John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Emily Borman (SBN 303180)
emily.borman@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lisa B. Iturriaga (SBN 339678)
lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

BONNIE DEVERA, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, vs. MAXZONE VEHICLE LIGHTING CORP., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. CIVSB2502838 *Assigned for all purposes to:* *Hon. Thomas S. Garza* *Dept. S27* **DECLARATION OF JOHN G. YSLAS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT** PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING Date: September 2, 2026 Time: 8:30 a.m. Dept.: S27

DECLARATION OF JOHN G. YSLAS

I, John G. Yslas, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice before all of the courts of the State of California. I am a Senior Partner at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC ("WLF"), counsel for Plaintiff Bonnie Devera ("Plaintiff") in this matter. I am thoroughly familiar with and have personal knowledge of all of the facts set forth herein.

2. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement.

Procedural History

3. On January 27, 2025, Plaintiff filed this action as a putative class action against Defendant Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp. ("Defendant") alleging: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (2) failure to pay overtime wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (7) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures; and (8) unfair business practices.

4. On the same date, Plaintiff provided written notice to the LWDA and Defendant of her intention to file a PAGA claim (LWDA-CM-1076018-25). A true and correct copy of the PAGA Letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1.** The LWDA did not notify Plaintiff that it intended to investigate within 65 days of this written notice. Therefore, on April 23, 2025, Plaintiff filed a separate action alleging a claim under PAGA, Case No. CIVSB2511435 (the "PAGA Action").

5. The Parties subsequently participated in a private all-day mediation with mediator Steve Pearl on January 7, 2026. The negotiations were adversarial, conducted at arm's length, and tempered by the efforts of both sides to serve the interests of their clients. The Parties were ultimately able to reach an agreement on general settlement terms.

6. The parties negotiated the terms of the Settlement over the next several months, which was finalized in April 2026. A true and correct copy of the fully executed Settlement Agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**. Attached thereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the Parties' proposed Class Notice.

7. On May 5, 2026, Plaintiff submitted a copy of the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA. A true and correct copy of the confirmation of submission my office received after submitting the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. On April 17, 2026, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint adding an additional claim for penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq*. ("Operative Complaint").

Investigation and Exposure Analysis

8. Prior to attending mediation, Plaintiff's Counsel thoroughly investigated the claims, applicable law, and potential defenses. Plaintiff's Counsel assessed the value to the class claims using the documents and data Defendant produced in informal discovery, including the extensive production of documents such as class data providing the number of Class Members, the number of workweeks in the Class Period, and the number of pay periods in the PAGA Period, Plaintiff's personnel file, employment handbook and policies, job descriptions, and time and payroll records. Plaintiff's Counsel engaged an expert to quantify the potential exposure using the time and payroll records, and then assessed the risks associated with each claim meriting reductions in the likely success at class certification and likely recovery at trial.

9. Defendant's records show that there are approximately 74 Class Members, making joinder of all Class Members impracticable. Further, given the size and amount of each Class Members' claim, Class Members have little incentive to litigate their claims on an individual basis because the out-of-pocket expenses and personal commitment necessary to litigate each claim likely outweighs any potential recovery.

10. Plaintiff has alleged that Defendant maintained common employment policies and/or practices that unlawfully deprived Class Members of wages, meal period, rest periods, reimbursements for business expenses, accurate wage statements, and timely payment of wages upon separation of employment. These allegations present common factual and legal questions of, *inter alia*, whether Defendant applied the same scheduling, timekeeping, pay, meal period, rest period, and reimbursement policies to all Class Members, whether these policies and practices resulted in Labor Code violations, whether Defendant's conduct was intention, and whether Class Members are entitled to damages and/or penalties. These common questions could be resolved

using Class Members' time records, payroll records, testimony from Defendant's designated representative(s), and Class Members' testimony.

11. Although the exposure Plaintiff's Counsel calculated is substantial, the various risks at succeeding at class certification and through trial affected the valuation of the claims for settlement purposes.

12. Minimum and Overtime Wages: Plaintiff's unpaid minimum and overtime wage claims were based on the allegations that Defendant's maintained a practice of unlawfully rounding employees' time and Defendant required Class Members to perform work duties, in lieu of meal periods and/or rest breaks, and after clocking out. Based on Plaintiff's estimate that she worked a total of 1 hour off-the-clock each week, Plaintiff's Counsel assumed each Class Member worked 1-hour off-the-clock per week in calculating potential exposure to be approximately $326,492.78 for these claims. However, Defendant could argue that any off-the-clock time was undocumented and unknown to Defendant, and that Defendant was therefore not obligated to pay for this time. Because this claim would have relied heavily on Class Member testimony and would not be evidenced in Defendant's time and payroll records, the risk of succeeding at class certification was substantial. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counsel applied a risk discount based on a 40% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 40% chance of succeeding at trial on the merits, yielding a realistic estimate of approximately $52,238.84 ($326,492.78 x 40% x 40%), or approximately 21% of the Gross Settlement Amount.

13. Meal Periods: Plaintiff's meal period claims were based on the allegations that Defendant failed to maintain a policy and practice of providing meal periods and/or paying meal period premiums when its time records showed Class Members' meal periods were late, short, or missed. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant had a practice of rounding Plaintiff and Class Members meal period to exactly 60 minutes. Plaintiff's Counsel calculated the potential exposure on this claim to be approximately $571,710.62. However, Defendant could argue that Class Members signed meal period waivers and/or on-duty meal period agreements. Additionally, this claim would have relied heavily on Class Member testimony as to the accuracy of their employee timecard as it applies to their meal periods. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counsel applied a risk discount

based on a 30% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 20% chance of succeeding at trial on the merits, yielding a realistic damage estimate of approximately $34,302.64 ($571,710.62 x 30% x 20%), or approximately 14% of the Gross Settlement Amount.

14. Rest Breaks: Plaintiff's rest break claims were based on the allegations that Defendant failed to maintain a policy and/or practice of providing rest breaks and/or paying rest break premiums when Class Members' rest breaks were late, short, or missed. Plaintiff's Counsel applied a 100% violation rate to all shifts over 3.5 hours and calculated a potential exposure of $1,001,244.51 for this claim. However, Defendant could argue that a 100% violation rate was unrealistic. Because this claim would have relied exclusively on Class Member testimony, Plaintiff's Counsel applied a risk discount based on a 40% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 30% chance of succeeding at trial on the merits, yielding a realistic damage estimate of approximately $120,149.34 ($1,001,244.51 x 40% x 30%), or approximately 48% of the Gross Settlement Amount.

15. Reimbursements: Plaintiff's reimbursement claim was based on the allegation that Defendant required Class Members to use their personal cell phones for work-related matters. Based on Plaintiff's estimate that she incurred approximately $30 in unreimbursed expenses per month, Plaintiff's Counsel assumed each Class Member incurred $30 in unreimbursed expenses per month in calculating potential exposure to be approximately $73,237.50 for this claim. However, Defendant could argue that these expenses were not required by Defendant, and that it could not have known that these expenses were being incurred. As such, Plaintiff's Counsel applied a risk discount based on a 40% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 30% chance of succeeding at trial on the merits, yielding a realistic damage estimate of approximately $8,788.50 ($73,237.50 x 40% x 30%), or approximately 4% of the Gross Settlement Amount.

16. Derivative Penalties: Plaintiff alleged that as a result of Defendant's alleged failure to pay all wages and meal and rest period premiums owed, Defendant owed waiting time penalties and wage statement penalties. However, Defendant could argue that it had good faith defenses that made the imposition of these penalties unwarranted. Moreover, Plaintiff could not recover these penalties if she failed to prove the underlying claims. Although Plaintiff's Counsel calculated that

potential exposure for the waiting time penalty claim was approximately $195,461.01 and approximately $180,000.00 for the wage statement penalty claim, Plaintiff's Counsel could not attribute a high value to these claims. As such, Plaintiff's Counsel applied a risk discount based on a 30% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 20% chance of succeeding at trial on the merits for the waiting time penalty claim, yielding a realistic damage estimate of approximately $11,727.66 ($195,461.01 x 30% x 20%) and a risk discount based on a 30% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 20% chance of succeeding at trial on the merits for the wage statement penalty claim, yielding a realistic damage estimate of approximately $10,800.00 ($180,000.00 x 30% x 20%).

17. PAGA: For the PAGA claim, Plaintiffs' Counsel determined that Defendant's potential exposure could potentially reach $196,400.00, assuming the initial $100 penalty would apply for each of the 1,964 pay periods in the PAGA Period. However, even assuming success on the merits of each claim, PAGA gives the Court discretion to reduce penalties for a variety of reasons, including where to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory. Therefore, the settlement allocates $12,500.00 of the Gross Settlement Amount to PAGA, or approximately 5% of the Gross Settlement Amount.

Plaintiff's Counsel's Qualifications

18. Plaintiff is represented by WLF. The attorneys at WLF performed significant work and expended litigation costs in prosecuting this matter with no guarantee of payment.

