BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.
Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq., CA Bar No. 285256
mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (310) 975-1493; Fax: (310) 675-0861

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
Joshua S. Falakassa, CA Bar No. 295045
josh@falakassalaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (818) 456-6168; Fax: (888) 505-0868

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Classes

[Additional counsel listed on next page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

ROBERT MACIAS, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LEFIEL MANUFACTURING CO., a California corporation; and DOES 1-50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV04710
(Related to Case Nos.: 25STCV06644 and 25STCV13876)

Honorable Theresa M. Traber
Department 1

DECLARATION OF JASMINE Y. KIANFARD IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

Date:	October 28, 2026
Time:	10:30 a.m.
Dept.:	1
Complaint Filed:	February 20, 2025
Trial Date:	Not Set

Ryan A. Quadrel (State Bar No. 308311)
rquadrel@blackstonepc.com
Shelby L. Miner (State Bar No. 318338)
sminer@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
Jasmine Y. Kianfard (State Bar No. 349975)
jkianfard@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 622-4278

Attorneys for Plaintiff WALTER REDD, individually, and on behalf of other similarly situated employees

DECLARATION OF JASMINE Y. KIANFARD

I, Jasmine Y. Kianfard, declare and state as follows:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in all Courts of the State of California. I am a member of Blackstone Law, APC, attorneys of record for Plaintiff Walter Redd ("Plaintiff Redd"). I have personal knowledge of the facts contained herein, and, if called to testify, I could and would competently do so.

Experience and Adequacy of Blackstone Law, APC

2. Blackstone Law, APC was started in February 2018, representing plaintiffs in individual and representative employment litigation. The firm has grown exponentially over the past eight-plus years, now maintaining over thirty highly pedigreed attorneys working on almost exclusively labor and employment class actions, California Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") cases, and individual matters, with roughly 15% of the firm focused on other complex general litigation matters. Below is a summary of the experience and qualifications of the attorneys from Blackstone Law, APC who primarily have been responsible for the representation of Plaintiff Redd in connection with the resolution of the above-captioned matter.

3. Jonathan M. Genish is the founder of Blackstone Law, APC. He received his law degree from Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law and was admitted to the California State Bar in 2008. During law school, he clerked at the litigation firm Oved & Oved, LLP and was published several times in various small publications. Upon graduation, he was rehired by Freedman & Taitelman, LLP as an associate and remained employed there from September 2008 through August 2015. During his tenure, he managed hundreds (perhaps thousands) of complex litigation cases, ranging from employment, corporate, entertainment, and general business litigation matters, though his primary area of expertise was employment, both single plaintiff and representative actions. On the vast majority of those cases, he was the only or primary attorney managing the case and thus obtained extensive experience. In that capacity, he conducted wage and hour and wrongful termination labor and employment intakes; was the primary contact for all clients; took and defended hundreds (if not thousands) of depositions; propounded and responded to all discovery; prepared and opposed all motions and pleadings, including dispositive and certification motions; strategized on all cases;

attended all hearings; attended all mediations; coordinated with class action administrators; prepared and worked with experts; first and second chaired multiple trials and arbitrations; and engaged in all other intricate facets of litigation. During that time, he represented a wide range of clients from sole proprietorships to Fortune 500 companies in state, federal, complex, and appellate courts. Many of the cases he managed were highly publicized, with articles written about them in the Los Angeles Times, Deadline, The Hollywood Reporter, Business Insider, Law360, and others. Super Lawyers has regularly honored him as a Southern California Rising Star since 2012.

4. Ryan A. Quadrel is a leading wage and hour litigator whose practice focuses on high-exposure class and representative actions in state, federal, and complex courts throughout California. Known for his strategic judgment and disciplined litigation management, Mr. Quadrel brings extensive experience representing both employees and employers, allowing him to assess cases with the sophistication and balance required in complex employment matters. Mr. Quadrel earned his Juris Doctor degree from Touro College Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center in 2015, where he graduated in the top of his class and earned several accolades by competing and coaching teams in moot court competitions. Since his admission to the California State Bar, his practice has been dedicated almost exclusively to employment law, with a concentration on wage and hour class actions and representative actions under PAGA. Throughout his career, Mr. Quadrel has taken a leadership role in all aspects of complex litigation including trial and arbitration hearings. He regularly oversees case assessment and strategy, directs discovery, and manages the full spectrum of motion practice, including dispositive and class certification briefing. His experience includes soliciting testimony from trial witnesses, taking and defending depositions, coordinating with experts on liability and damages analyses, supervising communications with large groups of class members and aggrieved employees, and guiding cases through mediation, settlement approval, and administration. His strategic approach and command of wage and hour law have resulted in the recovery of unpaid wages and penalties for thousands of employees throughout the state. Recognized for both his results and his professional leadership, Mr. Quadrel frequently lectures on wage and hour legal updates and litigation strategy. He has been recognized as a Top Lawyer on several occasions by Palm Springs Life Magazine.

5. Shelby L. Miner is an Associate Attorney at Blackstone Law, APC whose practice focuses on wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA claims and consumer fraud. In 2014, Ms. Miner obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree from University of Minnesota – Twin Cities. In 2017, Ms. Miner earned her Juris Doctor from University of California, Los Angeles School of Law where she was awarded the Christopher E. Bergin Award for Excellent in Writing. Further, in 2016, Ms. Miner served as a Judicial Extern for the Honorable Louis A. Lavin of the second district California Court of Appeal. In 2017, Ms. Miner was admitted to the State Bar of California, and in 2020 was admitted to the State Bar of Minnesota. Further, Ms. Miner is also admitted to the Central District of California and the DC Court of Appeal.

6. Alexandra Rose joined Blackstone Law, APC from a highly reputable employment law firm. She graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 2016 and from New England Law | Boston with a Juris Doctor degree in 2019. She was admitted to the State Bar of California in December of 2019 and the State Bars of New York and New Jersey in 2023. She is additionally licensed in all federal district courts of California. She manages the post-settlement department at Blackstone Law, APC. In that capacity, she oversees and handles over 100 wage-and-hour putative class actions and/or representative actions under PAGA that are in settlement.

7. I joined Blackstone Law, APC from the Walt Disney Company. I received my Bachelor of Arts degree from California State University, Fullerton in 2015, Master of Journalism from University of Southern California, Los Angeles in 2016, and Juris Doctor degree from Chapman University Dale E. Fowler School of Law in 2021. I was admitted to the State Bar of California in 2023. I have worked on many wage and hour class action and PAGA representative matters, and my work has included, inter alia, conducting legal research, negotiating settlement terms, drafting pleadings, stipulations, memorandums of understanding, settlement agreements, and motion papers, and making court appearances.

8. Blackstone Law, APC has been counsel of record on several class action and PAGA actions that have since been resolved, the most recent of which are attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

///

///

Procedural History of the Actions

9. On February 20, 2025, Plaintiff Robert Macias ("Plaintiff Macias") provided written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") by online submission and to Defendant LeFiell Manufacturing Co. ("Defendant") by U.S. Certified Mail, pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.3, of the specified provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendant ("Macias PAGA Letter"). A true and correct copy of the Macias PAGA Letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

10. On February 20, 2025, Plaintiff Macias filed a Class Action Complaint ("Macias Operative Complaint") in the action entitled *Robert Macias v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV04710 ("Macias Action" or "Action"), thereby commencing a putative class action against Defendant.

11. On March 7, 2025, Plaintiff Redd provided written notice to the LWDA by online submission and to Defendant by U.S. Certified Mail, pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.3, of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendant ("Redd PAGA Letter"). A true and correct copy of the Redd PAGA Letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. Together, the Macias PAGA Letter and Redd PAGA Letter are referred to as the "PAGA Letters."

12. On March 7, 2025, Plaintiff Redd filed a Class Action Complaint ("Redd Class Operative Complaint") in the action entitled *Walter Redd v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV06644 ("Redd Class Action"), thereby commencing a putative class action against Defendant.

13. On May 12, 2025, Plaintiff Redd filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq.* ("Redd PAGA Operative Complaint") in the action entitled *Walter Redd v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV13876 ("Redd PAGA Action"), which alleged one cause of action under PAGA against Defendant.

///

///

14. On June 3, 2025, the Court ordered the Redd Class Action, the Redd PAGA Action, and the Macias Action (collectively, the "Actions") related. The Macias Action was deemed the lead case. The Redd Class Operative Complaint, Redd PAGA Operative Complaint, and Macias Operative Complaint (collectively, "Operative Complaints") allege causes of action for violations of the California Labor Code for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to pay double-time wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to provide compliant rest periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to pay all sick time, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to timely pay wages upon termination, and failure to reimburse necessary business expenses, for violations of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq.* based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations, and for civil penalties under PAGA based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations.

15. On May 7, 2026, Plaintiff Macias, Plaintiff Redd (together, "Plaintiffs") and Defendant (collectively, the "Parties") participated in a formal mediation conducted by Monique Ngo-Bonnici, Esq. ("Mediator"), a neutral and respected mediator with extensive experience in complex wage and hour matters, and with the assistance of the Mediator's evaluations, the Parties were able to reach an agreement to resolve this dispute on a class and representative basis. The Parties then worked diligently to negotiate and memorialize the terms in a long form settlement agreement.

