in no event later than 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will send to all Class Members identified in the Class Data, via first-class United States Postal Service ("USPS") mail, the Class Notice with Spanish translation, substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as Exhibit A. The first page of the Class Notice shall prominently estimate the dollar amounts of any Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment payable to the Class Member, and the number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if applicable) used to calculate these amounts. Before mailing Class Notices, the Administrator shall update Class Member addresses using the National Change of Address database.

7.4.3. Not later than 3 business days after the Administrator's receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.

7.4.4. The deadlines for Class Members' written objections, Challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods, and Requests for Exclusion will be extended an additional 15 days beyond the 45 days otherwise provided in the Class Notice for each and all Class Members whose notice is re-mailed. The Administrator will inform the Class Member of the extended deadline with the re-mailed Class Notice.

7.4.5. If the Administrator, Defendant or Class Counsel is contacted by or otherwise

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class Data and should have received Class Notice, the Parties will expeditiously meet and confer, and in good faith. in an effort to agree on whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class Members, and the Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than 15 days after receipt of Class Notice, or the deadline dates in the Class Notice, whichever are later.

7.5. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

7.5.1. Class Members who wish to exclude themselves (opt-out of) the Class Settlement must send the Administrator, by mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional 15 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed). A Request for Exclusion is a letter from a Class Member or his/her representative that reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the Settlement and includes the Class Member's name, address and email address or telephone number. To be valid, a Request for Exclusion must be timely postmarked by the Response Deadline.

7.5.2. The Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Administrator shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Administrator can reasonably ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member's desire to be excluded. The Administrator's determination shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. If the Administrator has reason to question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Administrator may demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Administrator's determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.

7.5.3. Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement, entitled

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the Participating Class Members' Releases under Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of this Agreement, regardless whether the Participating Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.

7.5.4. Every Class Member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion is a Non-Participating Class Member and shall not receive an Individual Class Payment or have the right to object to the class action components of the Settlement. Because future PAGA claims are subject to claim preclusion upon entry of the Judgment, Non-Participating Class Members who are Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release the claims identified in Paragraph 5.4 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment.

7.6. Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks. Each Class Member shall have 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional 15 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to challenge the number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if any) allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via mail. The Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member to submit supporting documentation. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Workweeks contained in the Class Notice are correct so long as they are consistent with the Class Data. The Administrator's determination of each Class Member's allocation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. The Administrator shall promptly provide copies of all challenges to calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination the challenges.

7.7. Objections to Settlement

7.7.1. Only Participating Class Members may object to the class action components of the Settlement and/or this Agreement, including contesting the fairness of the Settlement, and/or amounts requested for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Class Representative Service Payment.

7.7.2. Participating Class Members may send written objections to the Administrator, by mail. In the alternative, Participating Class Members may appear in Court (or hire an attorney to appear in Court) to present verbal objections at the Final Approval Hearing. A Participating Class Member who elects to send a written objection to the Administrator must do so not later than 45 days after the Administrator's mailing of the Class Notice (plus an additional 15 days for Class Members whose Class Notice was re-mailed).

7.7.3. Non-Participating Class Members have no right to object to any of the class action components of the Settlement.

7.8. Administrator's Duties. The Administrator has a duty to perform or observe all tasks to be performed or observed by the Administrator contained in this Agreement or otherwise.

7.8.1. Website, Email Address and Toll-Free Number. The Administrator will maintain and use an internet website to post information of interest to Class Members including the date, time and location for the Final Approval Hearing and copies of the Agreement, Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Preliminary Approval, the Class Notice, the Motion for Final Approval, the Motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and Class Representative Service Payment, the Final Approval and the Judgment. The Administrator will also maintain and monitor an email address and a toll-free telephone number to receive Class Member calls and emails.

7.8.2. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-outs) and Exclusion List. The Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than 5 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"); (b) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion; (c) copies of all Requests for Exclusion from Settlement submitted

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

(whether valid or invalid).

7.8.3. Weekly Reports. The Administrator must, on a weekly basis, provide written reports to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel that, among other things, tally the number of: Class Notices mailed or re-mailed, Class Notices returned undelivered, Requests for Exclusion (whether valid or invalid) received, objections received, challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods received and/or resolved, and checks mailed for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments ("Weekly Report"). The Weekly Reports must include provide the Administrator's assessment of the validity of Requests for Exclusion and attach copies of all Requests for Exclusion and objections received.

7.8.4. Workweek and/or Pay Period Challenges. The Administrator has the authority to address and make final decisions consistent with the terms of this Agreement on all Class Member challenges over the calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods. The Administrator's decision shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.

7.8.5. Administrator's Declaration. Before the date by which Plaintiff is required to file the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Administrator will provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its due diligence and compliance with all of its obligations under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, its mailing of Class Notice, the Class Notices returned as undelivered, the re-mailing of Class Notices, attempts to locate Class Members, the total number of Requests for Exclusion from Settlement it received (both valid or invalid), the number of written objections and attach the Exclusion List. The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration(s) in Court.

7.8.6. Final Report by Settlement Administrator. Within 10 days after the Administrator disburses all funds in the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing its disbursements by

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least 7 days before any deadline set by the Court, the Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration in Court.

7.8.7. Tax Forms. The Administrator shall be responsible for withholding all required state and federal taxes in accordance with this Agreement. The Administrator shall also be responsible for submitting Defendant's share of payroll taxes to the appropriate government agencies on behalf of Defendant.

7.9. Defendant's Right To Rescind**.** If more than eight (8) valid Requests for Exclusion are submitted from the Class Members, Defendant will have the right, but not the obligation, to revoke and void this Agreement at its discretion. Defendant shall make all reasonable efforts to meet and confer with Class Counsel prior to exercising this right. Defendant must exercise the option to rescind within five (5) business days of receiving written notice of the Requests for Exclusion from the Administrator. If Defendant exercises this right to rescind, Defendant shall pay any Administration Expenses Payment actually incurred by the Administrator up to the date of Defendant's notice to rescind. In the event the Agreement is terminated pursuant to this paragraph, the Parties shall proceed in all respects as if this Settlement is void. The Parties agree that they will not encourage any Class Member to object to the Settlement or to opt out.

8. CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES AND ESCALATOR CLAUSE

Based on its records, Defendant estimates that, as of the date of this Agreement, (1) there are 138 Class Members and 5,768 total Workweeks during the Class Period and (2) there are 93 Aggrieved Employees who worked 2,533 Pay Periods during the PAGA Period.

8.1. Increase in Workweeks. Defendant represents that its best estimate is that there are no more than 5,769 workweeks worked during the Class Period. In the event that the number of workweeks worked increases by more than 10% or an additional 577 workweeks worked, the release period shall be cut off as of the date that the 10% escalator clause is triggered. In no event

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

shall Defendant pay more than the GSA to fully and finally resolve all of Plaintiff's known and unknown claims, the Class Action, and the PAGA Action, and any other actions.

9. MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL

Prior to the calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiff will file in Court, a motion for final approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the Settlement under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l), a Proposed Final Approval Order and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiff shall endeavor to provide drafts of these documents to Defense Counsel prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer, and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval.

9.1. Response to Objections. Each Party retains the right to respond to any objection raised by a Participating Class Member, including the right to file responsive documents in Court no later than 5 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered or accepted by the Court.

9.2. Duty to Cooperate. If the Court does not grant Final Approval or conditions Final Approval on any material change to the Settlement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Class Members), the Parties will expeditiously work together in good faith to address the Court's concerns by revising the Agreement as necessary to obtain Final Approval. The Court's decision to award less than the amounts requested for the Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Administrator Expenses Payment and/or individual claims of plaintiff for alleged wrongful termination, shall not constitute a material modification to the Agreement within the meaning of this paragraph.

9.3. Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court. The Parties agree that, after entry of Judgment, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the Parties, Class Action, and the Settlement solely for purposes of (i) enforcing this Agreement and/or Judgment, (ii) addressing settlement administration matters, and (iii) addressing such post-Judgment matters as are permitted by law.

9.4. Waiver of Right to Appeal. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment reflected set forth in this Settlement, the Parties, their respective counsel, and all Participating Class Members who did not object to the Settlement as provided in this Agreement, waive all rights to appeal from the Judgment, including all rights to post-judgment and appellate proceedings, the right to file motions to vacate judgment, motions for new trial, extraordinary writs, and appeals. The waiver of appeal does not include any waiver of the right to oppose such motions, writs or appeals. If an objector appeals the Judgment, the Parties' obligations to perform under this Agreement will be suspended until such time as the appeal is finally resolved and the Judgment becomes final, except as to matters that do not affect the amount of the Net Settlement Amount.

9.5. Appellate Court Orders to Vacate, Reverse, or Materially Modify Judgment. If the reviewing Court vacates, reverses, or modifies the Judgment in a manner that requires a material modification of this Agreement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Class Members), this Agreement shall be null and void. The Parties shall nevertheless expeditiously work together in good faith to address the appellate court's concerns and to obtain Final Approval and entry of Judgment, sharing, on a 50-50 basis, any additional Administration Expenses reasonably incurred after remittitur. An appellate decision to vacate, reverse, or modify the Court's award of the Class Representative Service Payment or any payments to Class Counsel shall not constitute a material modification of the Judgment within the meaning of this paragraph, as long as the Gross Settlement Amount remains unchanged.

10. AMENDED JUDGMENT

If any amended judgment is required under Code of Civil Procedure section 384, the Parties will work together in good faith to jointly submit and a proposed amended judgment.

11. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

11.1. No Admission of Liability, Class Certification or Representative Manageability for Other Purposes. This Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or should be construed as an admission by Defendant that any of the allegations in the Operative Complaint have merit or that Defendant have any liability

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

for any claims asserted; nor should it be intended or construed as an admission by Plaintiff that Defendant's defenses in the Class Action or the PAGA Action have merit. The Parties agree that class certification and representative treatment is for purposes of this Settlement only. If, for any reason the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval, Final Approval or enter Judgment, any agreement by Defendant to class certification and representative treatment will be null and void, Defendant reserves the right to contest certification of any class for any reasons, and Defendant reserves all available defenses to the claims in the Class Action and the PAGA Action, and Plaintiff reserves the right to move for class certification on any grounds available and to contest Defendant's defenses. The Settlement, this Agreement and Parties' willingness to settle the Class Action and the PAGA Action will have no bearing on, and will not be admissible in connection with, any litigation (except for proceedings to enforce or effectuate the Settlement and this Agreement). Payment of wages does not extend or alter Plaintiff's or the Class Members' or the Aggrieved Employees' period of employment for any purpose.

11.2. Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval. Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel separately agree that, until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement is filed, they and each of them will not disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly, specifically or generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity except: (1) to the Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement confidential; (2) counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel separately agree not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any conversation or other communication, before the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, with any third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

Counsel's communications with Class Members or Aggrieved Employees in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members or Aggrieved Employees as appropriate, or nor does it restrict Defense Counsel's communications with Class Members or Aggrieved Employees in accordance with Defense Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members or Aggrieved Employees as appropriate.

11.3. No Solicitation. The Parties separately agree that they and their respective counsel and employees will not solicit any Class Member to opt out of or object to the Settlement, or appeal from the Judgment. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to restrict Class Counsel's ability to communicate with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

11.4. Indemnification. Plaintiff, Participating Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, and Class Counsel will be responsible for correctly characterizing their compensation for tax purposes and for paying any taxes on their amounts received. Plaintiff, Participating Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, and Class Counsel agree to indemnify Defendants for any liability incurred to any tax authority on account of Plaintiff, Participating Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, and/or Class Counsel's failure to pay all taxes due on the settlement proceeds, awarded attorneys' fees and costs, or any other amounts recorded on an IRS Form 1099.

11.5. Notice of Default. In the event that Defendant fails to pay the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with this Agreement, Plaintiffs shall provide notice to Defense Counsel and an opportunity to cure the default. Should Defendant fail to cure the default, any money paid through the date of default shall be retained by the Administrator and applied to satisfy the Judgment created by this Settlement.

11.6. Integrated Agreement. Upon execution by all Parties and their counsel, this Agreement together with its attached exhibits shall constitute the entire agreement between the Parties relating to the Settlement, superseding any and all oral representations, warranties, covenants, or inducements made to or by any Party.

11.7. Attorney Authorization. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

represent that they are authorized by Plaintiff and Defendant, respectively, to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any amendments to this Agreement.

11.8. Cooperation. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts, in good faith, to implement the Settlement by, among other things, modifying the Agreement, reallocating funds, submitting supplemental evidence and supplementing points and authorities as requested by the Court. In the event the Parties are unable to agree upon the form or content of any document necessary to implement the Settlement, or on any modification of the Agreement that may become necessary to implement the Settlement, the Parties will seek the assistance of a mediator and/or the Court for resolution. In no event shall Defendant pay more than the GSA to fully and finally resolve all of Plaintiff's known and unknown claims, the Class Action, and the PAGA Action, and any other actions.

11.9. No Prior Assignments. The Parties separately represent and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity and portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action, or right released and discharged by the Party in this Settlement.

11.10. No Tax Advice. Neither Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant nor Defense Counsel are providing any advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Settlement be relied upon as such within the meaning of United States Treasury Department Circular 230 (31 CFR Part 10, as amended) or otherwise.

11.11. Modification of Agreement. This Agreement, and all parts of it, may be amended, modified, changed, or waived only by an express written instrument signed or agreed to by all Parties or their representatives, and approved by the Court. Plaintiff and Defendant expressly agree that should the Parties agree to amend, modify, change, or waive this Agreement, or any part of it, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are authorized to submit to the Court any amendments of this Agreement, amended Agreements, or amendments to the Agreement, on behalf of the Parties once fully executed, which includes, but is not limited to, authorization of

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

the use of signatures previously provided by the Parties.

11.12. Agreement Binding on Successors. This Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors of each of the Parties.

11.13. Applicable Law. All terms and conditions of this Agreement and its exhibits will be governed by and interpreted according to the internal laws of the state of California, without regard to conflict of law principles.

11.14. Cooperation in Drafting. The Parties have cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Agreement. This Agreement will not be construed against any Party on the basis that the Party was the drafter or participated in the drafting

11.15. Confidentiality. To the extent permitted by law, all agreements made, and orders entered during the Class Action and the PAGA Action and in this Agreement relating to the confidentiality of information shall survive the execution of this Agreement.

11.16. Use of Class Data. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Cal. Evid. Code §1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by Defendant in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or in connection with the Settlement, may be used only with respect to this Settlement, and no other purpose, and may not be used in any way that violates any existing contractual agreement, statute, or rule of court.

11.17. Headings. The descriptive heading of any section or paragraph of this Agreement is inserted for convenience of reference only and does not constitute a part of this Agreement.

11.18. Calendar Days. Unless otherwise noted, all reference to "days" in this Agreement shall be to calendar days. In the event any date or deadline set forth in this Agreement falls on a weekend or federal legal holiday, such date or deadline shall be on the first business day thereafter.

11.19. Execution in Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts by facsimile, electronically (i.e., DocuSign), or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original. All executed counterparts and each of them will be deemed to be one and the same instrument if counsel for the Parties will exchange between themselves signed counterparts. Any executed counterpart will be admissible in evidence to prove the existence

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

and contents of this Agreement.

11.20. Stay of Litigation. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to CCP section 583.330 to extend the date to bring a case to trial under CCP section 583.310 for the entire period of this settlement process.

11.21. Severability. In the event that one or more of the provisions contained in this Agreement shall for any reason be held invalid, illegal, or unenforceable in any respect, such invalidity, illegality, or unenforceability shall in no way effect any other provision if Defendant's Counsel and Class Counsel, on behalf of the Parties and the Settlement Class, mutually elect in writing to proceed as if such invalid, illegal, or unenforceable provision had never been included in this Agreement.

11.22. Enforcement Action. This Agreement is enforceable under California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, and the Court shall retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms and provisions of this Agreement. In the event one or more of the parties to this Settlement Agreement institutes any legal action or other proceeding against any other party or parties to enforce the provisions of this Agreement or to declare rights or obligations under this Agreement, the successful party or parties shall be entitled to recover from the unsuccessful party or parties reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, including expert witness fees incurred in connection with any enforcement action(s). All such disputes shall be resolved by the Court.

[SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW]

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

IT IS SO AGREED:

	Signed by: Jeff Mink D37EE598CA90448...
Plaintiff, Rafael Lara Zavala	For Defendant, Naturipe Berry Growers, Inc.

AGREED AS TO FORM ONLY:

	Harrison Osaki
David D. Bibiyan Keaton Mendoza Counsel for Plaintiff	Anais Mora Harrison Osaki Counsel for Defendant

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

EXHIBIT A

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

NOTICE OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT AND DATE FOR FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

Zavala v. Naturipe Berry Growers Inc., et al.

(County of Monterey, California Superior Court Case No. 25CV002099)

As a current or former non-exempt hourly-paid California employee of Naturipe Berry Growers, Inc., you are entitled to receive money from a class action and PAGA settlement.

Please read this Notice carefully. This Notice relates to a proposed settlement of class action and PAGA litigation. If you are a Class Member, it contains important information about your right to receive a payment from the Settlement fund.

You have received this Notice of Class Action and PAGA Settlement because the records of Naturipe Berry Growers, Inc. ("Defendant"), show that you are a "Class Member" and, therefore, entitled to a payment from this class action and PAGA settlement. Class Members are all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant, either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the period from April 22, 2021, through September 18, 2026, or preliminary approval, whichever is later in the State of California ("Class Period").

- The settlement is to resolve a class action and PAGA lawsuit, *Zavala v. Naturipe Berry Growers Inc., et al.* pending in the Superior Court of California for the County of Monterey, Case Number 25CV002099 (the "Lawsuit"), which alleges that Defendant: (1) failure to pay overtime; (2) failure to pay minimum wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to provide rest periods; (5) failure to pay all wages due upon termination; (6) wage statement violations; (7) failure to timely pay wages; (8) Violation of Labor Code § 2802; (9) Violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and (9) unfair competition.

- Based on the alleged Labor Code violations above-mentioned and other alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff also seeks penalties under California Labor Code Private Attorneys' General Act ("PAGA"). PAGA authorizes employees to file lawsuits to recover civil penalties on behalf of themselves, other employees, and the State of California, for Labor Code violations.

- On _____, the County of Monterey Superior Court granted preliminary approval of this class action and PAGA settlement and conditionally certified a class action for the purposes of settlement only, ordered that all Class Members be notified of the Settlement. The Court has not made any determination of the validity of the claims in the Lawsuit. Defendant vigorously denies the claims in the Lawsuit and contends that it fully complied with all applicable laws.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT	
DO NOTHING AND RECEIVE PAYMENT	Get a payment and give up your legal rights to pursue claims released by the settlement of the Lawsuit.
OPT OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT	Exclude yourself from the Settlement, get no payment for settlement of the class claims, and retain your legal rights to individually pursue the class claims that would otherwise be released by the settlement of the Lawsuit. If you worked at any time from January 28, 2024, through

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

	the end of the Class Period, ("PAGA Period") as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee of Defendant, as well, then you will be deemed an "Aggrieved Employee" and you will still receive your share of the proceeds available from the settlement of the Released PAGA Claims, defined below, (your "Individual PAGA Payment") even if you opt out of the class settlement.
OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT	If you do not opt out, you may write to the Settlement Administrator, Phoenix Settlement Administrators, about why you object to the settlement, and they will forward your concerns to counsel which will then be provided to the Court. If the Court approves the Settlement despite your objection, you will still be bound by the Settlement. You or your attorney may also address the Court during the Final Approval Hearing scheduled for [DATE AND TIME] in Department 15 of the Monterey County Superior Court, located at 1200 Aguajito Road, Monterey, CA, 93940.