19. WLF was selected by Best Lawyers and U.S. News & World Report as one of the nation's Best Law Firms since 2020 and is comprised of more than 100 attorneys and over 600 employees. WLF is actively and continuously practicing in employment litigation, representing employees in both individual and class actions in both state and federal courts throughout California.

20. WLF is qualified to handle this Litigation because its attorneys are experienced in litigating Labor Code violations in individual, class action, and representative action cases. WLF has handled, and is currently handling, numerous wage and hour class action lawsuits, as well as class actions involving consumer rights and data privacy litigation.

21. I graduated from the University of California, Santa Barbara with High Honors in 1991 with Bachelor of Arts degrees in Psychology. I received my Juris Doctor from UCLA Law School in 1996.

22. Upon graduating from law school in 1996, I worked for a boutique law firm practicing general litigation which included employment law matters. Since 2000 (that is, the last 26 years) my practice has been exclusively focused on labor and employment matters including handling wage and hour class, collective and representative actions (including the California Private Attorneys General Act, or "PAGA"), including in the international law firms of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP (where I was a senior associate), Foley & Lardner LLP (where I was a partner and a national Vice Chair of the Labor and Employment Group), Norton Rose Fulbright LLP (where I was a partner) and Seyfarth Shaw LLP (where I was a partner and member of the Wage and Hour Practice Group). During my time at these law firms, I was the primary attorney or took a major leading role in defending employers on numerous wage and hour class, collective and representative actions.

23. In late June 2022 I left Seyfarth Shaw LLP and joined my current firm, Wilshire Law Firm, PLC, to represent plaintiff employees. I have been and am handling many wage and hour class and representative actions litigating such matters on behalf of plaintiff employees in numerous Superior Courts and District Courts. From matters representing both plaintiffs and defendants, I have successfully mediated the resolution of many wage and hour class, collective, and representative actions. Just since starting to settle cases in late April 2023 I have already successfully mediated matters in which I have been counsel or co-counsel resulting in **well over $240 million** in settlements and verdicts which are in the process of being finalized, and with numerous upcoming mediations scheduled. In those and numerous other matters, I have managed and assisted with the litigation and settlement of many wage and hour PAGA and class actions. In those actions, I performed similar tasks as those performed in the course of prosecuting this action. Indeed, I recently tried and prevailed in achieving a jury verdict in a wage and hour class action in the matter of *Aguilar-Flores v. Javier's – CC LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV36438 (settled after verdict).

24. I have received numerous awards for my legal work. For example, from 2015 to 2018, I was listed in Los Angeles Super Lawyers for Employment Litigation (Thomson Reuters). I have also served on numerous prominent boards and in other leadership positions, including serving as Southern California Regional President for the Hispanic National Bar Association and on the board of directors of the Mexican American Bar Foundation. I also previously served on the 5-member Los Angeles Civil Service Commission, which generally oversees the personnel decisions for the City of Los Angeles.

25. I have also published numerous blogs on labor and employment issues including on wage and hour issues. For example, I published "Headline News: Wal-Mart v. Dukes-Impact on Class Action Litigation" (while a partner with Foley & Lardner LLP) and "Are You Really Protected From Wage-and-Hour Successor Liability in an Asset Purchase" (while a partner with Seyfarth Shaw LLP). I have also been a presenter at numerous conferences, including being a presenter involving the "Employment Law Update" at a National Employment Law Council conference.

26. Eugene Zinovyev is a Junior Partner at WLF. He graduated from the University of California-Berkeley with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Economy of Industrial Societies, and received his Juris Doctor from the University of California, San Francisco School of Law in 2009. He has practiced employment and wage and hour law since on both the plaintiff and defense sides. Mr. Zinovyev has tried multiple jury cases to verdict as well as numerous bench trials. He has also briefed published appellate court decisions in both state and federal court. Mr. Zinovyev is admitted to practice before all Federal District Courts in California as well as the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. He is also a member of the California Employment Lawyers Association. He has mediated and settled dozens of class and representative actions as well as individual civil matters.

27. John Brown is an Associate Attorney at Wilshire Law firm, PLC. He was admitted to practice law in the State of California in 2004. John graduated from UC Berkeley with a Bachelor of Arts and received his Juris Doctor from The UCLA School of Law. His current practice has been focused on class action employment law. He has participated in dozens of settlements totaling tens of millions of dollars, from the memorandum of understanding and settlement agreement

drafting stage through to final approvals from the court.

28. Lisa B. Iturriaga is a Settlement Attorney at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. She was admitted to practice law in the State of California in 2021. Ms. Iturriaga graduated from University of South Florida with a Bachelor of Science in Finance and a Bachelor of Arts in Marketing. She received her Juris Doctor from Chapman University Dale E. Fowler School of Law. Since graduating, her practice has been in insurance defense (previously) and employment law (currently). Since 2023, she has exclusively worked on Plaintiff-side wage and hour cases. Ms. Iturriaga is also a member of the California Employment Lawyers Association (CELA).

29. Gabriella Solé is a fourth-year Associate Attorney at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. She was admitted to practice law in the State of California in 2022. Ms. Solé graduated from University of California, Los Angeles with a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology. She received her Juris Doctor from University of San Francisco, School of Law. During law school, she was a First Year Moot Court Director on the Moot Court Board. Since graduating, her practice has been mainly focused on wage and hour class action litigation.

30. In support of the reasonableness of WLF's hourly rates, attached as **Exhibit 4** is a true and correct excerpt from the *2025 Real Rate Report* published by Wolters Kluwer. The Real Rate Report is widely relied upon in the legal industry because it is derived from anonymized billing data taken from actual law firm invoices that were submitted to clients and approved for payment, rather than from voluntary surveys or self-reported rates. Although the report refers to "2025" rates, the data reflects rates charged by law firms during the first half of 2024 and therefore represents the most recent available objective evidence of prevailing market rates.

a. The report provides rate information filtered by geographic market, practice type, and timekeeper role. Page 33 of the report reflects rates drawn from 565 partners and 518 associates practicing in Los Angeles. In that dataset, the third-quartile hourly rate is $1,365 for partners and $982 for associates. These figures confirm that Los Angeles is a high-rate legal market and that experienced litigation partners routinely bill in excess of $1,300 per hour based on rates actually paid by clients in 2024. The Real Rate Report further shows that in the San Diego market, partners with 21 or more years of experience command third-quartile billing rates of approximately

$1,334 per hour, confirming that highly experienced litigators in major California markets routinely bill at the upper end of the rate spectrum.

b. The 2025 Real Rate Report's practice-area-specific data further supports this conclusion. Page 81 provides third-quartile rates for the detailed practice category "Employment and Labor: Other Litigation," which is directly analogous to the type of work performed in this case. That dataset includes 24 partners and 14 associates and shows a third-quartile rate of $1,252 per hour for partners and $564 per hour for associates. These figures demonstrate that even within the specialized employment litigation market, partners regularly bill well above $1,200 per hour based on rates actually charged to clients. When this practice-specific benchmark is considered together with the broader regional market data, it confirms that WLF's hourly rate for highly experienced counsel in a representative employment action falls within the upper range of prevailing market rates rather than outside it.

c. The Real Rate Report does not provide 1st quartile or 4th quartile rates, presumably to provide a sense of the average attorney billing rates. Importantly, the third quartile represents the point below which 75% of rates fall; it is not a cap on reasonable rates. By definition, a substantial portion of partners in the relevant benchmark market routinely bill above that level, particularly those with extensive experience, specialized expertise, or leadership roles in complex litigation. Courts evaluating fee requests recognize that leading counsel in complex or representative actions may reasonably bill above median or third-quartile benchmarks where their experience, results obtained, and responsibilities justify higher rates. We firmly believe WLF belongs in the 4th quartile of attorney billing rates in Southern California. As previously discussed, WLF is a nationally recognized employment litigation firm that has been named one of the nation's *Best Law Firms* by U.S. News & World Report and Best Lawyers since 2020, and its attorneys regularly litigate complex wage-and-hour class and representative actions throughout California. I am a UCLA School of Law graduate with nearly three decades of experience litigating labor and employment matters—including as a partner and holding leadership roles at major international law firms when I was on the defense side for 26 years, as well as substantial recent class and representative action results including being one of the few attorneys in the state of California to try a wage and hour class action to verdict (and prevail), and achieving results exceeding $240 million in just the last three years since starting to settle matters as a plaintiffs' attorney. My credentials and experience place my $1,500 hourly rate within the highest tier of Southern California employment litigators, consistent with rates that would fall within the fourth quartile beyond those reported in the Real Rate Report.

Representations

31. Plaintiff does not have any interest, financial or otherwise, in the proposed third-party administrator, ILYM Group, Inc. No one at WLF (meaning the law firm itself and anyone employed at the law firm) has any interest, financial or otherwise, in the proposed third-party administrator, ILYM Group, Inc.

32. WLF does not have a fee-splitting agreement with any other counsel in this case.

33. Plaintiff Counsel is not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement.

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

Executed on May 6, 2026 at Los Angeles, California.