16. On September 18, 2026, the Parties executed the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement"). A true and correct copy of the Settlement Agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

Summary of the Terms of the Settlement Agreement

17. For purposes of settlement only, the Parties have agreed that the Class shall be defined as "all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the Class Period" ("Class" or "Class Member(s)"). The Class Period is defined as the period from February 20, 2021 through July 7, 2026. Based on information provided by Defendant, it is estimated that there are a total of one hundred seventy-five (175) Class Members.

18. The Parties have agreed to settle the class and PAGA claims at issue in the Operative Complaints for a non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount of Five Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($525,000.00), exclusive of employer-side payroll taxes. The Gross Settlement Amount is a common fund and therefore includes all requested costs, fees, and other allocations. The Gross Settlement Amount includes: (1) Class Counsel's fees in the amount of thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $183,750.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $525,000.00); (2) Class Counsel's actual litigation costs and expenses, not to exceed Forty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($40,000.00); (3) Settlement Administration Costs, not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00); (4) Enhancement Payments in the aggregate amount of Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($20,000.00); and (5) PAGA Amount in the amount of Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00). After the above-estimated amounts are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the Net Settlement Amount that will be available for Class Members is currently estimated to be Two Hundred Forty-One Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($241,250.00). Additionally, 35% of the PAGA Amount ("PAGA Employee Amount"), which is $10,500.00 out of $30,000.00, will be fully distributed to "all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period" ("PAGA Employee(s)"). The "PAGA Period" is defined as the period from March 7, 2024 through July 7, 2026.

19. The Net Settlement Amount will be distributed and paid to all Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion ("Settlement Class Member(s)") on a *pro rata* basis based on the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period ("Workweeks"). The *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount that a Class Member may be eligible to receive under the Class Settlement ("Individual Settlement Share") will be calculated by the Settlement Administrator, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

20. The PAGA Employee Amount will be distributed and paid to all PAGA Employees on a *pro rata* basis based on the number of pay periods each PAGA Employee worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the PAGA Period ("Pay Periods").

The *pro rata* share of the PAGA Employee Amount that a PAGA Employee may be eligible to receive under the PAGA Settlement ("Individual PAGA Payment") will be calculated by the Settlement Administrator, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

21. Each Individual Settlement Share will be allocated as twenty percent (20%) wages and eighty percent (80%) penalties, interest, and non-wage damages. The portion allocated to wages will be reported on an IRS Form W-2 and the portions allocated to penalties, interest, and non-wage damages will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator will withhold the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Shares, and issue checks to Settlement Class Members for their net payment of their Individual Settlement Share ("Individual Settlement Payment"). The employer's share of taxes and contributions in connection with the wages portion of Individual Settlement Shares will be paid by Defendant separately and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties and will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Settlement Administrator.

22. The Settlement Agreement is a non-reversionary and non-claims made settlement. The Net Settlement Amount will be fully distributed to Settlement Class Members and the PAGA Amount will be fully distributed to the LWDA and PAGA Employees, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement. No money will revert to Defendant.

23. Each Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment check will be valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days from the date the checks are issued, and thereafter, shall be canceled. Any funds associated with such canceled checks will be distributed by the Settlement Administrator to the State of California's Unclaimed Property Division in the name of the Settlement Class Member and/or PAGA Employee.

The Settlement is Reasonable

Informed Arms-Length Negotiations

24. The Parties' settlement negotiations were at all times made at arm's-length and were adversarial. The Settlement was reached following a full day of mediation with a highly respected mediator with substantial experience mediating wage and hour cases, and Plaintiffs engaged in

additional negotiations in order to finalize the long-form agreement presently before the Court.

25. The Parties engaged in extensive informal discovery prior to reaching a settlement. Prior to mediation, Defendant produced a random fifty percent (50%) sampling of putative class members' time data, all of the putative class members' pay data, Defendant's relevant wage and hour policies, and information regarding the total number of putative class members, the number of current versus former employees, the total workweeks worked by the putative class members, and the average rate of pay for the putative class members.

26. This allowed Class Counsel to conduct an informed assessment and analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and the potential class-wide damages.

27. Based on the information exchanged, the Parties extensively briefed issues regarding class certification and liability and provided their analyses to the Mediator who helped the Parties debate the strengths and weakness of their respective positions. At all times, Plaintiffs were willing and prepared to litigate this matter through class certification and trial if the Parties had been unable to reach a favorable resolution.

Estimate of Potential Value of Claims

28. Class Counsel analyzed all available data and estimated Defendant's maximum potential exposure for the class claims to be approximately $5,110,391, assuming the litigation was successful at trial on all claims at issue and every employee had a violation for each claim on every shift worked. This maximum potential analysis was then reduced based on the challenges facing the likelihood of obtaining class certification, prevailing at trial, and other attendant risks. This estimate is based off an estimated maximum liability for all claims at issue and the total aggregate workweeks during the relevant time period, less interest, and based on the analysis of the data which was extrapolated out for all putative class members across the entire putative class period, which included: $842,961 for meal period violations (less meal period premiums paid); $2,658,954 for rest period violations at a 100% violation rate; $536,226 for unpaid off-the-clock work for 1 hour per workweek of off-the-clock work; $102,149 for unpaid overtime wages at the required regular rate of pay; $3,046 for unpaid meal break premiums and sick pay at the required regular rate of pay; $159,510 for unreimbursed business expenses; $420,595 for waiting time penalties; and $386,950 for wage

statement penalties. Plaintiffs further estimated that Defendant faced an additional exposure of $496,000 in potential, non-stacked (i.e., one penalty, per employee, per pay period during the PAGA statutory period) PAGA penalties. Together with the PAGA penalties, Defendant's maximum potential exposure totaled $5,606,391 in damages.

Specific Risks Considered

29. Although the investigation and information discovered support Plaintiffs' contentions, Defendant raised potential defenses and other circumstances that impacted the risk of proceeding on a class-wide basis. Consideration of these risks factored into the negotiations and the decision to enter the Settlement. First and foremost, Defendant contended that the majority of the Class Members signed enforceable arbitration agreements with class action waivers. Accordingly, this significantly affected the potential size of the putative class.

30. Class Counsel are aware of Defendant's defenses and arguments and have also taken into account the uncertainty and risk of the outcome of further litigation, and the difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation, including those involved in class and/or representative adjudication. Plaintiffs further recognize the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability for the claims asserted in the Actions, Defendant's defenses, and the difficulties in establishing entitlement to monetary recovery. Plaintiffs have also considered the Parties' settlement discussions, as well as the evaluations of the Mediator, who is experienced and well-regarded in complex labor and employment matters.

31. Defendant denied and continues to deny any liability and wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims alleged in the Actions and further denies that class certification is appropriate for any purpose other than the Settlement. Defendant believes that it would ultimately prevail in the Actions. Defendant proffered defenses to both certification and to the merits of Plaintiffs' claims. Defendant contended that Plaintiffs' claims are not suitable for class certification because individual issues would predominate should these cases go to trial. As with all class actions, these complex cases raise difficult management and proof issues and, accordingly, there is a significant risk that the Court may deny class certification.

///

///

32. For example, Plaintiffs' meal period claims, which were based on Defendant's alleged failure to provide lawful meal periods, have been increasingly difficult to certify in recent years. Plaintiffs' theory of liability for meal period violations was based on allegations that Defendant had failed to implement its policies and that its practices failed to allow Class Members to take meal breaks in the manner required under California law. Defendant contended that its policies and practices at all times during the Class Period were lawful. Indeed, Plaintiffs' analysis revealed only a 15.2% violation rate for purported unique meal period violations after offsetting for meal period premiums paid and enforceable meal break waivers. Defendant further argued that the rate of purported meal period violations reflected in the data would require individualized inquiry and that such inquiry would prohibit a class from being certified. We also had to consider the risk that the Court would find validity in the individualized proof defense to certification of Plaintiffs' meal period claim.

33. Additionally, a large portion of Defendant's overall liability lies in Plaintiffs' rest period allegations. As with the meal period allegations, Defendant contended that it had a lawful written rest period policy, provided compliant rest breaks, and relieved Class Members of all duties as required under California law. Additionally, this claim was even more uncertain given the difficulties associated with proving the alleged rest period violations, as Defendant was not required to record these breaks. Given the lack of records demonstrating rest period violations, there were legitimate concerns Plaintiffs would not be able to certify these claims or prove substantial damages with requisite certainty, which made the estimated value of this claim subject to much challenge.

34. Plaintiffs also faced challenges certifying and proving liability for their minimum wage and overtime claims. These claims were largely based on Defendant's unrecorded, off-the-clock work performed by the Class Members both before and after their shifts and during purported meal periods. For example, it was reported that Defendant required Plaintiffs and the Class Members to arrive before their scheduled shift to prepare tools and equipment, stage materials for the day, and discuss the day's workflow. However, the individualized nature of why this work was performed and the individualized nature of damages presented substantial concerns regarding the manageability of the case and the risk the Court could find these issues prevented certification, and the estimated damages for this claim were based on an assumption that all Class Members worked off the clock for at least one hour per

week. Additionally, Plaintiffs alleged that Defendant failed to pay overtime compensation, meal break premiums, and sick pay at the rate of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay by failing to include all non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate calculation. However, Defendant contended that it paid all overtime compensation, meal break premiums, and sick pay at the correct regular rate of pay.