The Final Approval Hearing on the adequacy, reasonableness and fairness of the Settlement will be held at ___:___ __.m. on _____, in the Monterey County Superior Court, located at 1200 Aguajito Road, Monterey, CA, 93940, in Department 15. You are not required to attend the Hearing, but you are welcome to do so.

Why Am I Receiving This Notice?

Defendant's records show that you currently work, or previously worked, for Defendant as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee in the State of California at some point during the Class Period. You were sent this Class Notice because you have a right to know about a proposed settlement of a class action and PAGA lawsuit, and about all your options before the Court decides whether to finally approve the settlement. If the Court approves the settlement and then any objections and appeals are resolved, a "Settlement Administrator" appointed by the Court will make the payments described in this Notice. This Notice explains the Lawsuit, the settlement, your legal rights, what benefits are available, who is eligible for them and how to get them.

What is This Case About?

Rafael Lara Zavala was a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee of Defendant. He is the "Plaintiff" in this case and is suing on behalf of himself and Class Members for Defendant's alleged failure to pay overtime; failure to pay minimum wages; failure to provide meal periods; failure to provide rest periods; failure to pay all wages due upon termination; wage statement violations; failure to timely pay wages; violation of Labor Code § 2802; violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and unfair competition.

Based on the alleged Labor Code violations above-mentioned and other alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff also seeks penalties under California Labor Code Private Attorneys' General Act ("PAGA").

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

Defendant denies all the allegations made by Plaintiff and denies that it violated any law. The Court has made no ruling on the merits of Plaintiff's claims. The Court has only preliminarily approved this class action and PAGA settlement. The Court will decide whether to give final approval to this settlement at the Final Approval Hearing.

Summary of the Settlement Terms

Plaintiff and Defendant have agreed to settle this case on behalf of himself, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees for the Gross Settlement Amount of $200,000.00. The Gross Settlement includes: (1) Administration Costs up to $7,250.00; (2) a service award of up to $6,000 to Plaintiff for his time and effort in pursuing this case, and in exchange for a broader release of claims against Defendant; (3) not more than (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount in attorneys' fees which, unless escalated pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, amounts to $70,000.00; (4) up to $30,000.00 in litigation costs to Bibiyan Law Group ("Class Counsel"), according to proof; and (5) payment allocated to PAGA penalties in the amount of $30,000.00 of the Gross Settlement Amount toward PAGA penalties. Pursuant to the PAGA, sixty-five percent (65%) of the amount allocated toward PAGA, or $19,500.00, will be paid to the LWDA and thirty-five percent (35%), or $10,500.00, will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees. After deducting these sums, a total of approximately not less than $_____ will be available for distribution to Class Members ("Net Settlement Amount").

Defendant represents that its best estimate is that there are no more than 5,768 workweeks worked during the Class Period. In the event that the number of workweeks worked increases by more than 10% or an additional 577 workweeks worked, the release period shall be cut off as of the date that the 10% escalator clause is triggered. In no event shall Defendant pay more than the GSA to fully and finally resolve all of Plaintiff's known and unknown claims and the Actions.

Distribution to Class Members

Class Members who do not opt out will receive a *pro rata* payment of the Net Settlement Amount based on the number of weeks worked by Class Members in non-exempt, hourly-paid positions for Defendant in California during the Class Period ("Eligible Workweeks"). Specifically, Class Members' payments will be calculated by dividing the number of Eligible Workweeks attributed to the Class Member by all Eligible Workweeks attributed to members of the Settlement Class, multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount. Otherwise stated, the formula for a Class Member is: (Individual's Eligible Workweeks ÷ total Settlement Class Eligible Workweeks) x Net Settlement Amount. In addition, Class Members who worked during the PAGA Period (*i.e.*, Aggrieved Employees) will receive a *pro rata* share of the $10,500.00 allocated as PAGA penalties, whether or not they opt out, based on the number of pay periods worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period.

Defendant's records indicate that you worked [Eligible Workweeks] Workweeks as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee in California during the Class Period and [Eligible Workweeks] Workweeks during the PAGA Period. Based on these records, your estimated payment as a Class Member would be [$Estimated Award] and your estimated payment as an Aggrieved Employee would be [$Estimated Award].

Workweek Dispute

If you believe the number of Workweeks attributed to you is incorrect and wish to dispute it, you must mail a dispute to the Settlement Administrator no later than [RESPONSE DEADLINE]. Please include any documentation you have that you contend supports your dispute. The Settlement Administrator will provide

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

copies of all disputes to counsel for Defendant and shall immediately attempt to resolve all such disputes directly with relevant Settlement Class Member(s) with the assistance of Defendant's Counsel. The Parties will file with the Court any Workweek Disputes, any evidence provided by you, and any resolution of the dispute. The Court may review any decision made by the Parties or the settlement administrator regarding a Workweek Dispute

Tax Reporting

100% of the payments for PAGA penalties to Aggrieved Employees will be allocated as penalties reported on IRS Form 1099. 20% of each Settlement Payment to Class Members who do not opt out will be allocated as wages and reported on an IRS Form W-2, 40% will be allocated as penalties reported on IRS Form 1099, and 40% will be allocated as interest reported on IRS Form 1099. This notice is not intended to provide legal or tax advice on your Settlement Share.

Your check will be valid for 180 days after issuance. Thereafter, checks for such payments shall be canceled and funds associated with such checks shall be considered unpaid, unclaimed or abandoned cash residue pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 384 ("Unpaid Residue"). The Unpaid Residue plus accrued interest, if any, as provided in Code of Civil Procedure section 384, shall be transmitted as follows: to Rancho Cielo located at 710 Old Stage Road, Salinas, CA 93908. The P.O. Box designated for donations is: P.O. Box 6948, Salinas, CA 93912.

Your Options Under the Settlement

Option 1 – *Do Nothing and Receive Your Payment*

If you do not opt out, you are automatically entitled to your Individual Settlement Payment (*i.e.*, your share of the Net Settlement Amount) because you are a Class Member. If you do not dispute your settlement share calculation and do not opt out of the settlement, you will be bound by the entire release in the settlement and receive your Individual Settlement Payment, as well as your Individual PAGA Payment if you are also an Aggrieved Employee. **In other words, if you are a Class Member, you do not need to take any action to receive the settlement payment(s) set forth above**.

Class Members who do not submit a valid and timely opt out (pursuant to Option 2 below), will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all "Released Claims" he or she may have or had upon final approval of this Settlement and payment by Defendant to the Settlement Administrator.

Effective upon entry of Judgment, the Order granting Final Approval of this Settlement, and on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiff, Class Members, and Class Counsel will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:
For the duration of the Class Period, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release the Released Parties from, settle with Released Parties on, compromise with Released Parties on, and relinquish all claims, rights, demands, damages, liabilities, causes of action, transactions, or occurrences, in law or in equity, that were alleged and/or pled, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the amended Complaint in the Lawsuit ("Operative Complaint") and/or the original Complaint in the Lawsuit, including but not limited to: (1) failure to pay overtime; (2) failure to pay minimum wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to provide rest periods; (5) failure to pay all wages due upon termination; (6) wage statement violations;

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

(7) failure to timely pay wages; (8) Violation of Labor Code § 2802; (9) Violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and (10) unfair competition. (the "Class Released Claims").

For the duration of the PAGA Period, all Aggrieved Employees release, settle with Released Parties on, compromise with Released Parties on, and relinquish, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from all claims, rights, demands, damages, liabilities, causes of action, transactions, or occurrences, in law or in equity, for PAGA penalties that were alleged and/or pled, or reasonably could have been alleged and/or pled, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint, the Complaint in Plaintiff's representative action against Defendant, in Monterey Superior Court, Case No. 25CV006542, and Plaintiff's PAGA Notices ("Released PAGA Claims").

"Released Parties" means Defendant and each of its past and present parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, and agents and all of their respective employees, principals, managing agents, members, attorneys, officers, board members, directors, investors, shareholders, owners, partners, tax advisors, legal representatives, accountants, insurers, donors, trustees, administrators, real or alleged alter egos, real or alleged joint employers, predecessors, successors, purchasers, transferees, assigns, affiliates, and all other representatives of Defendant, individually and in their corporate or other representative capacities.

Option 2 – *Opt Out of the Settlement*

If you do not wish to receive your Individual Settlement Payment or release the Class Released Claims, you may exclude yourself by submitting a written request to be excluded from the Class. Your written request must reasonably communicate that you wish to be excluded from the Settlement and must include your name, address, signature, and email address or telephone number, and statement standing for the proposition that you do not wish to participate in the Settlement. Sign, date and mail your written request for exclusion to the address below.

[Administrator]
[Mailing Address]

Your written request for exclusion must be mailed and postmarked to the Administrator not later than [RESPONSE DEADLINE].

The proposed settlement includes the settlement of the PAGA Released Claims. An employee may not request exclusion from the settlement of a PAGA claim. Thus, if the court approves the settlement, then even if you request exclusion from the settlement, if you are an Aggrieved Employee, you will still receive your Individual PAGA Payment and will be deemed to have released the PAGA Released Claims. A request for exclusion will preserve your right, if any, to individually pursue only the Class Released Claims. Furthermore, you will be bound by the PAGA Released Claims even if you do not deposit your check.