John G. Yslas

EXHIBIT 1

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
3055 Wilshire Blvd, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Tel: (213) 381-9988
Fax: (213) 381-9989
wilshirelawfirm.com

Sean Paisan, Esq.
John Yslas, Esq.
Molly Desario, Esq.
Stephanie Mazepa, Esq.
Nicol Hajjar, Esq.
Thiago Coelho, Esq.
Benjamin Haber, Esq.

January 27, 2025

LWDA
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
(*Via Online Submission*)

Judy Lin
Agent for Service of Process for:
Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.
15889 Slover Ave. Unit A
Fontana, California 92337
(*Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested*)

Re: ***Bonnie Devera v. Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.***
Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Bonnie Devera ("Mr. Devera" or "Plaintiff") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp. ("MVL" or "Employer"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Employer engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Mr. Devera wishes to pursue this action on behalf of himself, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of potentially all other persons who worked for MVL in California as a non-exempt or hourly-paid employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiff alleges he and Aggrieved Employees suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Mr. Devera's Employment with MVL

MVL is an automobile parts company. Plaintiff worked as a checker for MVL. Plaintiff's primary job function was to ensure quality compliance. In performing Plaintiff's duties, Plaintiff was regularly required to perform work (off-the-clock), without compensation. Due to understaffing and high workloads, Plaintiff was also frequently deprived of an opportunity to take legally compliant meal and rest breaks. Employer failed to provide Plaintiff with meal and rest break premiums as required by the Labor Code. Additionally, Plaintiff necessarily incurred business-related expenses, but Employer failed to reimburse such business-related expenses. These are just non-exhaustive examples of the facts and theories Plaintiff asserts, which are described in more detail below.

Employer owns/owned and operates/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California. As such and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Employer's business in California, Employer is subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

Mr. Devera is a resident of Fontana, California who worked for Employer in San Bernardino County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2018 to approximately November 2024.

During Plaintiff's employment for Employer, Employer paid Plaintiff an hourly wage and classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. Employer typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiff also worked more than eight hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Employer failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Plaintiff's employment terminated, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and failed to indemnify Plaintiff for business expenditures. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Employer was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight, and Overtime Wages

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Employer failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Employer required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work "off-the-clock," uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work during uncompensated meal periods and requiring Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work before clocking in and/or after clocking out. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. California Labor Code § 510 requires that employers compensate employees 1.5 times their regular rate of pay when employees work over eight hours per day, 40 hours per week, or when employees work up to eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek. Employer failed to properly calculate Plaintiff's and other Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when paying overtime, by failing to include all compensation in overtime calculations. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Employer also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked.

Throughout the statutory period, Employer also engaged in a practice of improper rounding. Under *Camp v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.*, 84 Cal.App.5th 638 (2022), because Employer could and did track the exact time in minutes that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked, it must pay for all time worked. When an employer uses an electronic timekeeping system to record time worked, this ability to "precisely capture time worked" means that "the employer must pay the employee for that worktime when due." *Id*. at 671. As a result of Employer's rounding policy, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for all hours that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Employer is liable to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s). Despite these legal requirements, Employer wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period in a manner required by law (and also including but not limited to failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to leave the work premises to take meal periods). Employer also continued to assert control over Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees by, among other things, requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, permission to take a meal period under the conditions required by law, and without properly compensating Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided as required by law. Employer also did not inform Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees of their right to, nor permitted Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take, all of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees' second meal periods when Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked at least ten hours of work in a workday and otherwise unlawfully pressured Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to waive such breaks. Accordingly, Employer failed to provide meal periods to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s). Employer, however, failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods that were not provided.

As a result, Employer is liable to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employer is required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e., more than three and a half hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Throughout the statutory period, Employer has wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods in a manner required by law (and also including but not limited to failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to leave the work premises to take rest periods). Employer required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of three and a half consecutive hours a day without authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period, or without compensating Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted.

Instead, Employer continued to assert control over Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Employer failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Employer, however, failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all of the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Employer is liable to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on Employer's failure to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Employer also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours worked. However, Employer failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Employer, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Employer, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Employer owes Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Employer is liable to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when employees begin and end each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Employer, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

Employer's failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand, and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Employer's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Employer. As a direct result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorneys' fees in seeking to compel Employer to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Employer's knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. Direct deposits of wages to an employee's bank, saving and loan, or credit union account that were previously authorized by the employee are immediately terminated when an employee quits or is discharged, and the payment of wages upon termination of employment in the manner described above shall apply unless the employee has voluntarily authorized that deposit and provided that the employer complies with the provisions of Labor Code § 213(d) relating to the payment of wages upon termination or quitting of employment.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees was terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Employer failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Employer's employment. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight, and overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages. Employer also violated Labor Code section 213(d) by paying final wages (if any are paid at all) via direct deposit without Plaintiff's and other Aggrieved Employees' voluntary authorization.

Employer's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Employer their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Employer is liable to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination, and for unlawfully making any such payment (if any) via direct deposit without Plaintiff's voluntary authorization.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: "An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with 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, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees." (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Throughout the statutory period, Employer failed to timely furnish Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

Because Employer violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Employer the greater of their actual damages caused by Employer's failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars ($4,000) per employee. Moreover, Employer is liable to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to timely furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures

Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify their employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Employer wrongfully required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Employer. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for

Employer, but Employer failed to indemnify Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

As a result, Employer is liable to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to indemnify Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

Recordkeeping Requirement Violations

California Labor Code section 1174 requires employers to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by employees. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 similarly requires employers to keep accurate time records reflecting the times during which all owed meal periods were provided each day.

Based on information and belief, Employer failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records as required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked, applicable rates of pay, time records showing when Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and accurate itemized wage statements.

Based on information and belief, Employer failed to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, by virtue of Employer's time rounding and/or auto deduction policies and practices and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices. Employer failed to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by virtue of Employer's failure to relieve Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees of all duties and Employer's control for unpaid meal periods, resulting in unpaid hours worked.

Based on information and belief, Employer further failed to record the true start and end times of Plaintiff's and other Aggrieved Employees' meal periods.

Based on further information and belief, Employer further failed to record the true start and end times of Plaintiff's and other Aggrieved Employees' work shifts, or some of them.

Additionally, Employer failed to keep accurate records and issue accurate wage statements by not documenting accrued sick time for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees. Employer's failure to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, violates Labor Code sections 1174, 1198, 1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7. These violations subject Employer to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 226.6, 1174.5 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision, for each Aggrieved Plaintiff, results in a separate civil penalty.[1]

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Employer violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked,

[1] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved Plaintiff per pay period").

including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;

2. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month;
5. California Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
8. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures; and
9. Labor Code § 1174 by failing to keep accurate and complete payroll records.

Therefore, on behalf of Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

Plaintiff has placed Employer on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence, as indicated on the first page. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

John G. Yslas, Esq.

EXHIBIT 2

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawifrm.com
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Emily Borman (SBN 303180)
emily.borman@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lisa B. Iturriaga (SBN 339678)
lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
CHERYL WILKE, SB# 216109
E-Mail: Cherly.Wilke@lewisbrisbois.com
110 SE 6th Street, Suite 2600
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Telephone: 954.728.1280
Facsimile: 954.728.1282

Attorneys for Defendant

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

BONNIE DEVERA, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, vs. MAXZONE VEHICLE LIGHTING CORP., a California corporation, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. CIVSB2502838 *Assigned for All Purposes To:* *Hon. Thomas S. Garza, Dept. S27* **CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between Plaintiff Bonnie Devera ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp. ("Defendant"). The Agreement refers to Plaintiff and Defendant collectively as "Parties," or individually as "Party."

1. **DEFINITIONS.**

1.1 "Actions" means Plaintiff's lawsuit alleging class and representative action wage and hour violations against Defendant captioned *Devera v. Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.*, Case No. CIVSB2502838, filed on January 27, 2025, in San Bernardino County Superior Court, and Plaintiff's representative PAGA action captioned *Devera v. Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.*, Case No. CIVSB2511435 filed on April 23, 2025, in in San Bernardino County Superior Court.

1.2 "Administrator" means ILYM Group, Inc. Class Action Administration, the neutral entity the Parties have agreed to appoint to administer the Settlement.

1.3 "Administration Costs" 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 who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period.

1.5 "Class" means all persons who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.

1.6 "Class Counsel" means John G. Yslas, Eugene Zinovyev, John Brown, Lisa B. Iturriaga, Emily Borman, and Gabriella Sole of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC.

1.7 "Class Counsel Fees Payment" means an award of attorneys' fees granted to Class Counsel and paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. The Parties have agreed that Plaintiff will request approval from the Court of up to one-third (1/3) of the GSA (currently $83,333.33 [eighty-three thousand three hundred thirty-three dollars and thirty-three cents]).

1.8 "Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment" means the amount allocated to Class Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable expenses and costs incurred to prosecute the Action, not to exceed $28,000.00 (twenty-eight thousand dollars and zero cents) and paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.