35. Plaintiffs also contended that Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for necessary business-related expenses, such as the purchase of tools and other materials necessary to complete assigned tasks and usage of personal cell phones for work-related purposes. Defendant contended that it had a policy and practice of reimbursing employees for necessary business-related expenses. Defendant further contended that, with respect to the alleged expenses for which Plaintiffs and the other Class Members never requested reimbursement from Defendant, it did not know and had no reason to know that alleged business-related expenses had been incurred. Defendant further contended that the reason for why a Class Member undertook certain expenses, while not others, and failed to receive reimbursement for certain expenses while not others, would raise individual issues that could not be certified.

36. There are also substantial risks associated with Plaintiffs' waiting time penalties and wage statement claims. First, these claims were derivative of Plaintiffs' claims for unpaid meal period premiums, unpaid rest period premiums, unpaid minimum wages, and unpaid overtime wages, and if certification was denied on those underlying claims, these derivative claims for penalties would also likely fail. Further, even if Plaintiffs prevailed on their underlying claims, they would still be required to demonstrate that Defendant's violations of California Labor Code section 203 were *willful* violations. Wage statement claims have also seen varying treatment at the appellate level because such claims have an element of discretion attached to them rather than a pure calculation of damages after liability is proven. Accordingly, these derivative claims, which comprised a substantial portion of Defendant's estimated liability, were therefore uncertain.

37. Class Counsel also recognized that, even if Plaintiffs prevailed at class certification, proving the amount of wages due to each Class Member would be an expensive, time-consuming, and extremely uncertain proposition. In order to prove liability and damages, Class Counsel will need to

request and analyze thousands of pages of documents, obtain the Class Members' contact information, contact them, and obtain declarations at great expense. Obtaining the cooperation of current employees would also be difficult, given the likely reluctance to aid prosecution of a lawsuit against a current employer. On the other hand, Defendant would likely be able to obtain the cooperation of its employees. Moreover, even if Plaintiffs prevailed at class certification and trial, possible appeals would substantially delay any recovery by the Class.

38. Class Counsel also separately contemplated the risks of proceeding with the PAGA claims and potential liability Defendant could face from these claims as part of the global resolution. Existing case law makes PAGA claims subject to the same defenses and risks as Plaintiffs' underlying wage claims. Class Counsel also anticipated that even if successful on the merits at trial, the imposition of cumulative civil penalties based on the alleged wage and hour violations could be considered unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory, and that Defendant would argue that it made a good faith attempt to comply with its legal obligations warranting a reduction in penalties. Class Counsel also anticipated Defendant would argue that the violations per pay period were low, warranting an additional reduction in civil penalties. Finally, we were also mindful of the fact that PAGA is fundamentally not intended to be compensatory in nature but is instead intended to facilitate enforcement of California's labor laws by financing state activities and educating and deterring non-compliance.

39. Accordingly, after considering this multitude of factors, we concluded that it was in the best interest of the State of California and the PAGA Employees to enter into the Settlement, and to allocate Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00) of the Gross Settlement Amount towards the PAGA claims, which represents approximately 5.71% of the Gross Settlement Amount. This percentage of the settlement is well-within the range of wage and hour settlements regularly approved in both state and federal court for cases that include both a class and PAGA action. Typically, such hybrid cases allocate only 1% of the gross settlement value to resolve PAGA claims, and, indeed, settlements allocations as little as 0.22% of the gross settlement amount have been approved as reasonable by courts. Moreover, the overall relief obtained by the Settlement is significant, not only from a monetary perspective, but also because it fulfills the public policy

objectives of PAGA—to promote enforcement of California's labor laws, provide funds to the state, and deter future non-compliance by the employer.

40. Therefore, taking into account how each of the above risks potentially effected Plaintiffs' ability to first obtain class certification, and then prove the underlying violations, the Court's broad discretion in civil penalties, plus the cost and delay in recovering the alleged potential damages, Class Counsel discounted Defendant's estimated liability based on the challenges facing their ability to succeed on class certification by 65% to $1,962,237. The merits-based risk factors further reduced Defendant's estimated liability by an additional 65%. This resulted in an adjusted estimated liability of $686,783. In light thereof, the settlement amount of $525,000 is a significant settlement.

41. Class Counsel therefore submits that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Settlement is in the best interest of the Class Members, the PAGA Employees, and the State of California and is within the accepted range of recoveries for this type of litigation given the inherent risk of litigation, the risk of obtaining and maintaining class certification, and the costs of further litigation.

Enhancement Payments

42. As part of the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiffs are requesting reasonable Enhancement Payments of Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00) each to Plaintiffs (total, $20,000.00). These Enhancement Payments are eminently reasonable given the time and effort Plaintiffs spent on this matter, and the benefit to the Class Members as a result of Plaintiffs' actions. Notice of the requested Enhancement Payments is disclosed to the Class Members in the Class Notice.

Attorneys' Fees and Costs

43. The attorneys' fees incurred by Class Counsel are in line with the common fund requested. The Settlement Agreement provides for Class Counsel to apply for attorneys' fees in an amount of up to thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $183,750.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $525,000.00) and actual litigation costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed Forty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($40,000.00), which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court. Class Counsel has borne all of the risks and

costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.

44. The effectiveness of Class Counsel's prosecution of this matter has translated into tangible monetary benefits as follows: (1) Class Members, the State of California, and PAGA Employees will obtain monetary recovery over a relatively short period of time, as opposed to waiting additional years for the same, or potentially worse, result; (2) a guaranteed result that compares favorably with other similar class action settlements of this type, given the strengths and weaknesses of the case; and (3) significant savings in Class Counsel's fees and/or costs that would have only increased significantly had the cases progress through certification, trial, and/or upon appeal.

45. Class Counsel has litigated this matter for over a year and was actively preparing this matter for class certification and trial. The Motion for Final Approval will elaborate on the nature of the legal services provided, the time incurred in performing those services, and Class Counsel's hourly rates. The Motion for Final Approval will also elaborate on the reimbursement costs sought by Class Counsel. Notice of the requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs is disclosed to the Class Members in the Class Notice.

Notice to the Class

46. The Parties have agreed to retain Apex Class Action, LLC ("Apex" or "Settlement Administrator") to handle the notice and settlement administration process. The Parties respectfully request that the Court appoint Apex to handle these procedures and to serve as the Settlement Administrator. Defendant will provide Apex with the Class List and Apex will calculate each Class Member's estimated Individual Settlement Share and each PAGA Employee's estimated Individual PAGA Payment. Apex will also receive and process Requests for Exclusion, Notices of Objection, and Disputes; will provide necessary reports and declarations; will calculate, subtract, and transmit necessary taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Shares; will prepare and submit informational and other tax filings and documents; will issue and transmit all payments provided for by the Settlement, including, but not limited to, mailing Individual Settlement Payment checks to the Settlement Class Members and Individual PAGA Payment checks to the PAGA Employees; and perform any other usual and customary duties for administering a class action settlement.

47. I am not aware of an alternative method of providing notice to the Class which would result in a higher likelihood of actual notice. The original source of the mailing addresses is from each Class Member, who provided the information to Defendant. As a fail-safe to this highly reliable method, skip tracing will be performed, if necessary.

Notice of Settlement to the LWDA

48. In accordance with California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2), on October 1, 2026, a copy of the proposed Settlement was submitted to the LWDA via online submission through the LWDA's website. A true and correct copy of the email from the LWDA confirming receipt is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

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

Executed on October 1, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Jasmine Y. Kianfard
Jasmine Y. Kianfard

EXHIBIT 1

- *Luis A. Romero v. Thyssenkrupp Materials, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV03007, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jose Luis Ramirez, et al. v. TMI Automotive Products Inc., et al.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2304340, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Yrene Diaz, et al. v. Macadi Cleaning Corporation*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33823, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ingrid Ruano v. Box Express Manufacturing*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV17209, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lakeysha Vaughn, et al. v. Den-Mat Holdings, LLC, et al.*, Santa Barbara County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV01042, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Carla Recinos Castillo, et al. v. Radiant Services Corp., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV37683, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Eduardo Venegas v. Ionis Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case 24STCV12702, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Marissa Riemann v. Quantum Design, Inc., et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 24CU009870C, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jossue Morentin, et al. v. Andros Engineering Corporation*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-25-101034, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Urbano Zavala Lopez v. Food for Life*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2305901, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Demaris Masadas v. California Dinner Entertainment, LLC dba Pirate's Dinner Adventure*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01354556-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Laura Abarca v. Skirball Cultural Center*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07567, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Frank Breckenridge v. Pacific Material Handling Solutions, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV070227, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Gina Harris v. Arhaus, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV24656, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Debra McDonald v. LFCU Financial Services, LLC dba Logix Federal Credit Union, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV16050, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Victoria Esquivel v. Hamlet Karapetian, DMD, Inc. dba Friendly Smiles Dental Group, et al.*, Santa Barbara County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV03582, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Gabriela Guerrero, et al. v. SAR California Holdco Inc. dba Sarku Japan*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-23-104255, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Roman Ramirez Gallegos, et al. v. Dolex Dollar Express, Inc.*, Los Angeles County

Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV21872, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Ismael Mercado, et al. v. Natural Alternatives International, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00052115-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marcella Holmes, et al. v. Pacifica Hotel Company*, San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV-0681, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Daniel Pereira, et al. v. L.N. Curtis and Sons*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV101859, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Dillan Burghart, et al. v. Watermark Services, IV, LLC*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV035212, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Kasim Hakimi v. Catalent Pharma Solutions, LLC*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV087209, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cesar Ibarra v. Leuen, Inc. dba The Original Pantry Café*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV017182, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sharon Baker v. OPARC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11229, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Basilia Villa Magaña v. CJKANTRG PA, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV25886, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexis Stuart-Drinnen v. DiCarlo's Italian Cafe, LLC, et al.*, San Bernardino County

Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2313579, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Monique Duong v. Boardwalk IG Management, LLC*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01334565-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Peter J. Gutierrez v. Univar Solutions USA Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV26851, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Steve Robles v. Avery Products Corporation*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2024-01390483-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Dianna Flores v. Capitol Distribution Company LLC dba Capitol Food Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV20477, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mark Trahan v. Celebrity Casinos, Inc. dba Crystal Casino*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 25STCV30655, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jamie Ramires, et al. v. Bright Star Schools*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV15490, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alesia Williams v. Altamed Health Services Corp.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV15413, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Moreno v. Kern Regional Center*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-24-103353, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jonathan Cruz-Pulido v. Central Valley Meat Co., Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County

Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV13660, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Gregorio Pineda, et al. v. Orthopaedic Hospital dba Orthopaedic Institute for Children and Luskin Orthopaedic Institute for Children, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV01618, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *John Price v. Fort Point Beer Company*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-610592, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *David Jason Quiñones, et al. v. J-M Manufacturing Company Inc. dba JM Eagle*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV16439, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Laila Droubi, et al. v. GSF Properties, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-24-100950, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rowena Ray v. Sierra Central Credit Union*, Butte County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV02890, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Hamid Kondori, et al. v. Mission Imports, et al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2022-01295280-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Johnny Rivas v. Buckingham Property Management*, Kings County Superior Court, Case No. 23CU0355, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Manuel Hernandez v. DHC PS Holdings LLC, et al.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV079333, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and

hour class and PAGA action.

- *Daniel He, et al. v. Bay Photo Lab Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV05682, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Leonard Moore v. Truepill, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV047001, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Colton Ray v. Papé Machinery, Inc., et al.*, Humbolt County Superior Court, Case No. CV2402126, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Elba Garcia v. South Central Los Angeles Regional Center for Developmentally Disabled Persons, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV04382, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Miguel Avila v. Weber Metals, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV04071, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Hector Cornejo v. Renovo Solutions, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27376, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Juan Campos-Ledezma, et al. v. Institute for Environmental Health, Inc.*, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-23-006693, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jeanne Boudreau v. Intelliswift Software, Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-611128, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel Munguia v. Moog Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.

24STCV11688, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Francisco Javier Sanchez, Jr. v. Jim Crawford Construction Company, Inc.*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG01421, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Jose Ramirez v. A.J. Kirkwood & Associates, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 24CU012580C, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Kirstie Deveaux, et al. v. Motorola Solutions, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV427798, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Geri Gates, et al. v. SD & A Teleservices, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV29390, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Bryan Zuniga v. Inova Diagnostics, Inc., et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00055201-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ivorya Geneve v. Mikuni Restaurant Group, Inc.*, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C23-02732, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Amira Fakira, et al. v. CSL Plasma, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV057131, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Vadim Savin, et al. v. Fleetlogix Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00051984-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Grace Weissmuller, et al. v. Astrix Technology, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior

Court, Case No. 21STCV45436, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Gabriel Perez, et al. v. Kimberlite Corporation, et al.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV073959, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Armida Marquez v. The Nielsen Company (US), LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV06394, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sergio Valdez v. Ampere Computing, LLC, et al.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV438808, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mario Mendoza v. Mingei International, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2024-00015385-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Vivian Huynh v. Technical Safety Services, LLC*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV053505, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Connor Brown v. Bi-Rite Management Services LLC, et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-24-611385, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Joshua Gilmore v. Golden Bolt, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11281, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tony Jones v. Saddle Creek Corporation dba Saddle Creek Logistics Services*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2024-01379065-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Armida Burton v. Mercury Mission Systems, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior

Court, Case No. 24STCV02628, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Triada Pallidou v. TJB Geary's, LLC dba Geary's Beverly Hills*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV15627, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Joey Ruiz, et al. v. Southern Tire Mart, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV12037, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Salomon Garcia, et al. v. Atlas Freight Forwarding, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2022-00039724-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Chardriana Jean v. Woodruff-Sawyer & Co.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV102594, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Stephanie Leon v. Fulgent Therapeutics, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV14168, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Emma Romero v. Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2322374, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Karen Hartstein v. Hyatt Corporation*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV15895, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Michael Casas, et al. v. Encorr Sheets, LLC*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2319925, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Quincy O'Neal v. Included Health, Inc., formerly known as Grand Rounds Health,*

Inc., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-608391, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Javario Datrail Luna v. A-Check America, Inc., et al.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2306180, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Kevin Werner, et al. v. Greystar Management Services, LP, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV08498, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jully Mullings v. Antelope Ambulance Service*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30241, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Maria Martina Aleman v, Holding Hands OPCO LLC dba Holding Hands, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV25240, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jesus Herrera v. Reeve Store Equipment Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV04239, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Vanessa Vazquez v. Cliffs Resort LLC*, San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV-0025, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Javier Hernandez, Jr. v. DGDG 1, LLC, et al.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV416770, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Juan Manuel Munoz v. MGA Entertainment, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV06386, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Mayra Campos Molina, et al. v. Harbor Hotels, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV10683, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *William Sykes, IV, et al. v. Wente Bros.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV048758, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Padilla, et al. v. WEHO Hospitality Sunset, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV01072, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marvin Morales v. Skurka Aerospace, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV12893, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tyler Krug, et al. v. EKC Enterprises, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-23-103975, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Joseph Amyot v. Silverthorn Resort, Inc.*, Shasta County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV-0203487, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marissa Hartman v. Napa LP Hospitality Corporation*, Napa County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV00116, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lesly Arreguin, et al. v. Intercare Therapy, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27972, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alma Lopez, et al. v. Advanced Manufacturing and Development, Inc.*, Mendocino County Superior, Case No. 23CV000673, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Brittni Aghedo, et al. v. Villa Esperanza Services*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27362, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Robin Jennings v. Mizuho Orthopedic Systems, Inc. dba Mizuho OSI*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV070891, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jonathan Martin v. Atlas Digital, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30498, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cynthia Molt v. Los Angeles Film School, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30757, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *William Ramirez v. Employer Solutions Staffing Group LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV24735, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Anu Verma v. SingerLewak LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11344, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Toby Lanzarin, et al. v. Building Material Distributors, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00330343-CU-OE-GDS, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Kassandra Herndon, et al. v. Agreeya Solutions, Inc.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0002783, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Damon Siler, et al. v. Call-The-Car dba Call the Car*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07514, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Daniel Ochoa-Lopez v. CorTech West Staffing, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV19480, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA
- *Juan Escobedo v. Block Tops, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01356309-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Antonio Quintero v. Weyerhaeuser NR Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV02624, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cristo Hernandez v. Eldorado National (California), Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2201056, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rigoberto Tecaliz v. National Restaurant Inc. dba Black Bear Diner*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00046906-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cecilia Estrada v. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07184, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexander Davis v. JAJ Roofing dba Citadel Roofing and Solar*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV011004, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Aurelio Aguilar v. Supreme Car Wash, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV29696, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Aaron Coffey v. Catalina Channel Express, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV41396, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Djuana Shanella Hale, et al. v. Welbe Health, LLC, et al.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0006866, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mario Fosados v. Drew Chain Security Corp.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV00519, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jose Manuel Amaro Bernal v. Joseph Holt Plastering, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV15637, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Brandon Geston v. FRTO LLC, et al.*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG01292, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alfonso Herrera v. W.L. Butler Construction, Inc., et al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01335445-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marcos Ojendiz, et al. v. Jonathan Louis International*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV35253, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Emmanuel Caldera v. Zeb's World Famous Boathouse Inc. dba Goat Hill Tavern*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01310801-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alex Javier Nakamoto v. Skydio, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV062913, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jason McEntee v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV041360, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Alexzander Roberts, et al. v. Lemonade Restaurant Group*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV38302, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Halla Knotts v. Launch Technical Workforce Solutions, LLC*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332568, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Armando Gastelum v. Premier Trailer Manufacturing, Inc.*, Tulare County Superior Court, Case No. VCU300333, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Tiffany Patterson v. Black Mountain Healthcare, LLC., d/b/a Seaport Home Health & Hospice*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00037563-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Angel Rodriguez v. American Textile Maintenance*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV17855, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rita Ray v. Families Together of Orange County*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01324555-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ly Hai v. Sunroad HS Auto, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2022-00025788-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Anabel Perez v. Eureka Specialties, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV35940, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Luis Galicia v. Virco, Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.