Option 3 – *Submit an Objection to the Settlement*

If you wish to object to the Settlement, you may submit an objection in writing by mail, stating why you object to the Settlement. Your written objection must provide your name, address, signature, email address or telephone number, and any reason why you believe that the Court should not approve the Settlement. Your written objection must be mailed and postmarked to the Administrator no later than [RESPONSE DEADLINE]. Please note that you cannot both object to the Settlement and opt out of the Settlement. If you exclude yourself, then your objection will be overruled. If the Court overrules your objection, you will be bound by the Settlement and will receive your Settlement Share.

Questions? Contact the Settlement Administrator toll free at [PHONE NUMBER]

Docusign Envelope ID: F938FBE6-5A93-8E8D-81E0-E36F4ACD6EF9

Even if you don't submit a written objection, you may appear at the Final Approval Hearing and provide a verbal objection before the Court.

Final Approval Hearing

You may, if you wish, appear at the Final Approval Hearing set for _____ at ___:___ _.m. in the Department 15 of the Monterey County Superior Court, located at 1200 Aguajito Road, Monterey, CA, 93940, and orally object to the Settlement, discuss your written objections with the Court and the Parties, or otherwise comment on the Settlement at your own expense. You may attend this hearing virtually by audio or video at https://www.monterey.courts.ca.gov/. You may also retain an attorney to represent you at the Hearing at your own expense.

Additional Information

This Notice of Class Action and PAGA Settlement is only a summary of this case and the Settlement. For a more detailed statement of the matters involved in this case and the Settlement, you may call the Settlement Administrator at [PHONE NUMBER] or Class Counsel, whose information appears below:

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)
david@tomorrowlaw.com
Keaton Mendoza (SBN 321172)
kmendoza@tomorrowlaw.com
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

You may also visit the Settlement Administrator's website at [WEBSITE] to gain access to key documents in this case, including the Settlement Agreement, the Operative Complaint, the Class Notice, Order Granting Preliminary Approval of this Settlement, the Order Granting Final Approval of this Settlement, and the Final Judgment.

You may also refer to the pleadings, the Settlement Agreement, and other papers filed in this case, which may be inspected at Department 15 of the Monterey County Superior Court, located at 1200 Aguajito Road, Monterey, CA, 93940, during regular business hours of each court day. You may also obtain these documents through the Court's website at https://www.monterey.courts.ca.gov/

All inquiries by Class Members regarding this Notice of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and/or the Settlement should be directed to the Settlement Administrator.

PLEASE DO NOT CONTACT THE CLERK OF THE COURT, THE JUDGE, DEFENDANT, OR DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEYS WITH INQUIRIES.

Questions? Contact the Settlement Administrator toll free at [PHONE NUMBER]

EXHIBIT 2

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

1460 Westwood Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90024
310.438.5555 T
310.300.1705 F
www.tomorrowlaw.com

January 28, 2025

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: *Notice Letter of on Behalf of RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3*

Employer: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC
1611 Bunker Hill Way, Suite 200
Salinas, CA93906

NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC
1611 Bunker Hill Way, Suite 200
Salinas, CA93906

NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE FARMS, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter "PAGA Notice"). The $75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time this PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This PAGA Notice concerns Rafael Lara Zavala's ("Employee") employment with Employee's former employers: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC; NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC; NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC; NATURIPE FARMS, LLC; NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC; NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC. ("Employer").

Employee was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employer, at without limitation, 1611 Bunker Hill Way 2nd floor, Salinas, CA 93906, with duties that included, but were not limited to, sampling produce for quality control, from approximately May of 2008 through to approximately October of 2024. In connection with the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 201.5, 201.7, 202, 203, 203.5, 204, 204a, 205, 205.5, 210, 212, 221, 222, 223, 222.5, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 245, 246, 432, 432.3, 432.5, 432.7, 432.8, 1102.5, 1197.5, 1198, 1198.5, 1527, 3366, 3457, and 8397.4, Employee seeks to represent all employees of Employer, and each of them, as well as their parents, subsidiaries and affiliates (hereinafter, collectively, "Employer"). On all other claims mentioned herein, Employee seeks to represent only non-exempt employees of Employer. All employees that Employee seeks to represent, as detailed in this Paragraph, shall be referred to as "Aggrieved Employees". Moreover, the allegations herein shall encompass the "PAGA Period", which shall refer to three years preceding the date of this letter and continuing past the date of this Letter into perpetuity.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered Employer's violations of the Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of requiring its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages every day, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to come early to work and leave late work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Employer's control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to clock out for rest periods, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock, and/or go through security screenings and/or temperature checks off the clock; failing to include all forms of remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, mask allowances, gift cards and other forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay; detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked, for paying straight pay instead of overtime pay, for failing to pay overtime as required under Labor Code section 226.2, and by attempting but failing to properly implement an alternative workweek schedule ("AWS") (including, without limitation, by failing to implement a written agreement designating the regularly scheduled alternative workweek in which the specified number of work days and work hours are regularly recurring; failing to adopt the AWS in a secret ballot election, before the performance of work, by at least a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the affected employees in the work unit; failing to follow the notice/disclosures procedures prior to any AWS election; and/or failing to register an AWS election with the State of California, as required by Labor Code section 511 and applicable Wage Orders) all to the detriment of Employee and other Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 221, 222, 223, 226.2, 510, 511, 551, 552, 1194, 1198 (as it pertains

to employees governed by a collective bargaining agreement ["CBA"]), 1811, 1815 and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages, including, without limitation, at least one hour of unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employer's control every day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to come early to work and leave late work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Employer's control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to clock out for rest periods, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to undergo security checks and/or bag checks off the clock, to store and retrieve personal belongings off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls, receive and respond to emails and/or texts, or drive off-the-clock; detrimental rounding of employee time entries; editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked; ; failing to pay the minimum amounts required under Labor Code section 226.2; and failing to pay split shift premiums. In addition, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work, and did report, but were not put to work and/or were furnished less than half their usual or scheduled day's work without being paid for half the usual or scheduled work at their regular rate of pay. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 221, 222 (as it pertains to employees governed by a CBA), 223, 226.2, 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1475, 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for at least one unpaid hour of work per day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with

minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employer's control every day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to come early to work and leave late work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Employer's control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to clock out for rest periods, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to undergo security checks and/or bag checks off the clock, to store and retrieve personal belongings off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls, receive and respond to emails and/or texts, or drive off-the-clock; detrimental rounding of employee time entries; editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked; and failing to pay split shift premiums. In addition, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work, and did report, but were not put to work and/or were furnished less than half their usual or scheduled day's work without being paid for half the usual or scheduled work at their regular rate of pay. These acts and/or omissions violated Labor Code sections 1771, 1774 and 1198, and, thus Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to these sections and Labor Code section 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to every day work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, each workday, without limitation: by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that were recorded for less than thirty minutes, and meal periods that may appear on the record to be thirty minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes due to time required to walk to and from a suitable break area, time spent having to wait in line to clock back in, having to don and doff safety gear during the meal period, having to undergo security or bag checks during the meal period, and /or having to retrieve and store personal belongings during the meal period; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal periods; not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal periods; and auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which employees worked. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 221, 222 (as to employees governed by a CBA), 223, 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at

the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 221, 222 (for employees governed by a CBA), 223, 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation: by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes, or rest periods that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes due to, without limitation, due to time required to walk to and from a suitable break area, time spent having to don and doff safety gear during the rest period, having to retrieve and store personal belongings during the rest period, and/or having to undergo security or bag checks during the rest period, requiring that they be bundled together and/or with meal periods; interrupting them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during rest periods; not providing rest periods in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 221, 222 (for employees governed by a CBA), 223, 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of failing to maintain adequate temperatures which created excessive heat or humidity exposing Employee and Aggrieved Employees to temperature related hazards and/or comfortable working environments, as required under California Code of Regulations Title 8,

section 3396. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed to maintain temperatures at comfortable levels in violation of section 15 of the applicable Wage Orders, which requires temperature be maintained in each work area to be reasonably comfortable, consistent with industry-wide standards for the nature of the process and the work performed. Employer, as required by the same wage order provisions, also: failed and fails to take all feasible means to reduce excessive heat or humidity created by the work process to provide reasonable comfort; failed and fails to provide a heated room for Employee and Aggrieved Employees so that they may retire for warmth while maintaining such room at not less than 60 degrees; and/or failed and fails to maintain a temperature of not less than 68 degrees in toilet rooms, resting rooms, and change rooms during hours of use Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and fails to permit Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from taking cooldown periods every day as required under California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395; rest and recovery periods as required by Labor Code section 226.2; and premium pay in lieu thereof under Labor Code section 226.7. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Sections 3395 and 3396 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. In addition, for the failure each day of the PAGA Period by Employer to provide rest and recovery periods under Labor Code section 226.2, each Aggrieved Employee was owed compensation at a regularly hourly rate that is no less than the higher of the amounts set forth in Labor Code section 226.2(a)(3)(A)(i) or 226.2(a)(3)(A)(ii). However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7, and rest and recovery periods under Labor Code section 226.2(a)(3)(A) were not made for these non-compliant cooldown periods and/or rest and recovery periods, either at all or at the proper rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.7 and/or 1198. Employer would also be liable for its failures to provide comfortable levels of temperatures to employees under the wage orders, including Section 15 thereof. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 221, 222 (for employees governed by a CBA), 223, 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors under Labor Code section 1174, subsection (c), payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by, and applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective place