1.9 "Class Data" means Class Member identifying information in Defendant's possession including the Class Member's name, last-known mailing address, Social Security number, and number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods.

1.10 "Class Member" or "Settlement Class Member" means a member of the Class, as either a Participating Class Member or Non-Participating Class Member (including a Non-Participating Class Member who qualifies as an Aggrieved Employee).

1.11 "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.

1.12 "Class Notice" means the Court approved Notice of Settlement and hearing date for Final Approval, to be mailed to Class Members in English in the form, without material variation, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.13 "Class Period" or "Class Settlement Period" means the period from January 27, 2021, through March 8, 2026 ("Settlement Class Period").

1.14 "Class Representative" means the named Plaintiff Bonnie Devera in the Action.

1.15 "Class Representative Service Payment" or "Enhancement Award" means the payment to the Class Representative for initiating the Actions and providing services in support of the Action.

1.16 "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

1.17 "Defendant" means named Defendant Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.

1.18 "Defense Counsel" means Cheryl Wilke of LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP.

1.19 "Effective Date" means the date by which both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment 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, 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 the Judgment; or (c) if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.

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 upon granting Final Approval of the Settlement.

1.23 "Gross Settlement Amount" or "GSA" means two hundred fifty thousand dollars and zero cents ($250,000.00), which is the total amount Defendant agrees to pay under the Settlement, except as provided in Paragraph 8 below.

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 PAGA Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period.

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

1.29 "Net Settlement Amount" means the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: PAGA Penalties payment, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Costs 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 “Operative Complaint” means the operative First Amended Class Action Complaint filed in the Action.

1.32 “PAGA Pay Period” means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period.

1.33 “PAGA Period” means the period from January 27, 2024, through March 8, 2026.

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

1.35 “PAGA Notice” means Plaintiff’s January 27, 2025, letter to the LWDA and Defendant providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a).

1.36 “PAGA Penalties” means the total amount of $12,500.00 in PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 35% ($4,375.00) to the Aggrieved Employees and 65% ($8,125.00) to the LWDA in settlement of PAGA claims.

1.37 “Participating Class Member” means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Settlement.

1.38 “Plaintiff” means Bonnie Devera, the named plaintiff in the Action.

1.39 “Preliminary Approval” means the Court’s Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

1.40 “Released Class Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.2 below.

1.41 “Released PAGA Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.3 below.

1.42 “Released Parties” means Defendant.

1.43 “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.

1.44 "Response Deadline" means sixty (60) days after the Administrator mails Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) fax, email, or mail Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) fax, email, or 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 fourteen (14) calendar days beyond the Response Deadline has expired.

1.45 "Settlement" means the disposition of the Action effected by this Agreement and the Judgment.

1.46 "Workweek" means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendant for at least one day, during the Class Period.

2. **RECITALS.**

2.1 On January 27, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Class Action Complaint alleging causes of action against Defendant for (1) Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages; (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (4) Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods; (5) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination; (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements; (7) Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures; and (8) Unfair Business Practices.

2.2 On January 27, 2025, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiff gave notice to the LWDA and Defendant that Plaintiff intended to proceed with a representative action under PAGA (LWDA-CM-1076018-25). On April 23, 2025, after the 65-day statutory period passed, Plaintiff filed a separate complaint for penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, et seq., Case No. CIVSB2511435. Plaintiff filed the Operative Complaint, adding an additional claim for penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq*.

2.3 Defendant denies the allegations in the Action, denies any failure to comply with the laws identified in the Actions, and denies any and all liability for the causes of action alleged in the Actions.

2.4 On January 7, 2026, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by mediator Steve Pearl. The Parties did not settle on the day of, but accepted a mediator's proposal thereafter and agreed on general settlement terms. The Parties memorialized their agreement in a Memorandum of Understanding on March 2, 2026.

///

2.5 In advance of mediation, Class Counsel conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of, and applicable law to, the Actions. Prior to mediation, Plaintiff obtained and analyzed a representative sampling of time and payroll data for Class Members and the necessary policy documents through informal discovery to properly evaluate the strengths and weakness of the claims and engage in meaningful settlement discussions. Plaintiff's investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996) and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc*., 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 (2008) ("*Dunk/Kullar*").

2.6 The Court has not granted class certification because the Parties engaged in mediation before any class certification.

2.7 The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they are not aware of any other pending matters or actions asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement.

3. **MONETARY TERMS.**

3.1 Gross Settlement Amount. Except as otherwise provided by Paragraph 8 below, Defendant will pay two hundred fifty thousand dollars and zero cents ($250,000.00) to fully settle, resolve, and extinguish all claims asserted in the Action, including without limitation all claims asserted in the PAGA Notice. The Gross Settlement Amount is non-reversionary and does not include employer payroll taxes owed on the wage portions of the Individual Class Payments, which Defendant will pay separately.

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: A payment for the Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff of not more than $10,000.00 (ten thousand dollars and zero cents) in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representative is entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member. 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 the

Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payments, Plaintiff will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payment no later than sixteen (16) court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered by the Court. If the Court approves a Class Representative Service Payment less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Participating Class Members. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payment using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiff assumes full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payment.

3.2.2 To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be eighty-three thousand three hundred thirty-three dollars and thirty-three cents ($83,333.33) and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment for actual costs, not to exceed $28,000.00 (twenty-eight thousand dollars with zero cents). Defendant will not oppose requests for these payments. Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel will file a motion for Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payment no later than sixteen (16) court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered by the Court. 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 for distriubution to Participating Class Members. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiff's counsel arising from any claim to any portion of 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 division or sharing of any of these Payments.

3.2.3 To the Administrator: An Administrator Costs Payment not to exceed $4,950.00 except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Costs are less or the Court approves payment of less than $4,950.00, the

Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Participating Class Members.

3.2.4 To Each Participating Class Member: An Individual Class Payment is 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 each individual Participating Class Member's Workweeks.

3.2.4.1 Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. Twenty percent (20%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to the Settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portion is subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form. The remaining eighty percent (80%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to the settlement of claims for interest, reimbursement, and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. 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 twelve thousand five hundred dollars and zero cents ($12,500.00) to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 65% ($8,125.00) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 35% ($4,375.00) 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 of $4,375.00 by the total number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period, and (b) multiplying the result by each individual Aggrieved Employee's PAGA 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 to be distributed to Participating Class Members. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

4. **SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS.**

4.1 Class Workweeks and Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods. Based on a review of its records, Defendant represents there are 74 Class Members who collectively worked a total of 9,765 workweeks during the Class Period, and 53 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 1964 PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period.

4.2 Class Data. Not later than ten (10) days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, Defendant will 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 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 the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than fourteen (14) days after the Effective Date.

4.4 Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Within ten (10) days after Defendant fully 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 Costs

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 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. The face of each check shall prominently state the date (180 days after the date of mailing) when the check will be voided ("Void Date"). 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 the 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 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 seven (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, requested by the Class Member prior to the Void Date.

4.4.3 For any Class Member whose Individual Class Payment check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and canceled after the Void Date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of

California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b).

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. **RELEASES OF CLAIMS**. Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the Gross Settlement Amount and 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:

5.1 Plaintiff's Release. Plaintiff discharges Released Parties from all claims, transactions, or occurrences, that occurred during the Class Period, including all claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged, based on the facts contained in the Operative Complaint; and claims under the Fair Employment and Housing Act, Americans with Disabilities Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the California Labor Code, and all equivalent claims under federal 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, Plaintiff expressly waives and relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

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

///

5.2 Released Class Claims: All Participating Class Members will release all claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action, alleged or which could have reasonably been alleged based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint, including but not limited to: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1197.1); (2) failure to pay overtime wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198); (3) failure to provide meal periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512); (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7); (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 201-203); (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226); (7) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 2802); (8) failure to produce requested employment records (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226, 432, and 1198.5); and (9) unfair business practices (pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*). The enumeration of these specific claims shall neither enlarge nor narrow the scope of *res judicata* based on the claims that were asserted in the Action or could have been asserted in the Action based on the facts and circumstances alleged in the Complaint. The Released Class Claims are those that accrued during the Class Period.

5.3 Released PAGA Claims: All Aggrieved Employees will release all claims for PAGA civil penalties that are alleged or reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint and in Plaintiff's November 1, 2024 and November 18, 2024 PAGA Notices, including but not limited to: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1197.1); (2) failure to pay overtime wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198); (3) failure to provide meal periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 210, 226.7 and 512); (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 210 and 226.7); (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 and 213(d)); (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226 and 226.3); (7) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 2802); (8) failure to produce requested employment records (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226, 432, and 1198.5);

(9) failure to pay all earned wages twice per month and unlawfully withholding accrued wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 210 and 216); (10) failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 1174, and 1174.5); (11) recordkeeping requirement violations (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.6, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1198 and 1199); and (12) civil penalties for wage and hour violations (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 558). The Released PAGA Claims are those that accrued during the PAGA Period.