23STCV29425, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Rene Umana v. Columbus Technologies*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV16432, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Sitara Nayabkhil v. San Francisco SPCA (dba SFSPCA), a California 501(c)(3) non-profit organization*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-609950, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Fernando Solis v. Tuff Shed, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24VECV00368, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tyler Emery v. Santa Cruz Bicycles, LLC*, Santa Cruz Superior Court, Case No. 24CV00244, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Odalys Montejo v. Team Nissan LLC*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 2023CUOE017853, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA
- *Vanessa Cortes v. Giti Tire (USA) LTD*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332578, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Travis Sanford v. Santa Cruz Seaside Company*, Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV01762, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jered Ortega v. YMCA of San Diego County*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00043645-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Corina Martinez v. Stagnaro Bros. Seafood, Inc.*, Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV00082, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alejandra Jimenez v. ClearFreight, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV28938, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jazzmin Cortez v. Millard Mall Services, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2104010, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Christa Morton, et al. v. PSI Services, LLC*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG00039, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Michael Bravo v. Michels Pacific Energy, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 22CV403427, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel Rodriguez v. Republique, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV14521, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Theresa Bendorf, et al. v. Sea World LLC, et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2021-00034922-CU-OE-CTL, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Victor De La Cruz v. Northwest Pipe Company*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2211140, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Bobby Birdi v. Lucid USA, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 21CV003541, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class

and PAGA action.

- *Jose Trujillo, et al. v. Producers Dairy Foods, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00313753, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *David Williams v. Rancho Nicasio, LLC*, Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV2203067, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexander Jackson v. Lifecare Assurance Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV26579, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alexis Cardoza v. BHFC Operating LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV34040, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Maria Ayala, et al. v. SDH Services West, LLC*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-21-101933, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Alfredo Sanchez v. Greenworld, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2105756, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Oscar Bryant v. Midwest Construction Services, Inc. dba Trillium*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2121529, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Matthew Savattieri v. AMI Expeditionary Healthcare, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33372, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lexy Barajas, et al. v. H. W. Hunter, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV01892, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and

hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Alejandro Valdez v. C.H.I. Automart, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV40168, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sheizan Bawa v. Meathead Movers, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2021-01211895-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tanisha Lopez, et al. v. Restorix Health, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33067, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Perla Soto, et al. v. Nippon Express U.S.A., Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV24902, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Angel Garcia, et al. v. J&B Investments, Inc., et al.,* San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2208601, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sindy Aviles, et al. v. Freeway Insurance Services America, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV34864, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alexander Gnaedig, et al. v. Favorite Healthcare Staffing, Inc.,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV20904, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Richard Evans v. My Paint Stop, LLC, et al.,* Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC21-01812, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Luis Parada George v. Main Electric Supply Company, LLC, et al.,* Orange

County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2021-01220136-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Samia Salazar Yunis v. Sharif Jewelers,* Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2020-00290080, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel Analco v. Felix Chevrolet, LP, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV36654, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sasha Aiono v. Benefit Cosmetics,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33719, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

EXHIBIT 2

BOKHOUR
LAW GROUP

MEHRDAD BOKHOUR
Attorney at Law

1901 Avenue of the Stars | Suite 920
Los Angeles | California 90067

tel 310 975 1493
fax 310 675 0861

February 20, 2025

SUBMITTED VIA LWDA'S PAGA CLAIM NOTICE ONLINE PORTAL

COPY SENT VIA CERTIFIED MAIL TO:

LEFIELL MANUFACTURING CO.
13700 FIRESTONE BLVD
SANTA FE SPRINGS, CA 90670

C/O WILLIAM MITCHELL
2 PARK PLAZA SUITE 850
IRVINE, CA 92614

Re: *Robert Macias v. Lefiell Manufacturing Co.*
Notice of Intent to File Suit for California Labor Code § 2698 et seq. Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

This office and Falakassa Law, P.C. represent Robert Macias (hereinafter "Mr. Macias") and a proposed group of current and former non-exempt employees working for Lefiell Manufacturing Co. (hereinafter "Lefiell Manufacturing") and any of its affiliated, predecessor, and merged entities in the State of California for violations of the California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 221, 226(a), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1174, 1174.4, 1194, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, and all applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("Wage Order").

This letter shall serve as notification under Labor Code § 2699.3 (hereinafter "PAGA Notice"). The $75 filing fee payable to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency for the Private Attorneys General Act Notice ("PAGA Notice") was paid online. A copy of this PAGA Notice was submitted electronically to the Department of Industrial Relations.

Mr. Macias wishes to bring a representative action on behalf of himself and the State of California as well as on behalf of the following group of "aggrieved employees":

> All current and former non-exempt hourly employees who work or worked for Lefiell Manufacturing Co. in California during the one year immediately preceding the filing of this PAGA Notice and continuing into the present and ongoing ("aggrieved employees")

mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com
www.bokhourlaw.com

Lefiell Manufacturing specializes in producing tubular products for commercial aviation, defense, and aerospace. These include mast sections, masthead assemblies, tang assemblies, boom sections, bails for mainsheets, swaging, and roll forming.

Mr. Macias has worked as a non-exempt Production Control Planner at Lefiell Manufacturing since May 2019. Based in Santa Fe Springs, California, he performs essential duties integral to the company's operations. Alongside Mr. Macias, other non-exempt employees—such as Quality Control Inspectors, Production Control Planners, Maintenance Mechanics, Planners/Schedulers, CNC Machinists, CNC Programmers, and Executive Administrative Assistants—play a critical role in supporting Lefiell Manufacturing's daily operations and overall success across California.

These non-exempt employees were responsible for a wide range of tasks critical to the company's operations, such as maintenance, programming, quality control, and overall manufacturing duties. Their work ensured the effective operation of Lefiell Manufacturing's assets. Despite the essential nature of their contributions, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees allege that Lefiell Manufacturing failed to comply with California labor laws, including but not limited to accurate timekeeping, proper wage payment, and provision of meal and rest periods, as set forth below.

At all relevant times, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees regularly worked various shifts, many of which were in excess of 8 hours in a workday and 40 hours in a workweek. Mr. Macias alleges that other aggrieved employees were also subjected to the same policies, procedures, practices, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations to which he was subjected during his employment.

First, at all relevant times, Lefiell Manufacturing has had a uniform practice of consistently failing to accurately record and pay for all time worked, including time under which aggrieved employees were subject to the employer's control. This included a policy and practice of failing to record and capture aggrieved employees' time correctly, including all time spent working off the clock. As a result of this company-wide policy/practice, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees are not compensated for all the hours that they work and all of the overtime hours they work, in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1197.1, 1199, and applicable Wage Orders.

As a result, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees were not adequately paid for all hours worked in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 1194, 1197.1, 1199, and applicable Wage Orders. Additionally, due to the unlawful timekeeping policy/practices, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees were also not correctly paid at the correct overtime rate for hours worked in excess of eight hours per shift in violation of Labor Code § 510.

Labor Code § 1197.1 authorizes employees who are paid less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law or by order of the commission a civil penalty, restitution of wages,

and liquidated damages as follows: (1) for any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid...[and] (2) [f]or each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty dollars ($250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation was intentionally committed.

Labor Code § 510 requires an employer to compensate an employee who works more than eight (8) hours in one workday, forty (40) hours in a workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day, no less than one and one-half times (11/2) the regular rate of pay. In addition, Labor Code § 510 obligates employers to compensate employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve (12) hours in a workday or more than eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. Pursuant to Section 3 of the applicable Wage Orders, non-exempt employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or more than 40 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (11/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek.

Accordingly, through PAGA and to the extent permitted by law, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover penalties for violations of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1197.1, 1199 1197.1 under Labor Code § 1197.1, 1199, or Labor Code § 2699(f)(2), and attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Furthermore, at all relevant times, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees worked regular shifts that lasted longer than 8.0 hours in a workday. This resulted in aggrieved employees regularly working more than 40 hours in a workweek. However, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees were not properly paid at the correct overtime rate for all overtime hours worked due to Lefiell Manufacturing's uniform failure to include all forms of compensation/remuneration, including, but not limited to, commissions, incentives, non-discretionary bonuses, shift pay, and all other forms of remuneration in calculating the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of overtime compensation.