of employment under Labor Code section 1174, subsection (d), and a copy of the payroll record provided by the contractor under Labor Code section 1695.55, as well as the information required to be kept under Labor Code sections 2673 and/or 1776, subdivision (a), making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employer also failed to provide these documents to Employee and other Aggrieved Employees upon request in violation of these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198 and/or 1775, subdivision (b)(1). Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, 1695.55, 1198 and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policy or practice of failing to: accurately record time; failing to pay overtime and minimum wages; failing to provide meal periods; failing to provide rest periods; and failing to provide compensation in lieu of meal or rest periods, as described above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Aggrieved Employees, including, without limitation, Employee, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; the name of the employee and only the last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name and address of the other (and, in the case of a farm labor contractor, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer); and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), as well as Labor Code section 226.2 to the extent it does not include for piece-rate work the information required therein including, without limitation, the quantity, rate and units worked per piece, as well as separately itemized non-productive time and rest and recovery periods. Specifically, Employer intentionally failed to furnish employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect the hours worked by Employee and other Aggrieved Employees and the rates of pay at which they were or should have been paid (including due to failure to pay at the proper regular rate), thus resulting in a failure to reflect gross and net wages earned and paid at each rate, as well. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 226, 226.2, 1696.5 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 and 226.2 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 and 226.2 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226 and 226.2. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, 1198, 1696.5 and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or

oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; all paid sick leave, vacation pay and paid time off; and all premium pay owed as set out above, including, without limitation, for failure to pay at the proper regular rate of pay, among other things. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 201, 201.5, 201.7, 202 203, 203.5 ,204a, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5 and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 (or, as applicable, 203.5, 204a, 204.1, 204.2, 205 and/or 205.5) for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 203 (or 203.5 and/or 204a) were not made for these violations of Labor Code sections 201, 201.5, 201.7, 202, 203, 203.5, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205 and/or 205.5. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer required or requires the execution of a release of claim or right on account of wages due, or to become due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, including, without limitation, as a condition of being paid, to execute a statement of the hours worked during a pay period in which Employer knew to be false. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code sections 206.5 and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of unlawfully deducting wages from Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, by issuing in payment of wages due, or to become due, or as an advance on wages to be earned: (1) an order, check, draft, note, memorandum, gift card, or other acknowledgement of indebtedness, (unless it was negotiable and payable in cash, on demand, without discount, at some established place of business in the state), the name and address of which must but did not appear on the instrument, and at the time of its issuance and for a reasonable time thereafter, which must be but was not at least 30 days, the maker or drawer did not have sufficient funds in, or credit,

arrangement, or understanding with the drawee for its payment; and/or (2) any scrip, coupon cards, or other thing redeemable, in merchandise or purporting to be payable or redeemable otherwise than in money. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that such wages were not compensated at the "regular rate" of compensation as provided under Labor Code sections 226.7 and 510, subsection (a), thus violating those Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. In addition, Employee is informed and believes that Employer, by these deductions and/or otherwise, have caused wages earned by Employee and Aggrieved Employees to be charged back or kicked back to Employer. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and are entitled to relief under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 212, 221, 222 (as it pertains to employees governed by a CBA), 223, 226.7, 246, 510 subsection (a), 1194, and 1197. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Employer, the name of the employer, including any "doing business as" names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employer under Labor Code section 2810.5. Employee is informed and believes that failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Employer to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 2810.5 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Employer in connection with these violations' civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas), purchasing uniforms, providing uniform and other deposits, separately laundering mandatory uniforms, for the purchase of tools and safety

equipment, and for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, for pre-employment medical, physical or drivers' exams taken as a condition of employment, or for compelling or coercing Employee and Aggrieved Employees, including applicants, to patronize in the purchase of a value or things, including, without limitation, the Employer's product(s) and/or service(s), in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Employer, as required by Labor Code sections 222.5, 231, 450, 1198, 2800, 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer are liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to reimburse deposits made, including uniform deposits together with all interest owed at the separation of employment in violation of Labor Code sections 404 and 1198, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in the amount of the deposit and accrued interest. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Heathy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employee is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employee is further informed and believes that Employer also did not permit its use upon request by Employee and other Aggrieved Employees as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner without retaliation. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 222 (as it pertains to employees governed by a CBA), 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is thus informed and believes that Employer violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Employee

further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees their paid time off and vacation time owed upon separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code sections 221, 222 (as it pertains to employees governed by a CBA), 223, 227.3 and applicable Wage Orders. Employee is thus informed and believes that Employer violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of Labor Code section 227.3 under Labor Code section 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy of failing to provide all temporary workers, including without limitation, Employee, with owed wages weekly by not later than the regular payday of the following week. Employee is informed and believes that this has resulted in a violation of Labor Code sections 201.3 and 1198. As a result, pursuant to Labor Code section 201.3, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations thereto and Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 201.3, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had collected, taken, or received gratuities (or a part thereof) that is paid, given to, or left for Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by a patron, or deducted amounts from wages due to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees on account of a gratuity, or required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to credit the amount (or a part thereof) of a gratuity against and as part of the wages due to the Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees from the Employer. In addition, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer permits and/or permitted patrons to pay gratuities by credit card but failed to pay Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees the full amount of the gratuity that the patron indicated on the credit card slip, without any deductions, for any credit card payment processing fees that may be charged to the employer by the credit card company by not later than the regular payday following the date the patron authorized the credit card. In addition, Employer failed to keep accurate records of all gratuities received by Employer and made those open to inspection at all reasonable hours. Employee is informed and believes that this has resulted in a violation of Labor Code sections 351, 353, 1198. As a result, pursuant to Labor Code sections 351 and 353, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations thereto and Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 351, 353, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to provide all working employees, including without limitation Employee, with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer has failed to place an adequate number of seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and/or permitted Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties when employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of their work requires standing. Employee and other aggrieved employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee is informed and believes that this has resulted in a violation of Labor Code section 1198. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations thereto and Employer would be liable for civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge and experience they obtained at Employer for purposes of competing with Employer, including, without limitation, preventing Employee and Aggrieved Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Employer and under what circumstances that they might be

receptive to an offer from a rival employer. As such, Employee is informed and believes that this violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Employer to their managers or outside of Employer to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. In addition, Employee is informed and believes that these policies and/or practices prevent Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation of Labor Code sections 232, 232.5 and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations of the Labor Code, and as such, these violations would expose Employer to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including, without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes, without limitation, the exercise of Employee and other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and economic liberty and would thus expose Employer to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has made, adopted, and/or enforced rules, regulations and/or policies that tend to forbid or prevent Aggrieved Employees, including Employee, from engaging or participating in politics and/or from becoming a candidate for public office. Moreover, Employee is informed and believes, and based

thereon alleges that Employer coerced, influenced and/or attempted to coerce and/or influence Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, through or by means of threat of discharge and/or loss of employment, to adopt or follow or refrain from adopting or following a particular course or line of political action and/or political activity. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that in doing so, Employer has violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1101, 1102, 1102.5 and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations and are thus informed and believe that Employer is exposed to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employer (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, non-compete agreements, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, purported confidentiality agreements, purported severance agreements, or purported release agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employer. And, even more specifically, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of requiring Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to confidentiality policies that unlawfully restrain trade by prohibiting employees from speaking with prospective employers about their work with Employer, including but not limited to their wages and working conditions. Employer also required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Employer's restrictions of Employee's and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 432.5, 1700.31 and 1198. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, 1700.31 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of conducting unlawful background checks on prospective and current employees, including without limitation Employee, prior to making a conditional offer. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated applicable laws by, without limitation: requiring job applicants and employees to disclose their conviction history before Employer made a conditional offer of employment; inquiring into or considering the conviction history of applicants before Employer made any conditional offers of employment;