6. **MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL**. Plaintiff will prepare and file a motion for preliminary approval ("Motion for Preliminary Approval").

6.1 Plaintiff's Responsibilities. Plaintiff will prepare 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 PAGA Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699, subd. (f)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of PAGA Settlement; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) 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, and/or the Administrator; (v) a signed declaration from 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 Members, and/or the Administrator. In their Declarations, Plaintiff and Class Counsel shall aver that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

6.2 Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel will obtain a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval, file the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than sixteen (16) court days before the hearing, unless otherwise ordered by the Court, and deliver the Court's Preliminary Approval Order to the Administrator.

6.3 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 in person or by telephone, 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 in person or by telephone, 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 ILYM Group, Inc. Class Action Administration to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, the Administrator 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 Costs. ILYM Group has extensive experience in disseminating class action notices and administering class action settlements, including direct mail services, telephone, and web-based support, database management, opt-out processing, and settlement fund distribution services for class actions ranging in size from 26 to 4.5 million Class Members. 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 to 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 468B-1 for the funding of the GSA. Any interest that accrues on the GSA sums paid into the QSF prior to distribution by the Administrator will become part of the NSA for distribution to Participating Class Members.

///

7.4 Notice to Class Members.

7.4.1 No later than five (5) calendar 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 (fourteen) 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 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 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 five (5) calendar 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 fourteen days (14) days beyond the sixty (60) days otherwise provided in the Class Notice for 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 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 in person or by telephone, 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 fourteen (14) 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 fax, email, or mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than sixty (60) days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional fourteen (14) 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 faxed, emailed, or 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 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 of 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 Released PAGA Claims identified in Paragraph 5.3 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment.

7.6 Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks. Each Class Member shall have sixty (60) days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional fourteen (14) days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to challenge the number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via fax, email or 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 the calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination of 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 Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Class Representative Service Payment.

7.7.2 Participating Class Members may send written objections to the Administrator, by fax, email, or 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 sixty (60) days after the Administrator's mailing of the Class Notice (plus an additional fourteen (14) 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 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 establish, 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 Settlement Agreement; Motion for Preliminary Approval; Preliminary Approval Order; Class Notice; Motion for Final Approval; Motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and Class Representative Service Payment; the Final Approval Order; and the Judgment. The Administrator will also maintain and monitor an email address and a toll-free telephone number to receive Class Member calls, faxes 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 five (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 (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 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. Not later than fourteen (14) days 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 signed 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 ten (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 employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least fifteen (15) 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.

8. **CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES and ESCALATOR CLAUSE.** The GSA was calculated based on the estimate that 74 Class Members worked a total of 9,765 workweeks during the Class Period. If the total number of workweeks increases by more than 15% (i.e. an increase of more than 1464 workweeks), then the GSA will be increased proportionally by the number of

workweeks worked in excess of 15%. For example, if the final number of total workweeks increases by 20% over 1464 workweeks, the GSA will increase by 5%. If this provision is triggered, the Parties agree that the portion of the GSA allocated to attorneys' fees will increase proportionally such that the total amount of attorneys' fees remains one-third (1/3) of the GSA after the upward adjustment required by this provision is implemented.

9. **MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL.** Not later than sixteen (16) court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, unless otherwise scheduled by the Court, Plaintiff will file in Court, a Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the PAGA settlement under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l); a Proposed Final Approval Order; and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiff shall 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 in person or by telephone, 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 five (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, and/or Administrator Costs Payment 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, the Actions, 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 conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment as 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 Costs 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 §384, the Parties will work together in good faith to jointly submit 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 has merit or that Defendant has any liability for any claims asserted; nor should it be intended or construed as an admission by Plaintiff that Defendant's defenses in the Actions 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 grant Preliminary Approval, Final Approval, or enter Judgment, Defendant reserves the right to contest certification of any class for any reason, Defendant reserves all available defenses to the claims in the Actions, 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 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).

11.2 <u>Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval</u>. 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 the 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 Counsel's communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

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 Defense Counsel's and Class Counsel's ethical obligations and Class Counsel's fiduciary duties owed to Class Members.

11.4 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.

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

11.6 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 Settlement Agreement, 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.

11.7 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.

11.8 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.

11.9 Modification of Agreement. This Agreement, and all parts of it, may be amended, modified, changed, or waived only by an express written instrument signed by all Parties or their representatives, and approved by the Court.

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

11.11 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.

11.12 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.

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

11.14 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.

11.15 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.

11.16 Notice. All notices, demands, or other communications between the Parties in connection with this Agreement will be in writing and deemed to have been duly given as of the third business day after mailing by United States mail, or the day sent by email or messenger, addressed as follows:

///

///

To Plaintiff:

John G. Yslas
john.yslas@wilshirelawifrm.com
Eugene Zinovyev
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lisa B. Iturriaga
lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

To Defendant:

Cheryl Wilke
Cherly.Wilke@lewisbrisbois.com
LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
110 SE 6th Street, Suite 2600
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Telephone: 954.728.1280

11.17 Execution in Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts by facsimile, electronically (i.e. DocuSign), or by 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 and contents of this Agreement.

11.18 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 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.

11.19 Binding Agreement. The Parties intend that this Agreement shall be fully enforceable and binding upon all Parties within the provisions of Cal. Civil Proc. § 664.6, and that it shall be admissible and subject to disclosure in any proceeding to enforce its terms pursuant to Cal. Evid. Code §§ 1122(a)(1) and l123(b), notwithstanding the confidentiality provisions that otherwise might apply under federal or state law. The Parties further agree and intend that the San Bernardino County Superior Court may enforce this Agreement pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6.

IT IS SO AGREED.

By the Parties:

DATED: 3/31/2026

Signed by:
FD043A9B08324F3...

Plaintiff Bonnie Devera

DATED: 4/1/2026

judy lin

Defendant Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.

By: Judy Lin

Position: CFO

Approved by counsel:

DATED: March 31, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

BY:

John G. Yslas
Eugene Zinovyev
John Brown
Lisa B. Iturriaga
Emily Borman
Gabriella Solé
Counsel for Plaintiff

DATED: 4/2/26

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

BY: Cheryl Wilke

Cheryl Wilke

Counsel for Defendant

EXHIBIT A

COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL

Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.
Case No. CIVSB2502838 (San Bernardino County Superior Court)

The San Bernardino County Superior Court authorized this notice.
It is not junk mail, spam, an advertisement, or solicitation by a lawyer.
Please read it carefully! You are not being sued.

You may be eligible to receive money from an employee class and a representative action lawsuit ("Action") against Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp. ("Defendant") for alleged wage and hour violations. The Actions were filed by former employee, Bonnie Devera, and seek payment of back wages and other relief for a class of all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant as hourly-paid, non-exempt employees in the State of California ("Class Members") who worked for Defendant during the Class Period (January 27, 2021, through March 8, 2026); and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA") for all Class Members who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period (January 27, 2024, through March 8, 2026) ("Aggrieved Employees")

The proposed Settlement has two main parts: (1) a Class settlement requiring Defendant to fund Individual Class Payments, and (2) a PAGA settlement requiring Defendant to fund Individual PAGA Payments and pay PAGA Penalties to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA").

Based on Defendant's records, and the Parties' current assumptions, **your Individual Class Payment is estimated to be $______ (less withholding) and your Individual PAGA Payment is estimated to be $______**. The actual amount you may receive likely will be different and will depend on a number of factors. (If no amount is stated for your Individual PAGA Payment, then according to Defendant's records you are not eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment under the Settlement because you didn't work during the PAGA Period.)

The above estimates are based on Defendant's records showing that **you worked ______ Workweeks during the Class Period and you worked ______ Pay Periods during the PAGA Period**. If you believe that you worked more during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date.

The Court has already preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and approved this Notice. The Court has not yet decided whether to grant final approval of the Settlement. Your legal rights are affected whether you act or not act. READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY. You will be deemed to have read and understood it. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will decide whether to finally approve the Settlement and how much of the Settlement will be paid to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's attorneys ("Class Counsel"). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Defendant to make payments under the Settlement and requires Class Members and Aggrieved Employees to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Defendant.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT	
DO NOTHING	Receive money. Give up rights to sue Defendant for claims released in the Settlement.
EXCLUDE YOURSELF	Receive no money from the Class settlement. You will retain the right to pursue your own legal claims against Defendant. However, even if you exclude yourself from the Class settlement, you will still receive a portion of the PAGA settlement and be bound by it if you worked during the PAGA Period.
OBJECT	Write to the Court about why you object to the Settlement. If the Settlement receives Final Approval, you will receive money and give up rights to sue Defendant for claims released in the Settlement.
CHALLENGE YOUR NUMBER OF WORKWEEKS AND/OR PAY PERIODS	Challenge your number of Workweeks or Pay Periods listed in this Notice and provide supporting evidence. If you challenge your workweeks or pay periods, you will still be part of the Settlement and will give up rights to sue Defendant for claims released in the Settlement.