Under the California Labor Code (as well as the FLSA), courts have consistently held that regularly paid non-discretionary bonuses (and other forms of pay) must be included in determining an employee's "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime. (See *Haber v. The Americana Corp*. 378 F. 2d 854, 855-856 (9th Cir. 1967) [holding that regularly paid efficiency bonuses must be included in calculating the "regular rate"]; *Wang v. Chinese Daily News, Inc.* 435 F. Supp. 2d 1042, 1055-1057 (C.D. Cal. 2006) [granting summary judgment to Plaintiff under California and federal law on the grounds that Defendant improperly calculated overtime by excluding annual bonuses paid to employees from the "regular rate of compensation"]; see *Walling v. Youngerman-Reynolds Hardwood Co.* (1945) 65 S.Ct. 1242, 1245. ("The regular rate by its very nature must reflect all payments which the parties have agreed shall be received regularly during the workweek, exclusive of overtime payments. It is not an arbitrary label chosen by the parties but an actual fact. Once the parties have decided upon the amount of wages and the mode of

payment, the determination of the regular rate becomes a matter of mathematical computation, the result of which is unaffected by any designation of a contrary 'regular rate' in the contracts."); see also 29 CFR §§ 778.110 ("production bonus") and 778.111 ("piece-rate").

Labor Code § 510 requires an employer to compensate an employee who works more than eight (8.0) hours in one workday, forty (40.0) hours in a workweek, and for the first eight (8.0) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day, no less than one and one-half times (11/2) the regular rate of pay. In addition, Labor Code § 510 obligates employers to compensate employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve (12.0) hours in a workday or more than eight (8.0) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. Pursuant to Section 3 of the applicable Wage Orders, non-exempt employees shall not be employed more than eight (8.0) hours in any workday or more than 40.0 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (11/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek.

By their policy of requiring aggrieved employees to work in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40.0) hours in a workweek without compensating them at the rate of one-half (11/2) their "regular rate of pay," Lefiell Manufacturing willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code § 510 and the applicable Wage Orders.

Accordingly, through PAGA and to the extent permitted by law, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover penalties for violations of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1197.1, 1199 1197.1 under Labor Code § 1197.1, 1199, or Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Further, California Labor Code § 510(a) provides that any work in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday, or in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a workweek, must be compensated at a rate of no less than twice the employee's regular rate of pay. Lefiell Manufacturing failed to compensate Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees at the required double-time rates for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a single workday and/or for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive workday.

California Labor Code § 1194 entitles employees to recover unpaid wages, including overtime and double-time compensation, along with interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs. Lefiell Manufacturing's failure to pay Mr. Macias' and other aggrieved employees' lawful double-time wages also constitutes a violation of California Labor Code § 1198, which prohibits employers from requiring employees to work under conditions that violate wage and hour laws.

As a result of Lefiell Manufacturing's failure to pay Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees double-time wages, Mr. Macias has suffered damages in an amount to be determined at trial, including unpaid wages, interest, and other applicable damages. Due to Lefiell Manufacturing's unlawful conduct, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees are entitled to

recover unpaid wages, interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other relief deemed appropriate by the Court.

Similarly, at all relevant times, Lefiell Manufacturing also failed in its obligation to provide Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a),(b), which requires that "[a]n employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days. . . at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment." Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees must be "calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek."

Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be "calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Finally, Labor Code §246(i) requires employers to "provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

Here, at all relevant times, Lefiell Manufacturing failed in its obligation to provide Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees the legally required paid sick days at the appropriate "regular rate of pay," including all forms of compensation, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a), (b). As such, Lefiell Manufacturing paid sick time below his base rate of pay rather than the "regular rate of pay" as required by Labor Code §§ 246(l) (1-2).

Based on the foregoing Labor Code violations, Mr. Macias seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Moreover, at all relevant times, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees were denied compliant and timely 30-minute off-duty meal periods as mandated by California law. Due to Lefiell Manufacturing's uniform meal period policies/practices, operational requirements and work demands, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees often could not take timely and uninterrupted net 30-minute first meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work. Further, when Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees worked more than 10.0 hours in a shift, they were not allowed and permitted to take a mandated second meal period before the end of the tenth hour of work in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. Indeed, Mr. Macias' and other aggrieved employees' meal periods were often interrupted and lasted fewer than 30 minutes due to Lefiell Manufacturing's meal period policies/procedures, operational requirements, and work demands.

In addition, for each missed or non-compliant meal period, Lefiell Manufacturing failed and continues to fail to maintain a mechanism by which aggrieved employees were paid meal period premiums at the "regular rate of pay" pursuant to *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 5th 858 and Labor Code § 226.7.

Accordingly, due to Lefiell Manufacturing's uniform meal period practices, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees were also regularly denied legally compliant meal periods in violation of Labor Code 226.7, 510, 516, and applicable IWC Wage Orders and are entitled to penalties under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2).

Next, at all relevant times, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees were not provided with all 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or a major fraction thereof, due to Lefiell Manufacturing's uniform rest period policies/practices, operational requirements and work demands. As a result, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees were and are often unable to take a net 10-minute duty-free rest period for every major fraction of four hours worked. This includes a second rest period for shifts in excess of six hours and a third rest period for shifts in excess of 10.0 hours in a workday.

By not relieving all non-exempt employees of all duties during rest periods, Lefiell Manufacturing failed to provide legally compliant rest periods. See *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc*. (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 257, 269 [concluding that "during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time."]. In *Augustus*, the California Supreme Court expressly rejected the employer's assertion that it could provide an on-duty rest period to employees who worked as security guards and further explained: "that employers [must] relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time and relieve their employees of all duties." *Id*. at 273. Each time Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees could not take a compliant rest period, Lefiell Manufacturing failed and continues to fail to adequately pay rest period premium payments at the "regular rate of pay" as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

Accordingly, due to Lefiell Manufacturing's uniform rest period policies/practices and work demands, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees were also regularly denied legally compliant rest breaks in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and applicable Wage Orders and would be entitled to penalties under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2).

As a result of Lefiell Manufacturing's failure to pay Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees for all hours they were subject to the control of Lefiell Manufacturing Co., including all minimum, overtime, double-time, and sick pay wages, and Lefiell Manufacturing's failure to pay for meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Lefiell Manufacturing issued wage statements which failed to identify the gross wages earned accurately, the total hours worked, the net wages earned, and the correct corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1, 2, 5, and 9).

Labor Code § 226.3 provides that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) per employee per violation in an initial violation and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

Thus, for the violations of Labor Code section 226 described above, Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees may also recover Labor Code § 226.3 penalties for Lefiell Manufacturing's violations of Labor Code § 226(a). Consequently, because Lefiell Manufacturing failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), Mr. Macias and other aggrieved employees would be entitled to recover penalties under Labor Code §§ 226(e) or Labor Code § 2699(f)(2).

Finally, because Lefiell Manufacturing failed to pay all minimum, overtime, double-time, sick pay, wages, and meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Lefiell Manufacturing also failed and continues to fail to pay other aggrieved employees all wages owed at their time of separation from employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203. Thus, aggrieved employees would be entitled to recover penalties under Labor Code §§ 201-203 or Labor Code § 2699(f)(2).

Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of this notice whether your office intends to investigate the violations alleged herein above. We understand that if we do not receive a response from your office within sixty-five (65) calendar days of this PAGA Notice, Mr. Macias may thereafter pursue his interests and the interests of similarly aggrieved employees with a civil complaint against Lefiell Manufacturing for its violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

While we intend to pursue a PAGA representative and/or Class Action lawsuit against Lefiell Manufacturing for unpaid wages and civil penalties under Labor Code § 2699, it is our firms' policy to attempt to negotiate an early resolution of all matters where possible and beneficial to all aggrieved employees. If Lefiell Manufacturing is interested in resolving this matter, please contact me or have your lawyer contact our office to discuss an informal discovery plan and the possibility of early mediation on or before **April 19, 2025**.

Respectfully submitted,

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.



Joshua S. Falakassa, Esq.
Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq.

EXHIBIT 3

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Ryan A. Quadrel, Esq.
rquadrel@blackstonepc.com

March 7, 2025

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission
California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)
Sacramento, CA 95814
https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html

RE: ***Walter Redd v. LeFiell Manufacturing Company***

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Walter Redd ("Claimant") with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against LeFiell Manufacturing Company (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as "Employers"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers have employed Walter Redd from approximately May 2021 to the present as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Walter Redd has worked as a Shipping Clerk for Employers and has been based out of Employers' facility located at 13700 Firestone Blvd, Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA"). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of themself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged ("Aggrieved Employees"). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant's notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Claimant's employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("IWC Wage Order"). Employers' conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

meaning of PAGA.

The claims made on behalf of Claimant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee's regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

This uncompensated work often resulted in the total number of hours worked by Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees exceeding the daily and/or weekly triggers for overtime wages, yet Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees applicable overtime rate(s) for these hours.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id*.

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to sign meal waivers for noncompliant meal periods that were not voluntarily waived.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. For each day that an employer fails to authorize and permit a compliant rest period, the employer owes the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.,* 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia,* overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (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

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

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 only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

California Labor Code sections 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 if an employee quits 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' 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.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. CONCLUSION

Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

§ 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW



Ryan A. Quadrel, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Agent for Service, William Mitchell
2 Park Plaza, Suite 850
Irvine, CA 92614

LeFiell Manufacturing Company
13700 Firestone Blvd
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
LeFiell Manufacturing Company

EXHIBIT 4

JOINT STIPULATION OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

This Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement") is made and entered into by and between Plaintiffs Robert Macias ("Plaintiff Macias") and Walter Redd ("Plaintiff Redd") (together, "Plaintiffs" or "Class Representatives"), individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated and on behalf of the State of California with respect to aggrieved employees, and Defendant LeFiell Manufacturing Co. ("Defendant") (collectively, Plaintiffs and Defendant are referred to as "Parties" and individually as "Party").