considering, distributing, or disseminating information about arrests not followed by conviction, referrals to or participation in a pretrial or posttrial diversion program, convictions that have been sealed, dismissed, expunged, or statutorily eradicated pursuant to law, or any conviction for which the convicted person has received a full pardon or has been issued a certificate of rehabilitation, while conducting conviction history background checks in connection with any applications for employment; intending to deny an applicant a position of employment solely or in part because of the applicant's conviction history; and asking applicants for employment to disclose, through any written form or verbally, information concerning or related to an arrest, detention, processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication, or court disposition that occurred while the person was subject to the process and jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to the detriment of Employee and other aggrieved employees. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, as well as violation of Labor Code section 1198, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.7 and 1198, as well as Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.7, 432.8, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of relying on the salary history information of an applicant for employment as a factor in determining whether to offer employment to an applicant or what salary to offer the applicant in violation of Labor Code section 432.3 by including, on Employer's application for employment, an inquiry regarding current and/or former salary history information, including, without limitation, compensation and benefits of the applicant for employment. Employee is informed and believes that this practice has resulted in unequal pay. Specifically, for this reason, as well as for other reasons, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has failed to pay its employees at wage rates less than those paid to employees of the opposite sex and/or another race or ethnicity for substantially similar work, when viewed as a composite of skill, effort, and responsibility, and/or performed under similar working conditions without sufficient legal rationale. Finally, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer has discharged and/or discriminated and/or retaliated against Employee and Aggrieved Employees by reason of an action taken by them to invoke or assist in the enforcement of Labor Code section 1197.5. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.3, 1102.5, 1197.5, and 1198. Employee also alleges that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.3, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer and others in connection with the Employer (including, without limitation, the owner of the property, controller, and others in concert with the Employer) employed, permitted and/or suffered to work minors under the age of sixteen (16) years in connection with a manufacturing establishment or other place of employment; in adjusting belts to machinery, sewing or lacing machine belts in a workshop or factory, and/or oiling, wiping, cleaning machinery and/or assisting therewith; in operating or assisting in operating machines, including circular or band saws, wood shapers, wood-jointers, planers, sandpaper machinery, wood-polishing machinery, wood turning or boring machinery, picker machines, machines used in picking wool, cotton, hair or other material, carding machines, leather-burnishing machines, laundry machines, printing-presses, boring or drill presses, stamping machines used in sheet-metal and tinware, in paper and leather manufacturing, in washer and nut factories, metal or paper-cutting machines, paper-lace machines, corner-staying machines in paper-box factories, corrugating rolls, dough brakes, cracker machinery, wire or iron straightening or drawing machinery, rolling mill machinery, power punches or shears, washing, grinding or mixing machinery, calendar rolls in paper and rubber manufacturing, steam boilers, and others, even in or out of proximity to hazardous or unguarded belts, machinery or gearing; and in occupations declared hazardous as set forth in Labor Code section 1293.1; all in violation of Labor Code sections 1290, 1292, 1293, 1294.1 and 1301. In addition, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Aggrieved Employees are covered by Labor Code section 1391, Educational Code 49112 and Educational Code 49116. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of requiring its employees, who are fifteen (15) years old or younger to work for more than eight (8) hours in one day of twenty-four (24) hours, and/or more than forty (40) hours in one week, and/or before 7:00 a.m. or after 7:00 p.m. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of, among other things, requiring its employees, who are fourteen (14) or (15) years old to work, while school is in session, for more than three hours in any schoolday and/or more than eighteen (18) hours in any week. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of, among other things, requiring its employees, who are sixteen (16) or seventeen (17) years old, to work for more than eight (8) hours in one day, and/or more than 48 hours in one week, and/or before 5 a.m., and/or after 10 p.m. on any day preceding a schoolday, and/or to work more than four (4) hours on a schoolday. Accordingly, for violations of Labor Code section 1391, *et seq.*, As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1290, 1292, 1293, 1294.1 and 1301, 1391 and 1198. Employee also alleges that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1290, 1292, 1293, 1294.1 and 1301, 1391 and 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

/ / /

Although notice is not required under Labor Code section 2699.3 to recover penalties under Labor Code section 226.8, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer willfully misclassified Employee and Aggrieved Employees as independent contractors and charged willfully misclassified independent contractors a fee, or made deductions from compensation for purposes that include, without limitation, goods, materials space, rental, services, government licenses, repairs, equipment maintenance, or fines arising from the individual's employment where these acts would have violated the law if the individual were not misclassified. As such, including the Labor Code sections described hereabove, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 226.8. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employer previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employer is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employer is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employer is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employer is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employee or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employer is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

Employee is further informed and believes that within 5 years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employer that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, and thus Employer is further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). Employer was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, and thus is subject to increased penalties, as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employer's conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employer thus is subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employer's receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employer to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

cc: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE FARMS, LLC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

1460 Westwood Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90024
310.438.5555 T
310.300.1705 F
www.tomorrowlaw.com

February 21, 2025

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: *Amended Notice Letter on Behalf of RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3*

Employer: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC
1611 Bunker Hill Way, Suite 200
Salinas, CA93906

NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC
1611 Bunker Hill Way, Suite 200
Salinas, CA93906

NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE FARMS, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter "PAGA Notice"). The $75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time the initial PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This amended PAGA Notice concerns RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA's ("Employee") employment with Employee's former employers NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC; NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC; NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC; NATURIPE FARMS, LLC; NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC; NATURIPE VALUE ADDED

FRESH, LLC. ("Employer"). Employee was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employer, at without limitation, 1611 Bunker Hill Way 2nd floor, Salinas, CA 93906, with duties that included, but were not limited to, sampling produce for quality control, from approximately May of 2008 through to approximately October of 2024. Employee seeks to represent non-exempt employees of Employer, "and each of them", as further set forth below. All employees that Employee seeks to represent, as detailed in this Paragraph, shall be referred to as "Aggrieved Employees". Moreover, the allegations herein shall encompass the "PAGA Period", which shall refer to three years preceding the date of this letter and continuing past the date of this Letter into perpetuity.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered Employer's violations of the Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of requiring its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages every day, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock. In addition, Employer failed to pay at the proper overtime include all forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay. Moreover, from the information provided by Employer, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employer failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees less hours than actually worked. These practices were all to the detriment of Employee and other Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 223, 551, 552, 1194, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages, including, without limitation, unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employer's control each day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock. Moreover, from the information provided by Employer, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employer failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees less hours than actually worked. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders

based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for work each day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699€(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to every day work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, each workday, without limitation failure to provide a suitable break area; by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that were recorded for less than thirty minutes, and meal periods that may appear on the record to be thirty minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal periods; and auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which employees worked. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation; by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide a suitable rest facility; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes

in length, including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes, or rest periods that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes due to, without limitation, interrupting them; not providing rest periods in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of failing to permit Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from taking cooldown periods every day as required under California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395; and premium pay in lieu thereof under Labor Code section 226.7. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 221, 223, 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policies or practices, Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Aggrieved Employees, including, without limitation, Employee, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employer refused to provide Employee's personnel file on January 27, 2025, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is informed

and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer required or requires the execution of a release of claim or right on account of wages due, or to become due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, including, without limitation, as a condition of being paid, to execute a statement of the hours worked during a pay period in which Employer knew to be false. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code sections 206.5 and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employer refused to provide Employee's personnel file on January 27, 2025, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Employer, the name of the employer, including any "doing business as" names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employer under Labor Code section 2810.5. Employee is informed and believes that failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Employer to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 2810.5 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Employer in connection with these violations' civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer are liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's

conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Heathy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employee is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employee is further informed and believes that Employer also did not permit its use upon request by Employee and other Aggrieved Employees as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner without retaliation. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is thus informed and believes that Employer violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and

2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge and experience they obtained at Employer for purposes of competing with Employer, including, without limitation, preventing Employee and Aggrieved Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Employer and under what circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. As such, Employee is informed and believes that this violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Employer to their managers or outside of Employer to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. In addition, Employee is informed and believes that these policies and/or practices prevent Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation of Labor Code sections 232, 232.5 and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations of the Labor Code, and as such, these violations would expose Employer to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state statutes entitling

employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including, without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes, without limitation, the exercise of Employee and other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and economic liberty and would thus expose Employer to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employer (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, non-compete agreements, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, purported confidentiality agreements, purported severance agreements, or purported release agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employer. Employer also required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Employer's restrictions of Employee's and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 432.5 and 1198. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of conducting unlawful background checks on prospective and current employees, including without limitation Employee, prior to making a conditional offer. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated applicable laws by, without limitation: requiring job applicants and employees to disclose their conviction history before Employer made a conditional offer of employment; inquiring into or considering the conviction history of applicants before Employer made any conditional offers of employment; considering, distributing, or disseminating information about arrests not followed by conviction, referrals to or participation in a pretrial or posttrial diversion program, convictions that have been

sealed, dismissed, expunged, or statutorily eradicated pursuant to law, or any conviction for which the convicted person has received a full pardon or has been issued a certificate of rehabilitation, while conducting conviction history background checks in connection with any applications for employment; intending to deny an applicant a position of employment solely or in part because of the applicant's conviction history; and asking applicants for employment to disclose, through any written form or verbally, information concerning or related to an arrest, detention, processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication, or court disposition that occurred while the person was subject to the process and jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to the detriment of Employee and other aggrieved employees. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, as well as violation of Labor Code section 1198, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.7 and 1198, as well as Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.7, 432.8, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of relying on the salary history information of an applicant for employment as a factor in determining whether to offer employment to an applicant or what salary to offer the applicant in violation of Labor Code section 432.3 by including, on Employer's application for employment, an inquiry regarding current and/or former salary history information, including, without limitation, compensation and benefits of the applicant for employment. Employee is informed and believes that this practice has resulted in unequal pay. Specifically, for this reason, as well as for other reasons, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has failed to pay its employees at wage rates less than those paid to employees of the opposite sex and/or another race or ethnicity for substantially similar work, when viewed as a composite of skill, effort, and responsibility, and/or performed under similar working conditions without sufficient legal rationale. Finally, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer has discharged and/or discriminated and/or retaliated against Employee and Aggrieved Employees by reason of an action taken by them to invoke or assist in the enforcement of Labor Code section 1197.5. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.3, 1102.5, 1197.5, and 1198. Employee also alleges that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.3, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employer previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employer is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employer is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employer is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employer is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employee or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employer is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If within 5 years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employer that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employer would be further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). To the extent Employer was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, Employer would thus be subject to increased penalties, as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employer's conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employer thus is subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employer's receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employer to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ David D. Bibiyan

David D. Bibiyan

cc: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE FARMS, LLC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

1460 Westwood Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90024
310.438.5555 T
310.300.1705 F
www.tomorrowlaw.com

April 1, 2025

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: *Second Amended Notice Letter on Behalf of RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3*

Employer: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC
1611 Bunker Hill Way, Suite 200
Salinas, CA93906

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter "PAGA Notice"). The $75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time the initial PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This second amended PAGA Notice concerns RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA's ("Employee") employment with Employee's former employer NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC. ("Employer"). Employee was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employer, at without limitation, 1611 Bunker Hill Way 2nd floor, Salinas, CA 93906, with duties that included, but were not limited to, sampling produce for quality control, from approximately May of 2008 through to approximately October of 2024. Employee seeks to represent non-exempt employees of Employer, as further set forth below. All employees that Employee seeks to represent, as detailed in this Paragraph, shall be referred to as "Aggrieved Employees". Moreover, the allegations herein shall encompass the "PAGA Period", which shall refer to three years preceding the date of this letter and continuing past the date of this Letter into perpetuity.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered Employer's violations of the Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of requiring its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages every day, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock. In addition, Employer failed to pay at the proper overtime include all forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay. Moreover, from the information provided by Employer, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employer failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees less hours than actually worked. These practices were all to the detriment

of Employee and other Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 223, 551, 552, 1194, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages, including, without limitation, unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employer's control each day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock. Moreover, from the information provided by Employer, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employer failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees less hours than actually worked. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for work each day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699€(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to every day work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, each workday, without limitation failure to provide a suitable break area; by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that were recorded for less than thirty minutes, and meal periods that may appear on the record to be thirty minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal periods; and auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which employees worked. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed

and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation; by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide a suitable rest facility; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes, or rest periods that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes due to, without limitation, interrupting them; not providing rest periods in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of failing to permit Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from taking cooldown periods every day as required under California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section

3395; and premium pay in lieu thereof under Labor Code section 226.7. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 221, 223, 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policies or practices, Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Aggrieved Employees, including, without limitation, Employee, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k).

Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employer refused to provide Employee's personnel file on January 27, 2025, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer required or requires the execution of a release of claim or right on account of wages due, or to become due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, including, without limitation, as a condition of being paid, to execute a statement of the hours worked during a pay period in which Employer knew to be false. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code sections 206.5 and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employer refused to provide Employee's personnel file on January 27, 2025, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Employer, the name of the employer, including any "doing business as" names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employer

under Labor Code section 2810.5. Employee is informed and believes that failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Employer to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 2810.5 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Employer in connection with these violations' civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer are liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Heathy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employee is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employee is further informed and believes that Employer also did not permit its use upon request by Employee and other Aggrieved Employees as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner without retaliation. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is thus informed and believes that Employer violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that

Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge and experience they obtained at Employer for purposes of competing with Employer, including, without limitation, preventing Employee and Aggrieved Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Employer and under what circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. As such, Employee is informed and believes that this violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer

had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Employer to their managers or outside of Employer to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. In addition, Employee is informed and believes that these policies and/or practices prevent Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation of Labor Code sections 232, 232.5 and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations of the Labor Code, and as such, these violations would expose Employer to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including, without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes, without limitation, the exercise of Employee and other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and economic liberty and would thus expose Employer to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employer (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, non-compete agreements, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, purported confidentiality agreements, purported severance agreements, or purported release agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employer. Employer also required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Employer's restrictions of Employee's and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 432.5 and 1198. As such, Employee is informed and

believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of conducting unlawful background checks on prospective and current employees, including without limitation Employee, prior to making a conditional offer. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated applicable laws by, without limitation: requiring job applicants and employees to disclose their conviction history before Employer made a conditional offer of employment; inquiring into or considering the conviction history of applicants before Employer made any conditional offers of employment; considering, distributing, or disseminating information about arrests not followed by conviction, referrals to or participation in a pretrial or posttrial diversion program, convictions that have been sealed, dismissed, expunged, or statutorily eradicated pursuant to law, or any conviction for which the convicted person has received a full pardon or has been issued a certificate of rehabilitation, while conducting conviction history background checks in connection with any applications for employment; intending to deny an applicant a position of employment solely or in part because of the applicant's conviction history; and asking applicants for employment to disclose, through any written form or verbally, information concerning or related to an arrest, detention, processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication, or court disposition that occurred while the person was subject to the process and jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to the detriment of Employee and other aggrieved employees. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, as well as violation of Labor Code section 1198, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.7 and 1198, as well as Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.7, 432.8, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of relying on the salary history information of an applicant for employment as a factor in determining whether to offer employment to an applicant or what salary to offer the applicant in violation of Labor Code section 432.3 by including, on Employer's

application for employment, an inquiry regarding current and/or former salary history information, including, without limitation, compensation and benefits of the applicant for employment. Employee is informed and believes that this practice has resulted in unequal pay. Specifically, for this reason, as well as for other reasons, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has failed to pay its employees at wage rates less than those paid to employees of the opposite sex and/or another race or ethnicity for substantially similar work, when viewed as a composite of skill, effort, and responsibility, and/or performed under similar working conditions without sufficient legal rationale. Finally, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer has discharged and/or discriminated and/or retaliated against Employee and Aggrieved Employees by reason of an action taken by them to invoke or assist in the enforcement of Labor Code section 1197.5. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.3, 1102.5, 1197.5, and 1198. Employee also alleges that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.3, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employer previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employer is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employer is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employer is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employer is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employee or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employer is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If within 5 years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employer that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employer would be further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). To the extent Employer was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, Employer would thus be subject to increased penalties,

as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employer's conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employer thus is subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employer's receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employer to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ David D. Bibiyan

David D. Bibiyan

cc: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

1460 Westwood Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90024
310.438.5555 T
310.300.1705 F
www.tomorrowlaw.com

October 13, 2025

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: *Third Amended Notice Letter on Behalf of RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3*

Employers: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC
1611 Bunker Hill Way, Suite 200
Salinas, CA93906

NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC
1611 Bunker Hill Way, Suite 200
Salinas, CA93906

NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE FARMS, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC
9450 Corkscrew Palms Circle Suite 202
Estero, FL33928

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter "PAGA Notice"). The $75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time the initial PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This third amended PAGA Notice concerns RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA's ("Employee") employment with Employee's former employers NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC.,

NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC, NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC., NATURIPE FARMS, LLC, NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC., and NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC ("Employers"). All Employers except NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC. were inadvertently removed when Employee filed his Second Amended PAGA Notice. Employee was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employers, at without limitation, 1611 Bunker Hill Way 2nd floor, Salinas, CA 93906, with duties that included, but were not limited to, sampling produce for quality control, from approximately May of 2008 through to approximately October of 2024. Employee seeks to represent non-exempt employees of Employers, as further set forth below. All employees that Employee seeks to represent, as detailed in this Paragraph, shall be referred to as "Aggrieved Employees". Moreover, the allegations herein shall encompass the "PAGA Period", which shall refer to three years preceding the date of this letter and continuing past the date of this Letter into perpetuity.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered Employers' violations of the Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a policy or practice of requiring its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages every day, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock. In addition, Employers failed to pay at the proper overtime include all forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay. Moreover, from the information provided by Employers, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employers failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees less hours than actually worked. These practices were all to the detriment of Employee and other Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 223, 551, 552, 1194, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages, including, without limitation, unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employers' control each day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock. Moreover, from the information provided by Employers, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employers failed

to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees less hours than actually worked. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for work each day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a policy or practice of compelling its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to every day work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, each workday, without limitation failure to provide a suitable break area; by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that were recorded for less than thirty minutes, and meal periods that may appear on the record to be thirty minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal periods; and auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which employees worked. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers maintains policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted,

timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation; by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide a suitable rest facility; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes, or rest periods that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes due to, without limitation, interrupting them; not providing rest periods in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers maintains policies or practices of failing to permit Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from taking cooldown periods every day as required under California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395; and premium pay in lieu thereof under Labor Code section 226.7. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 221, 223, 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code

section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employers' herein-described policies or practices, Employers also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Aggrieved Employees, including, without limitation, Employee, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employers refused to provide Employee's personnel file on January 27, 2025, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers required or requires the execution of a release of claim or right on account of wages due, or to become due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, including, without limitation, as a condition of being paid, to execute a statement of the hours worked during a pay period in which Employers knew to be false. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers violated Labor Code sections 206.5 and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employers refused to provide Employee's personnel file on January 27, 2025, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Employers, the name of the employers, including any "doing business as" names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employers under Labor Code section 2810.5. Employee is informed and believes that failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Employers to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 2810.5 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is informed and believes that Employers violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Employers in connection with these violations' civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other

Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employers are liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. In addition, Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Heathy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.,* including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employee is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employee is further informed and believes that Employers also did not permit its use upon request by Employee and other Aggrieved Employees as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner without retaliation. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is thus informed and believes that Employers violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employers would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employers did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations

was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge and experience they obtained at Employers for purposes of competing with Employers, including, without limitation, preventing Employee and Aggrieved Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with a prospective employers, and from disclosing who else works at Employers and under what circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employers. As such, Employee is informed and believes that this violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Employers to their managers or outside of Employers to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. In addition, Employee is informed and believes that these policies and/or practices prevent Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation of Labor Code sections 232, 232.5 and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations of the Labor Code, and as such, these violations would expose Employers to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers

had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including, without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes, without limitation, the exercise of Employee and other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and economic liberty and would thus expose Employers to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employers (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, non-compete agreements, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, purported confidentiality agreements, purported severance agreements, or purported release agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employers. Employers also required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Employers' restrictions of Employee's and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Employee is informed and believes that Employers violated Labor Code sections 432.5 and 1198. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a practice or policy of conducting unlawful background checks on prospective and current employees, including without limitation Employee, prior to making a conditional offer. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated applicable laws by, without limitation: requiring job applicants and employees to disclose their conviction history before Employers made a conditional offer of employment; inquiring into or considering the conviction history of applicants before Employers made any conditional offers of employment;

considering, distributing, or disseminating information about arrests not followed by conviction, referrals to or participation in a pretrial or posttrial diversion program, convictions that have been sealed, dismissed, expunged, or statutorily eradicated pursuant to law, or any conviction for which the convicted person has received a full pardon or has been issued a certificate of rehabilitation, while conducting conviction history background checks in connection with any applications for employment; intending to deny an applicant a position of employment solely or in part because of the applicant's conviction history; and asking applicants for employment to disclose, through any written form or verbally, information concerning or related to an arrest, detention, processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication, or court disposition that occurred while the person was subject to the process and jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to the detriment of Employee and other aggrieved employees. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, as well as violation of Labor Code section 1198, and that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.7 and 1198, as well as Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.7, 432.8, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a practice or policy of relying on the salary history information of an applicant for employment as a factor in determining whether to offer employment to an applicant or what salary to offer the applicant in violation of Labor Code section 432.3 by including, on Employers' application for employment, an inquiry regarding current and/or former salary history information, including, without limitation, compensation and benefits of the applicant for employment. Employee is informed and believes that this practice has resulted in unequal pay. Specifically, for this reason, as well as for other reasons, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers has failed to pay its employees at wage rates less than those paid to employees of the opposite sex and/or another race or ethnicity for substantially similar work, when viewed as a composite of skill, effort, and responsibility, and/or performed under similar working conditions without sufficient legal rationale. Finally, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers has discharged and/or discriminated and/or retaliated against Employee and Aggrieved Employees by reason of an action taken by them to invoke or assist in the enforcement of Labor Code section 1197.5. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.3, 1102.5, 1197.5, and 1198. Employee also alleges that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.3, 1198

and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employers previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employers is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employers is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employers is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employers is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employee or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employers is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employers is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employers is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If within 5 years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employers that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employers would be further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). To the extent Employers was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, Employers would thus be subject to increased penalties, as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employers' conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employers thus is subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employers' receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employers to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Sarah H. Cohen