BASIC INFORMATION

1. WHY AM I RECEIVING THIS NOTICE?

Defendant's records indicate that you worked for Defendant at some point(s) between January 27, 2021, through March 8, 2026, and are therefore a member of the Class for purposes of this Settlement.

You received this Notice because you have a right to know about a proposed Settlement of the Action, and about all of your options, before the Court decides whether to finally approve the Settlement. The Settlement will resolve all Class Members' claims, which are described below, during the Class Period. The Settlement will also resolve claims for civil penalties brought under the California Private Attorneys' General Act ("PAGA"). If you are a Class Member, you may also an "Aggrieved Employee" if you worked for Defendant during the "PAGA Period," which is January 27, 2024, through March 8, 2026.

If the Court grants Final Approval to the Settlement, a settlement Administrator appointed by the Court will issue the payments provided for by the Settlement to Class Members. You are encouraged to always keep your address up to date with the Administrator (the Administrator's contact information can be found in Section 12, below).

This Notice package explains the allegations and background regarding the lawsuit, the Settlement, your legal rights, what benefits are available, who is eligible for them, and how to receive those benefits.

The Court in charge of the Action is the San Bernardino County Superior Court, and the case is titled, *Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.*, Case No. CIVSB2502838. The person who sued, Bonnie Devera, is the Plaintiff, and the company sued, Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp., is the Defendant.

2. WHAT IS THE LAWSUIT ABOUT?

The Plaintiff in the lawsuit alleges wage and hour violations against Defendant for: (1) Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages; (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (4) Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods; (5) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination; (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements; (7) Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures; and (8) Unfair Business Practices. In addition, Plaintiff is seeking to recover civil penalties pursuant to PAGA ("PAGA Penalties") based on the alleged violations of the California Labor Code listed above. Defendant denies Plaintiff's claims and denies any wrongdoing.

3. WHY IS THIS A CLASS ACTION?

In an employment class action, one or more people called "Class Representatives" (in this case, the Plaintiff) sue on behalf of all workers who they contend have similar claims. All of these workers are a Class or Class Members. Bringing one lawsuit, as opposed to many small ones, saves money, time and court resources. The court resolves the issues for all Class Members, except for those who exclude themselves from the Class.

4. WHY IS THERE A SETTLEMENT?

The Court has not decided in favor of the Plaintiff or Defendant on the merits of the claims alleged in the lawsuit. Plaintiff believes he would win at trial. Defendant thinks that Plaintiff's lawsuit would not proceed to a trial and/or that Plaintiff would not win at trial. However, there has been no trial. Instead, in acknowledgement of the risk that both Parties face should the case proceed, the Parties have agreed to a negotiated settlement. This way, all Parties avoid the cost of preparing for and conducting a trial, the risk of losing the right to a trial, and the workers affected by the alleged violations receive compensation. The Settlement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. The Plaintiff, as well as Plaintiff's lawyers (called "Class Counsel"), believes the Settlement is fair and reasonable and in the best interests of all Class Members.

WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

5. WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

If you received this Notice, you are a Class Member for settlement purposes. The Class includes: All employees of Defendant who were classified as non-exempt and worked within the State of California at any time from January 27, 2021, through March 8, 2026.

6. ARE THERE EXCEPTIONS TO BEING INCLUDED?

You are not a Class Member if you already have resolved the claims asserted in this lawsuit, whether by settlement or a separate legal proceeding (i.e., another lawsuit).

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS—WHAT YOU GET

7. WHAT DOES THE SETTLEMENT PROVIDE?

Defendant has agreed to pay a Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") of $250,000.00 (two hundred fifty thousand dollars and zero cents) to settle the lawsuit. From the GSA, Class Counsel will apply to the Court for attorneys' fees of up to one third (1/3) of the GSA (currently $83,333.33) and up to $83,333.33 in costs; a Class Representative Service Payment of $10,000.00 to Plaintiff (for Plaintiff's work and efforts prosecuting this case); a PAGA Penalties payment of $12,500.00 to resolve the PAGA claims; and Settlement Administration Costs to ILYM Group, Inc. Class Action Administration, not to exceed $4,950.00. The exact amount of the Class Counsel's Fees and Litigation Expenses, Class Representative Service Payment, and Administration Costs will be determined by the Court at the Final Approval hearing. The remaining portion of the Settlement amount, the "Net Settlement Amount" or the "NSA," is currently estimated to be approximately $XXXXXXX. The NSA will be apportioned and paid out as Individual Class Payments to the Settlement Class Members, who are the Class Members that do not request to be excluded ("opt out") of the Settlement.

PAGA Penalties payment: As part of the PAGA portion of the Settlement, the Parties will ask the Court to approve a $12,500.00 PAGA Penalties payment in settlement of claims for civil penalties under PAGA. As required under PAGA, 65% of the PAGA Penalties payment, or $8,125.00, will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency. The remaining 35% of the PAGA Penalties payment, or $4,375.00, will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees as Individual PAGA Payments.

8. HOW MUCH WILL MY PAYMENT BE?

An approximation of your Individual Class Payment appears on the first page of this Notice. If you are also an Aggrieved Employee, an approximation of your Individual PAGA Payment will also appear on the first page of this Notice.

Individual Class Payment: Your Individual Class Payment is based on the number Workweeks you worked, as represented in Defendant's records, in comparison to the total number of Workweeks worked by all Class Members during the Class Period (January 27, 2021, through March 8, 2026). Eighty percent (80%) of each Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be treated as a payment in settlement of the alleged claims for penalties and interest and will be reported on a Form 1099 by the Settlement Administrator, and twenty percent (20%) of each Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be treated as a payment in settlement of alleged claims for unpaid wages. The 20% allocated as unpaid wages will be reduced by applicable payroll tax withholdings and deductions and reported on a Form W-2.

Individual PAGA Payment: If you worked for Defendant from January 27, 2024, through March 8, 2026 ("PAGA Period"), you are also an "Aggrieved Employee" and will receive an Individual PAGA Payment in addition to your Individual Class Payment. The Individual PAGA Payments are based on the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by each Aggrieved Employee in comparison to the total amount of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period. One hundred percent (100%) of each Aggrieved Employees' Individual PAGA Payment will be characterized as penalties and will not be reduced by payroll tax withholdings and deductions. The Individual PAGA Payment will be reported on a Form 1099 by the Settlement Administrator. An approximation of your anticipated Individual PAGA Payment appears on the first page of this Notice.

For the Class Members who are also Aggrieved Employees, their Individual Class Payment will be combined with their Individual PAGA Payment, and they will receive a single check for the combined payments. If a Class Member chooses to opt-out of the Settlement, they will still receive an Individual PAGA Payment, as Aggrieved Employees cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the Settlement under California law.

HOW YOU GET A PAYMENT

9. HOW DO I RECEIVE A PAYMENT?

You do not need to do anything to receive a payment. However, if you believe that the number of Workweeks or PAGA Pay Periods you worked is incorrect, please correct it and provide any supporting evidence to the settlement Administrator, whose contact information is listed in Section 12 below.

10. WHEN WOULD I GET MY PAYMENT?

The Court will hold a Final Fairness Hearing on ____________, to decide whether to approve the Settlement. If the Judge approves the Settlement, and anyone objects, there may be appeals. It is always uncertain when these objections and appeals can be resolved and resolving them can take time. If there is no objection, the Effective Date of the Settlement will be the date of entry of the Court's Order granting final approval.

Following the Effective Date, Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments will be mailed to Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees approximately 30 days after the Court's approval of the Settlement becomes final so long as there are no appeals.

Settlement checks should be cashed promptly upon receipt. Proceeds of checks which remain uncashed after 180 days from the date of issuance will be forwarded to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b). If your settlement check is lost or misplaced, you should contact the Settlement Administrator immediately to request a replacement.

For an update on the status of payments, please contact the Settlement Administrator (see Section 12).

11. WHAT AM I GIVING UP TO GET A PAYMENT?

If the Court approves this Settlement and unless you exclude yourself, you will become a Participating Class Member, and that means that you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendant concerning the legal claims being resolved in this Settlement. Specifically, you will be giving up or "releasing" the Released Class Claims described below against Defendant and all of Defendant's subsidiaries, affiliates, shareholders, members, agents, predecessors, successors, owners, and assigns ("Released Parties"). The releases become effective once the GSA is fully funded by Defendant.

Released Class Claims: The "Released Class Claims" are all claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action, in law or in equity, arising at any time during the Class Period for the claims brought by Plaintiff in the Operative Class Complaint, or that could have been brought by Plaintiff against Defendant in the Operative Class Complaint based on the facts alleged therein.

Released PAGA Claims: If you an Aggrieved Employee (i.e. if you worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period), you will also release all claims for civil penalties that were alleged or could have been alleged in the Operative PAGA Complaint and the PAGA Notice based on the facts alleged therein during the PAGA Period.

EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLMENT

12. HOW DO I EXCLUDE MYSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT?

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must send the Settlement Administrator a written and signed request for exclusion which must be postmarked no later than [60 days after Class Notice is Mailed]. Be sure to include your name, address, and telephone number, and any other information you think would be helpful to the settlement Administrator to identify you. You can send your request for exclusion to the settlement Administrator at:

[ADMINISTRATOR]
Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.
XXXXX
City, State, XXXXX
Email:

If you ask to be excluded from the Settlement, you will not be legally bound by anything that happens in the Action, except as it relates to settlement of the PAGA claim. If you ask to be excluded from the Settlement you will not be able to object to the Settlement and you will not receive an Individual Class Payment, but you will still receive an Individual PAGA Payment if you worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period (January 27, 2024, through March 8, 2026). If you ask to be excluded, you may be able to sue (or continue to sue) Defendant in the future.

13. IF I DON'T EXCLUDE MYSELF, CAN I SUE DEFENDANT FOR THE SAME THING LATER?

No. Unless you exclude yourself, you give up any right to sue Defendant for the claims that this Settlement resolves. If you have a pending lawsuit, speak to your lawyer in that case immediately. You must exclude yourself from this Class to continue your own lawsuit. Remember, the exclusion deadline is [60 days after Class Notice is Mailed].

14. IF I EXCLUDE MYSELF, CAN I GET MONEY FROM THIS SETTLMENT?

No. If you exclude yourself, you will not receive any money from this Settlement except for your Individual PAGA Payment. However, if you timely exclude yourself from the Settlement, you will retain the right to pursue your own legal action against Defendant, if you desire.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU IN THIS LAWSUIT

15. DO I HAVE A LAWYER IN THIS CASE?

The Court has determined that Wilshire Law Firm is qualified to represent you and the Class Members in the lawsuit. These lawyers are called Class Counsel and their contact information is listed below. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

John G. Yslas
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Eugene Zinovyev
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lisa B. Iturriaga
lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

16. HOW WILL THE LAWYERS BE PAID?

Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve up to one third (1/3) of the GSA (currently $83,333.33) for attorneys' fees incurred in investigating the facts, litigating the case, and negotiating the Settlement. Class Counsel will also seek Court-approval of up to $28,000.00 in litigation expenses incurred in this matter. The Court may award Class Counsel less than what they request. Class Counsel will also ask the Court to approve payment to Plaintiff Bonnie Devera in the amount of $10,000.00 in addition to Plaintiff's Individual Class Payment and Individual PAGA Payment for the initiative, risk, and time and energy Plaintiff has spent in service to the Class as the Class Representative. The Court may award the Class Representative less than what is requested.

OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

You can and have the right to tell the Court you do not agree with the Settlement or some part of it.

17. HOW DO I TELL THE COURT THAT I OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT?

If you don't think the Settlement is fair, you can object to some or all of the Settlement. You can either object to the Settlement in person at the Final Approval Hearing or you can submit a written objection. Written objections and notices of intent to appear at the Final Approval Hearing must be mailed to the Settlement Administrator and postmarked on or before ___________, at the following address:

[ADMINISTRATOR]
Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.
XXXXX
City, State, XXXXX
Email:

The written objection should state your name and address and describe all legal and factual reasons that you object to the terms of the Settlement. You should also include or attach any documents upon which your objection is based. If the Court overrules the objection at the Final Approval hearing, the Settlement Agreement will be approved, and you will receive your payment. If you do not submit a written objection, you may still appear at the Final Approval hearing to voice your objection or to otherwise observe the proceedings.

18. WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN OBJECTING AND REQUESTING EXCLUSION?

Objecting is simply telling the Court that you do not agree with something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Class.

Requesting exclusion is telling the Court that you do not want to be part of the Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the case no longer affects you, and you do not get any money from this Settlement. If you submit both an objection and a request to be excluded from the settlement, the request to be excluded will control and you will not get any money from this settlement.

THE COURT'S FAIRNESS HEARING

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing to decide whether to approve the Settlement. You may attend and you may ask to speak, but you don't have to.

19. WHEN AND WHERE WILL THE COURT DECIDE WHETHER TO APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT?

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing at ______ on ____________ in Department S27 of the San Bernardino County Superior Court located at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 to determine whether the Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. If there are objections, the Court will consider them at that time. The Court will also be asked to approve the requests for the Class Representative Service Payment and the Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payments.

20. DO I HAVE TO COME TO THE HEARING?

No. Class Counsel will answer questions the Court may have. However, you are welcome to attend. If you send an objection, you do not have to come to the Court to talk about it. As long as you mailed your written objection to the settlement administrator on time, the Court will consider it. You may also pay your own lawyer to attend, but it is not necessary.

It's possible the Court will reschedule the Final Approval Hearing. You should check the Administrator's website ____________________________ beforehand or contact Class Counsel to verify the date and time of the Final Approval Hearing. You may also confirm the date set for the Final Approval Hearing via the Superior Court website by going to https://cap.sb-court.org/search and entering the Case Number for the Action, Case No. CIVSB2502838.

IF YOU DO NOTHING

21. WHAT IF I DO NOTHING AT ALL?

If you do nothing, you will receive a Settlement payment, and you will be bound by the terms of Settlement, which means that you will not be able to start a lawsuit, continue a lawsuit, or be a part of any other lawsuit against the Defendant about the legal issues in the Action.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

22. HOW DO I GET MORE INFORMATION?

The easiest way to read the Settlement Agreement, the Judgment or any other key Settlement documents is to go to the ILYM Group, Inc. Class Action Administration website at ______________________________. You can also telephone or send an email to Class Counsel at the contact information listed above in Section 15 or the Administrator using the contact information listed below, or consult the Superior Court website by going to https://cap.sb-court.org/search and entering the Case Number for the Action, Case No. CIVSB2502838.

You may also contact the Court-appointed Settlement Administrator, ILYM Group, Inc. Class Action Administration, by calling toll free 1-800____________, or you can write to the Administrator at the following address:

[ADMINISTRATOR]
Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp.
XXXXX
City, State, XXXXX
Email:

PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL FOR INFORMATION REGARDING THIS SETTLEMENT OR THE CLAIM PROCESS. YOU MAY, HOWEVER, CALL CLASS COUNSEL OR THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR, LISTED ABOVE.

EXHIBIT 3

Outlook

Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

From no-reply@formassembly.com <no-reply@formassembly.com>
Date Wed 5/6/2026 2:44 PM
To Letty Zepeda <letty.zepeda@wilshirelawfirm.com>

05/06/2026 02:44:27 PM

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

On 05/06/2026 02:44:27 PM your Proposed Settlement was successfully processed for case number LWDA-CM-1076018-25

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Flabor.ca.gov%2FPrivate_Attorneys_General_Act.htm&data=05%7C02%7Cletty.zepeda%40wilshirelawfirm.com%7C72563a47f6ed43e15bc208deabb8ae11%7C9ada260a4f194da187b814d372333753%7C1%7C0%7C639137006840417545%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=L%2FrfHALneqlUc6UILLgZ%2BpHu7F6unRzhAP%2BKWzo03Sk%3D&reserved=0

EXHIBIT 4

ELM Solutions

2025 Real Rate Report® powered by LegalVIEW® DynamicInsights

The industry's leading analysis of law firm rates, trends, and practices

Wolters Kluwer

Report Editor

Jennifer McIver
Director, Legal Operations and Industry Insights
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Lead Data Analysts

Anand Kumar Pathinettam Padian
Software and Data Engineer
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Farhan Shaikh
Data Scientist
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

ELM Solutions Creative

David Andrews
Senior Graphic Designer
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Contributing Analysts and Authors

Haemi Jung
Strategic Business Intelligence Manager
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Manish Sharma
Director, Business Analysis
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Karen Sekley-Dandrea
Director, Marketing
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Mat Greener
Project & Program Management Director
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Executive Sponsor

Brian Jorgenson
Vice President, Product Management
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions
2929 Allen Pkwy Ste 3300
Houston, TX 77019 United States
ATTN: Marketing
ELMSolutionsSales@wolterskluwer.com

Table of Contents - 2025 Real Rate Report

NOTE:
You may experience an issue that can sometimes occur in PDF viewer. Thin lines (like table borders) may appear to “disappear” or look broken when zoomed out in a PDF viewer. This is usually a display/rendering issue rather than a problem with the actual content of the PDF.

Solution:
- Open the PDF in Acrobat and go to Edit > Preferences > Page Display.
- Uncheck Enhance thin lines (if it’s checked).
- Restart Acrobat and reopen the PDF.

A Letter to Our Readers

Welcome to the latest edition of the Real Rate Report®, the legal industry's most trusted benchmark for legal billing rates.

Since 2010, the Real Rate Report has helped legal departments and law firms make smarter decisions about pricing, resourcing, and vendor management. That hasn't changed. What has changed is how we deliver those insights.

This year, the Real Rate Report is powered by LegalVIEW® DynamicInsights—our new digital-first platform that brings the same trusted LegalVIEW data to life in a more interactive, flexible, and timely way. Leveraging Wolters Kluwer's LegalVIEW database, with over $200B in anonymized, approved, invoice data, LegalVIEW DynamicInsights offers dynamic filters, quarterly updates, and calendar-year alignment to help users tailor benchmarks to their unique needs, on demand.