This Settlement Agreement shall be binding on Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members (as defined herein), the State of California as to the employment of PAGA Employees (as defined herein), and Defendant, subject to the terms and conditions hereof and the approval of the Court.

RECITALS

1. On February 20, 2025, Plaintiff Macias provided written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") by online submission and to Defendant by U.S. Certified Mail, pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.3, of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendant ("Macias PAGA Letter").

2. On March 7, 2025, Plaintiff Redd provided written notice to the LWDA by online submission and to Defendant by U.S. Certified Mail, pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.3, of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendant ("Redd PAGA Letter"). Together, the Macias PAGA Letter and Redd PAGA Letter are referred to as the "PAGA Letters".

3. On February 20, 2025, Plaintiff Macias filed a Class Action Complaint ("Macias Operative Complaint") in the action entitled *Robert Macias v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV04710 ("Macias Action" or "Action"), thereby commencing a putative class action against Defendant.

4. On March 7, 2025, Plaintiff Redd filed a Class Action Complaint ("Redd Class Operative Complaint") in the action entitled *Walter Redd v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV06644 ("Redd Class Action"), thereby commencing a putative class action against Defendant.

5. On May 12, 2025, Plaintiff Redd filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq*. ("Redd PAGA Operative Complaint") in the action entitled *Walter Redd v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV13876 ("Redd PAGA Action"), which alleged one cause of action under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2698 *et seq*. ("PAGA") against Defendant.

6. On June 3, 2025, the Court ordered the Redd Class Action, the Redd PAGA Action, and the Macias Action related. The Macias Action was deemed the lead case.

7. The Redd Class Operative Complaint, Redd PAGA Operative Complaint, and Macias Operative Complaint (collectively, "Operative Complaints") allege causes of action for violations of the California Labor Code for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to pay double-time wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to provide compliant rest periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to pay all sick time, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to timely pay wages upon termination, and failure to reimburse necessary business expenses, for violations of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq*. based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations, and for civil penalties under PAGA based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations.

8. Defendant denies all material allegations set forth in the Redd Class Action, Redd PAGA Action, and Macias Action (collectively, "Actions") and has asserted numerous affirmative defenses. Notwithstanding, in the interest of avoiding further litigation, Defendant desires to fully and finally settle the Actions, Released Class Claims (as defined herein), and Released PAGA Claims (as defined herein).

9. Class Counsel diligently investigated the class and PAGA claims against Defendant, including any and all applicable defenses and the applicable law. The investigation included, *inter alia*, the exchange of information, data, and documents, and review of corporate policies and practices. The Parties have engaged in sufficient informal discovery and investigation to assess the relative merits of the claims and contentions of the Parties.

10. On May 7, 2026, the Parties participated in mediation with Monique Ngo-Bonnici, Esq. (the "Mediator"), a respected mediator of complex wage and hour actions, and with the assistance of the Mediator's evaluations, the Parties reached the settlement that is memorialized herein. The Parties' settlement discussions were conducted at arms' length, and the Settlement is the result of an informed and detailed analysis of Defendant's potential liability and exposure in relation to the costs and risks associated with continued litigation. Based on Class Counsel's investigation and evaluation, Class Counsel believes that the settlement with Defendant for the consideration and on the terms set forth in this Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interest of the Class Members, State of California, and PAGA Employees in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant delay and uncertainty associated with litigation and various defenses asserted by Defendant.

11. The Parties expressly acknowledge that this Settlement Agreement is entered into solely for the purpose of compromising significantly disputed claims and that nothing herein is an admission of liability or wrongdoing by Defendant. If for any reason this Settlement Agreement is not approved, it will be of no force or effect, and the Parties shall be returned to their original respective positions.

DEFINITIONS

12. The following definitions are applicable to this Settlement Agreement. Definitions contained elsewhere in this Settlement Agreement will also be effective.

a. "Attorneys' Fees and Costs" means attorneys' fees approved by the Court for Class Counsel's litigation and resolution of the Actions and all actual costs and expenses incurred and to be incurred by Class Counsel in connection with the Actions, as set forth in Paragraph 15.

b. "Class" or "Class Member(s)" means, for settlement purposes only, all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the Class Period.

c. "Class Counsel" means Jonathan M. Genish, Ryan A. Quadrel, Shelby L. Miner, Alexandra Rose, and Jasmine Y. Kianfard of Blackstone Law, APC, Mehrdad Bokhour of Bokhour Law Group, P.C., and Joshua S. Falakassa of Falakassa Law, P.C., who will seek to be

appointed counsel for the Class for settlement purposes only.

d. "Class List" means a complete list of all Class Members that Defendant will diligently and in good faith compile from its records and provide to the Settlement Administrator. The Class List will be formatted in a readable Microsoft Office Excel spreadsheet containing the following information for each Class Member: (1) full name; (2) last known mailing address; (3) Social Security number; (4) dates worked for Defendant during the Class Period; and (5) such other information as is necessary for the Settlement Administrator to calculate Workweeks and Pay Periods.

e. "Class Notice" means the Notice of Class Action Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as "**Exhibit A**."

f. "Class Period" means the period from February 20, 2021 through July 7, 2026.

g. "Class Settlement" means the settlement and resolution of all Released Class Claims.

h. "Court" means the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles.

i. "Defendant's Counsel" means Kyle A. Wende and Hardy Ray Murphy of Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C.

j. "Dispute" means a letter submitted by a Class Member disputing the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods which have been credited to them, which must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action; (b) contain the Class Member's full name, signature, address, telephone number, and the last four (4) digits of the Class Member's Social Security number; (c) clearly state that the Class Member disputes the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to the Class Member and what the Class Member contends is the correct number; and (d) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline.

k. "Effective Date" means the following: (i) if no Settlement Class Member objects to the Class Settlement, then the Effective Date will be the date of Final Approval; or (ii) if any Settlement Class Member objects to the Class Settlement, the Effective Date will be the sixty-first (61st) calendar day after the date of Final Approval, provided no appeal is initiated by an objector; or

(iii) if a timely appeal is initiated by an objector, then the Effective Date will be the day after final resolution of that appeal (including any requests for rehearing and/or petitions for certiorari), resulting in final judicial approval of the Settlement.

l. "Employer Taxes" means the employer's share of taxes and contributions in connection with the wages portion of Individual Settlement Shares, which shall be computed by the Settlement Administrator and paid by Defendant in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount.

m. "Enhancement Payment(s)" means the amounts approved by the Court to be paid to Plaintiffs, both to recognize their effort and work in prosecuting the Actions on behalf of Class Members and PAGA Employees and to secure their general releases of claims, as set forth in Paragraph 16.

n. "Final Approval" means the determination by the Court that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment based thereon.

o. "Final Approval Hearing" means the hearing at which the Court will consider and determine whether the Settlement should be granted Final Approval.

p. "Final Approval Order and Judgment" means the order granting final approval of the Settlement and entering judgment thereon, in a form and content mutually agreed to by the Parties, and subject to approval by the Court.

q. "Gross Settlement Amount" means the amount of Five Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($525,000.00) to be paid by Defendant in full satisfaction of the Actions, Released Class Claims, and Released PAGA Claims, which includes all Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Amount, Settlement Administration Costs, and Net Settlement Amount to be paid to the Settlement Class Members. Defendant shall pay the Employer Taxes separately and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. The Gross Settlement Amount is non-reversionary; no portion of the Gross Settlement Amount will return to Defendant. The Gross Settlement Amount is subject to increase, as provided in Paragraph 19.

r. "Individual PAGA Payment" means the *pro rata* share of the PAGA Employee Amount that a PAGA Employee may be eligible to receive under the PAGA Settlement, to be calculated in accordance with Paragraph 21.

s. "Individual Settlement Payment" means the net payment of each Settlement Class Member's Individual Settlement Share, after reduction for the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Share, as provided in Paragraph 22.

t. "Individual Settlement Share" means the *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount that a Class Member may be eligible to receive under the Class Settlement, to be calculated in accordance with Paragraph 20.

u. "LWDA Payment" means the amount of Nineteen Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents ($19,500.00), i.e., 65% of the PAGA Amount, that the Parties have agreed to pay to the LWDA under the PAGA Settlement, as set forth in Paragraph 17.

v. "Net Settlement Amount" means the portion of the Gross Settlement Amount that is available for distribution to Settlement Class Members, which is the Gross Settlement Amount less the Court-approved Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Amount, and Settlement Administration Costs.

w. "Notice of Objection" means a Settlement Class Member's written objection to the Class Settlement, which must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action; (b) contain the objector's full name, signature, address, telephone number, and the last four (4) digits of the objector's Social Security number; (c) contain a written statement of all grounds for the objection accompanied by any legal support for such objection; (d) contain copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based; and (e) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline.

x. "PAGA Amount" means the allocation of Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00) from the Gross Settlement Amount for the PAGA Settlement. Sixty-five percent (65%) of the PAGA Amount, or $19,500.00, will be paid to the LWDA (i.e., the LWDA Payment) and the remaining thirty-five percent (35%), or $10,500.00, will be distributed to the PAGA Employees (i.e., the PAGA Employee Amount).