Sarah H. Cohen

cc: NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC., NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC, NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC., NATURIPE FARMS, LLC, NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC., and NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC (via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

1460 Westwood Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90024
310.438.5555 T
310.300.1705 F
www.tomorrowlaw.com

February 12, 2026

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: *Fourth Amended Notice Letter on Behalf of RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3*

Employers:

NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC.
1611 Bunker Hill Way, Suite 200
Salinas, CA93906
(CMRR Tracking # 9414809898643578092404)

NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC.,
c/o JEFF MINK
1611 BUNKER HILL WAY, SUITE 200
SALINAS, CA 93906
(CMRR Tracking #
9414809898643578092794)

NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC
9450 CORKSCREW PALMS CIR STE 202
ESTERO, FL33928
(CMRR Tracking # 9414809898643578092831)

NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC
c/o Jerry Moran
1812 CABO CT.
APTOS, CA 95003
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643578092893)

NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC.
9450 CORKSCREW PALMS CIR STE 202
ESTERO, FL33928
(CMRR Tracking #9414809898643578092930)

NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC.
c/o GONZALO CANESSA
950 INDUSTRIAL AVENUE SUITE 5
OXNARD, CA 93030
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643078509280)

NATURIPE FARMS, LLC.
9450 CORKSCREW PALMS CIR STE 202
ESTERO, FL33928
(CMRR Tracking #9414809898643078509235)

NATURIPE FARMS, LLC.
c/o Jerry Moran
1611 BUNKER HILL WAY #250
SALINAS, CA 93906
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643578093012)

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC
9450 CORKSCREW PALMS CIR STE 202
ESTERO, FL33928
(CMRR Tracking #9414809898643578093319)

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC
c/o Jerry Moran
1611 BUNKER HILL WAY #250
SALINAS, CA 93906
(CMRR Tracking #
9414809898643578093241)

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC
9450 CORKSCREW PALMS CIR STE 202
ESTERO, FL33928
(CMRR Tracking #9414809898643578093111)

NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC
c/o Jerry Moran
1812 CABO CT.
APTOS, CA 95003
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643578093470)

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter "PAGA Notice"). The $75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time the initial PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This fourth amended PAGA Notice concerns RAFAEL LARA ZAVALA's ("Employee") employment with Employee's former employers NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC., NATURIPE AVOCADO FARMS LLC, NATURIPE FARMS IMPORTS, INC., NATURIPE FARMS, LLC, NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FOODS, LLC., and NATURIPE VALUE ADDED FRESH, LLC ("Employers"). All Employers except NATURIPE BERRY GROWERS, INC. were inadvertently removed when Employee filed his Second Amended PAGA Notice. Employee was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employers, at without limitation, 1611 Bunker Hill Way 2nd floor, Salinas, CA 93906, with duties that included, but were not limited to, sampling produce for quality control, from approximately May of 2008 through to approximately October of 2024. Employee seeks to represent non-exempt employees of Employers, as further set forth below. All employees that Employee seeks to represent, as detailed in this Paragraph, shall be referred to as "Aggrieved Employees". Moreover, the allegations herein shall encompass the "PAGA Period", which shall refer to three years preceding the date of this letter and continuing past the date of this Letter into perpetuity.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered Employers' violations of the Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a policy or practice of requiring its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages every day, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or

permitting employees to work off the clock. In addition, Employers failed to pay at the proper overtime include all forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay. Moreover, from the information provided by Employers, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employers failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees less hours than actually worked. These practices were all to the detriment of Employee and other Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 223, 551, 552, 1194, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages, including, without limitation, unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employers' control each day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock. Moreover, from the information provided by Employers, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employers failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees less hours than actually worked. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for work each day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a policy or practice of compelling its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to every day work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, each workday, without limitation failure to provide a suitable break area; by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods;

providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that were recorded for less than thirty minutes, and meal periods that may appear on the record to be thirty minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal periods; and auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which employees worked. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers maintains policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation; by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide a suitable rest facility; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes, or rest periods that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes due to, without limitation, interrupting them; not providing rest periods in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.

Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers maintains policies or practices of failing to permit Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from taking cooldown periods every day as required under California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395; and premium pay in lieu thereof under Labor Code section 226.7. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 221, 223, 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employers' herein-described policies or practices, Employers also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Aggrieved Employees, including, without limitation, Employee, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is

informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employers refused to provide Employee's personnel file on January 27, 2025, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers required or requires the execution of a release of claim or right on account of wages due, or to become due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, including, without limitation, as a condition of being paid, to execute a statement of the hours worked during a pay period in which Employers knew to be false. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers violated Labor Code sections 206.5 and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employers refused to provide Employee's personnel file on January 27, 2025, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the

Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Employers, the name of the employers, including any "doing business as" names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employers under Labor Code section 2810.5. Employee is informed and believes that failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Employers to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 2810.5 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is informed and believes that Employers violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Employers in connection with these violations' civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employers are liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. In addition, Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Heathy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employee is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employee is further informed and believes that Employers also did not permit its use upon request by Employee and other Aggrieved Employees as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner without retaliation. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory

payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is thus informed and believes that Employers violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employers would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employers did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge and experience they obtained at Employers for purposes of competing with Employers, including, without limitation, preventing Employee and Aggrieved Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with a prospective employers, and from disclosing who else works at Employers and under what circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employers. As such, Employee is informed and believes that this violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or

injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Employers to their managers or outside of Employers to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. In addition, Employee is informed and believes that these policies and/or practices prevent Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation of Labor Code sections 232, 232.5 and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations of the Labor Code, and as such, these violations would expose Employers to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including, without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes, without limitation, the exercise of Employee and other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and economic liberty and would thus expose Employers to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employers (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, non-compete agreements, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration

agreements, purported confidentiality agreements, purported severance agreements, or purported release agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employers. Employers also required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Employers' restrictions of Employee's and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Employee is informed and believes that Employers violated Labor Code sections 432.5 and 1198. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a practice or policy of conducting unlawful background checks on prospective and current employees, including without limitation Employee, prior to making a conditional offer. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated applicable laws by, without limitation: requiring job applicants and employees to disclose their conviction history before Employers made a conditional offer of employment; inquiring into or considering the conviction history of applicants before Employers made any conditional offers of employment; considering, distributing, or disseminating information about arrests not followed by conviction, referrals to or participation in a pretrial or posttrial diversion program, convictions that have been sealed, dismissed, expunged, or statutorily eradicated pursuant to law, or any conviction for which the convicted person has received a full pardon or has been issued a certificate of rehabilitation, while conducting conviction history background checks in connection with any applications for employment; intending to deny an applicant a position of employment solely or in part because of the applicant's conviction history; and asking applicants for employment to disclose, through any written form or verbally, information concerning or related to an arrest, detention, processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication, or court disposition that occurred while the person was subject to the process and jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to the detriment of Employee and other aggrieved employees. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, as well as violation of Labor Code section 1198, and that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.7 and 1198, as well as Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.7, 432.8, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employers did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and has a practice or policy of relying on the salary history information of an applicant for employment as a factor in determining whether to offer employment to an applicant or what salary to offer the applicant in violation of Labor Code section 432.3 by including, on Employers' application for employment, an inquiry regarding current and/or former salary history information, including, without limitation, compensation and benefits of the applicant for employment. Employee is informed and believes that this practice has resulted in unequal pay. Specifically, for this reason, as well as for other reasons, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers has failed to pay its employees at wage rates less than those paid to employees of the opposite sex and/or another race or ethnicity for substantially similar work, when viewed as a composite of skill, effort, and responsibility, and/or performed under similar working conditions without sufficient legal rationale. Finally, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers has discharged and/or discriminated and/or retaliated against Employee and Aggrieved Employees by reason of an action taken by them to invoke or assist in the enforcement of Labor Code section 1197.5. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 432.3, 1102.5, 1197.5, and 1198. Employee also alleges that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.3, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employers previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employers is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employers is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employers is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employers is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employee or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employers is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employers is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employers is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If within 5 years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employers that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employers would be further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). To the extent Employers was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, Employers would thus be subject to increased penalties, as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employers' conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employers thus is subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employers' receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employers to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Sarah H. Cohen

Sarah H. Cohen

EXHIBIT 3