The Real Rate Report remains a vital snapshot of the market, and we know many of you rely on it as a reference tool. But DynamicInsights goes further. It enables deeper exploration of rate trends by role, experience, geography, practice area, industry, and more. Whether you're negotiating rates, evaluating law firm performance, or planning budgets, DynamicInsights gives you the agility and precision today's legal environment demands.

As always, we welcome your feedback and thank our data contributors for making this work possible. We're proud to be your partner in legal analytics and look forward to continuing to deliver insights that drive better business outcomes.

Sincerely,

Brian Jorgenson
Vice President, Product Management
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Real Rate Report Overview

The Real Rate Report is powered by LegalVIEW DynamicInsights, a web-based solution that delivers dynamic, invoice-backed insights through approved legal billing rates. It enables legal professionals to analyze rate trends by role, experience, industry, geography, practice area, and more using the world's largest repository of legal spend data.

DynamicInsights leverages the same trusted LegalVIEW database that has powered the Real Rate Report for years, now encompassing over $200B+ in anonymized, approved legal invoice data. As with previous Real Rate Reports, our data is sourced from corporations' and law firms' e-billing and time management solutions. We have included lawyer and paralegal rate data filtered by specific practice and sub-practice areas, metropolitan areas, and types of matters. This level of granularity gives legal departments and law firms the precision they need to identify areas of opportunity.

What's different with DynamicInsights?

Same source, same methodology: DynamicInsights uses the same rigorous data validation and methodology as the Real Rate Report.

- **Enhanced flexibility:** With dynamic filters, DynamicInsights enables users to tailor benchmarks to their unique needs and on demand.
- **Full year data:** DynamicInsights now aligns to a calendar year view—January through December—replacing the previous July-to-June format used in the Real Rate Report, reducing confusion and improving consistency across reporting periods.
- **More up to date:** Unlike the annual and static Real Rate Report, DynamicInsights is refreshed quarterly, offering more timely insights.
- **Digital-first access:** Delivered via a secure online interface, users can interact with the data, bookmark views, and share insights in real time.

DynamicInsights provides the same level of credibility and analytical power long trusted in the Real Rate Report with more agility and transparency for today's legal environment.

2025 Real Rate Report use considerations

- Examines law firm rates over time
- Identifies rates by location, experience, firm size, areas of expertise, industry, and timekeeper role (i.e., partner, associate, and paralegal)
- Itemizes variables that drive rates up or down

All the analyses included in DynamicInsights and this report are derived from the actual rates charged by law firm professionals as recorded on invoices submitted and approved for payment.

Examining real, approved rate information, along with the ranges of those rates and their changes over time, highlights the role these variables play in driving aggregate legal cost and income. The analyses can energize questions for both corporate clients and law firm principals.

Legal departments might ask whether they are paying the right amount for different types of legal services, while law firm principals might ask whether they are charging the right amount for legal services and whether to modify their pricing approach.

Examples of data to consider when reviewing rates:

- **Industry** – Compare spend and rate trends across various industries
- **Practice area** – Analyze cost variations in different legal practice areas
- **Detailed practice area** – Drill down into niche legal specialties for precise benchmarking
- **Am Law** – Benchmark against top-ranked law firms for competitive rate analysis
- **City** – Understand rate trends in specific metropolitan areas
- **Country** – Gain a global perspective on legal costs and spend management
- **Role** – Assess legal spend distribution across different law firm roles

Real Rate Report Overview

Understanding key statistical terms

To help interpret the legal rate data presented in DynamicInsights and this report, it's important to understand the statistical measures used. Below are definitions of the core metrics:

- **Mean (average):** The sum of all rate values divided by the total number of values added. It provides a general sense of the central tendency of the rates but can be influenced by extreme values (outliers).
- **Median:** The middle value when all rates are arranged in ascending order. If there is an even number of rates being analyzed, the median is the average of the two middle rates. It is a robust measure of central tendency of rates that is less affected by outliers.
- **First quartile (Q1):** The value below which 25% of the rates fall. It marks the lower boundary of the middle 50% of the rates and helps identify the lower range of typical values.
- **Third quartile (Q3):** The value below which 75% of the rates fall. It marks the upper boundary of the middle 50% of the rates and helps identify the upper range of typical values.
- **n:** The number of unique timekeepers contributing to the data.

These metrics are used to provide a more nuanced view of legal rates, helping users identify trends, outliers, and benchmarks across various dimensions.

LegalVIEW® DynamicInsights

Legal rates keep climbing and 2026 will be no exception. Stay ahead with award-winning insights designed to give your team the edge in every negotiation.

Data that wins awards...and rate negotiations

- **Unmatched Data Power:** Leverages over **$200B in invoice-backed legal spend data** to deliver deep, actionable insights.
- **Strategic Legal Spend Management**: Empowers legal teams to negotiate smarter, plan more effectively, and control costs with greater precision.
- **Enhanced Transparency & Collaboration:** Strengthens law firm-client relationships through data-driven transparency and benchmarking.
- **Insight-Driven Decision Making**: Enables analysis across key dimensions to support strategic negotiations and financial optimization.





Wolters Kluwer

Section I: High-Level Data Cuts

All data and analysis based on data collected thru Q2 2025

Section I: High-Level Data Cuts

Cities

By Role

2025 Real Rates for Associate and Partner | **Trend Analysis - Mean**

City	Role	n	First Quartile	Median	Third Quartile	2025	2024	2023
Los Angeles CA	Partner	565	$517	$925	$1,365	$993	$979	$913
	Associate	518	$485	$720	$982	$761	$741	$684
Louisville KY	Partner	32	$291	$395	$500	$411	$395	$380
	Associate	19	$275	$290	$342	$304	$274	$268
Madison WI	Partner	10	$275	$420	$491	$420	$443	$563
Memphis TN	Partner	22	$325	$394	$470	$404	$428	$387
Miami FL	Partner	191	$250	$525	$733	$547	$570	$575
	Associate	128	$175	$330	$479	$357	$389	$393
Milwaukee WI	Partner	32	$364	$459	$649	$524	$581	$525
	Associate	18	$322	$455	$690	$498	$462	$404
Minneapolis MN	Partner	138	$475	$694	$918	$692	$673	$637
	Associate	111	$333	$450	$620	$485	$467	$432

Section I: High-Level Data Cuts

Cities
By Years of Experience

2025 Real Rates for Partner | **Trend Analysis - Mean**

City	Years of Experience	n	First Quartile	Median	Third Quartile	2025	2024	2023
Phoenix AZ	21 or More Years	25	$350	$490	$674	$559	$499	$540
Pittsburgh PA	Fewer Than 21 Years	41	$501	$600	$810	$669	$658	$599
	21 or More Years	72	$480	$691	$860	$705	$733	$669
Portland ME	21 or More Years	18	$386	$435	$484	$418	$421	$381
Portland OR	Fewer Than 21 Years	17	$402	$465	$525	$599	$536	$509
	21 or More Years	32	$470	$525	$639	$594	$607	$553
Raleigh NC	21 or More Years	12	$396	$475	$510	$489	$477	$477
Richmond VA	Fewer Than 21 Years	10	$604	$703	$855	$707	$746	$687
	21 or More Years	24	$431	$713	$1,084	$739	$756	$726
Salt Lake City UT	Fewer Than 21 Years	12	$395	$447	$459	$422	$445	$412
	21 or More Years	16	$350	$463	$521	$480	$433	$407
San Diego CA	21 or More Years	33	$438	$785	$1,334	$894	$898	$882

Section II: Industry Analysis

All data and analysis based on data collected thru Q2 2025

2025 - Real Rates for Associate and Partner | **Trend Analysis - Mean**

Practice Area	Matter Type	Role	n	First Quartile	Median	Third Quartile	2025	2024	2023
Employment and Labor: Discrimination, Retaliation and Harassment / EEO	**Litigation**	Partner	27	$393	$495	$613	$509	$463	$436
		Associate	19	$400	$475	$493	$437	$387	$370
Employment and Labor: Other	**Litigation**	Partner	24	$564	$692	$1,252	$956	$782	$683
		Associate	14	$384	$469	$564	$553	$484	$458
	Non-Litigation	Partner	25	$450	$574	$695	$579	$573	$548
		Associate	25	$397	$450	$525	$465	$472	$456
Intellectual Property: Patents	**Non-Litigation**	Partner	41	$350	$595	$691	$605	$652	$634
		Associate	51	$208	$373	$517	$382	$378	$389
Real Estate: Leasing	**Non-Litigation**	Partner	17	$410	$539	$865	$616	$664	$667
		Associate	10	$278	$404	$617	$482	$444	$478
Real Estate: Other	**Non-Litigation**	Partner	58	$480	$626	$940	$694	$612	$540
		Associate	39	$320	$460	$733	$503	$468	$415