///

///

y. "PAGA Employee(s)" means all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period.

z. "PAGA Employee Amount" means the amount of Ten Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,500.00), i.e., 35% of the PAGA Amount, to be distributed to PAGA Employees on a *pro rata* basis based on their Pay Periods.

aa. "PAGA Period" means the period from March 7, 2024 through July 7, 2026.

bb. "PAGA Settlement" means the settlement and resolution of all Released PAGA Claims.

cc. "Pay Periods" means the number of pay periods each PAGA Employee worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the PAGA Period. Pay Periods will be calculated by the Settlement Administrator.

dd. "Preliminary Approval" means the date on which the Court enters the Preliminary Approval Order.

ee. "Preliminary Approval Order" means the order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement, in a form and content mutually agreed to by the Parties, and subject to approval by the Court.

ff. "Released Class Claims" means any and all claims which were alleged or which could have been alleged based on the factual allegations in the Operative Complaints, arising during the Class Period, which specifically includes claims for Defendant's alleged failure to pay minimum, overtime, and double-time wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide accurate wage statements, pay all sick time, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226(e), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, and California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq*.

///

///

gg. "Released PAGA Claims" means any and all claims arising from any of the factual allegations in the Operative Complaints and PAGA Letters, arising during the PAGA Period, for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698 *et seq*., which specifically includes claims for Defendant's alleged failure to pay minimum, overtime, and double-time wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide accurate wage statements, maintain all required employment records, pay all sick time, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226(e), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 2800, and 2802.

hh. "Released Parties" means Defendant and its current and former officers, directors, members, insurers, investors, shareholders, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, successors, and assigns, as well as Defendant's sole owner, the Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP) trust, and its trustees.

ii. "Request for Exclusion" means a letter submitted by a Class Member indicating a request to be excluded from the Class Settlement, which must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action; (b) contain the Class Member's full name, signature, address, telephone number, and last four (4) digits of the Class Member's Social Security number; (c) clearly state that the Class Member does not wish to be included in the Class Settlement; and (d) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline.

jj. "Response Deadline" means the deadline by which Class Members must submit a Request for Exclusion, Notice of Objection, and/or Dispute, which shall be the date that is forty-five (45) calendar days from the initial mailing of the Class Notice by the Settlement Administrator to Class Members, unless the 45th day falls on a Sunday or Federal holiday, in which case the Response Deadline will be extended to the next day on which the United States Postal service is open. The Response Deadline may also be extended by express agreement between Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel. In the event that a Class Notice is re-mailed to a Class Member, the Response Deadline for that Class Member shall be extended fifteen (15) calendar days from the original Response Deadline.

kk. "Settlement Administrator" means Apex Class Action, LLC, or any other third-party class action settlement administrator agreed to by the Parties and approved by the Court for purposes of administrating the Settlement. The Parties and their counsel each represent that they do not have any financial interest in the Settlement Administrator or otherwise have a relationship with the Settlement Administrator that could create a conflict of interest.

ll. "Settlement Administration Costs" means the costs payable from the Gross Settlement Amount to the Settlement Administrator for administrating the Settlement, as set forth in Paragraph 18.

mm. "Settlement Class" or "Settlement Class Member(s)" means all Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion.

nn. "Workweeks" means the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period. Workweeks will be calculated by the Settlement Administrator.

CLASS CERTIFICATION

13. For the purposes of this Settlement only, the Parties stipulate to the certification of the Class.

14. The Parties agree that certification for the purpose of settlement is not an admission that certification is proper under Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Should, for whatever reason, the Court not grant Final Approval, the Parties' stipulation to class certification as part of the Settlement shall become null and void ab initio and shall have no bearing on, and shall not be admissible in connection with, the issue of whether or not certification would be inappropriate in a non-settlement context.

TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises, and agreements set forth herein, the Parties agree, subject to the Court's approval, as follows:

15. Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendant agrees not to oppose or impede any application or motion by Class Counsel for attorneys' fees in the amount up to thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $183,750.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $525,000.00) and

reimbursement of actual costs and expenses associated with Class Counsel's litigation and settlement of the Actions, in an amount not to exceed Forty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($40,000.00), both of which will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. These amounts will cover any and all work performed and any and all costs incurred by Class Counsel in connection with the litigation of the Actions, including without limitation all work performed and costs incurred to date, and all work to be performed and all costs to be incurred in connection with obtaining the Court's approval of this Settlement Agreement, including any objections raised and any appeals necessitated by those objections. Class Counsel shall be solely and legally responsible for correctly characterizing this compensation for tax purposes and for paying any taxes on the amounts received. The Settlement Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099 to Class Counsel for the Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Class Counsel and Plaintiffs acknowledge and agree that this amount is subject to the discretion of the Court. The Court rejecting the application/motion for attorney fees, or awarding a lesser amount, shall not be grounds to rescind, cancel, void, terminate, or otherwise undo the effectiveness and enforceability of this Agreement. Any portion of the requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs that is not awarded by the Court to Class Counsel shall be reallocated to the Net Settlement Amount for the benefit of the Settlement Class Members.

16. Enhancement Payments. Defendant agrees not to oppose or impede any application or motion by Plaintiffs for Enhancement Payments in the amounts up to Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00) each (total, $20,000.00). The Enhancement Payments, which will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to Court approval, will be in addition to any other payments they are entitled to under the Settlement. Plaintiffs shall be solely and legally responsible for correctly characterizing this compensation for tax purposes and for paying any taxes on the amounts received. The Settlement Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099 to Plaintiffs for the Enhancement Payments. Class Counsel and Plaintiffs acknowledge and agree that these amounts are subject to the discretion of the Court. The Court rejecting the application/motion for Enhancement Payments, or awarding lesser amounts, shall not be grounds to rescind, cancel, void, terminate, or otherwise undo the effectiveness and enforceability of this Agreement. Any portion of the requested Enhancement Payments that are not awarded by the Court to Plaintiffs shall be reallocated to the Net Settlement

Amount for the benefit of the Settlement Class Members.

17. PAGA Amount. Subject to approval by the Court, the Parties agree that the amount of Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00) shall be allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount toward penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code Section 2698, et seq. (i.e., the PAGA Amount), of which sixty-five percent (65%), or $19,500.00, will be paid to the LWDA (i.e., the LWDA Payment) and thirty-five percent (35%), or $10,500.00, will be distributed to PAGA Employees (i.e., the PAGA Employee Amount) on a *pro rata* basis, based on the total number of Pay Periods worked by each PAGA Employee during the PAGA Period (i.e., the Individual PAGA Payments).

18. Settlement Administration Costs. The Settlement Administrator will be paid for the reasonable costs of administration of the Settlement and distribution of payments under the Settlement, which is currently estimated not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00). These costs, which will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to Court approval, will include, *inter alia*, translating the Class Notice to Spanish and Vietnamese, printing, distributing, and tracking Class Notices and other documents for the Settlement, calculating and distributing payments due under the Settlement, issuing of 1099 and W-2 IRS Forms and all required tax reporting, filings, withholdings, and remittances, providing necessary reports and declarations, and other duties and responsibilities set forth herein to process the Settlement, and as requested by the Parties. To the extent the actual Settlement Administrator's costs are greater than the estimated amount stated herein, such excess amount will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court. Any portion of the estimated, designated, and/or awarded Settlement Administration Costs which are not in fact required to fulfill payment to the Settlement Administrator to undertake the required settlement administration duties shall be reallocated to the Net Settlement Amount for the benefit of the Settlement Class Members.

19. Escalator Clause. Defendant has represented that the Class Members worked a total of 22,000 Workweeks during the period February 20, 2021 to May 7, 2026. If it is determined by the Settlement Administrator that the total number of Workweeks worked by the Class Members during the Class Period actually exceeds 22,000 by more than 10% (i.e., if the Workweeks exceed 24,200),

then the Gross Settlement Amount will be increased on a *pro rata* basis equal to the amount of percentage points (to the nearest tenth of a point) by which the Workweeks count exceeds that 10% threshold (i.e., if the number of Workweeks increased by 11.3%, then the Gross Settlement Amount will increase by 1.3%).

20. Individual Settlement Share Calculations. Individual Settlement Shares will be calculated and apportioned from the Net Settlement Amount based on the Class Members' number of Workweeks, as follows:

a. After Preliminary Approval, the Settlement Administrator will divide the Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Class Members to yield the "Estimated Workweek Value," and multiply each Class Member's individual Workweeks by the Estimated Workweek Value to yield each Class Member's estimated Individual Settlement Share that the Class Member may be entitled to receive under the Class Settlement.

b. After Final Approval, the Settlement Administrator will divide the final Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Settlement Class Members to yield the "Final Workweek Value," and multiply each Settlement Class Member's individual Workweeks by the Final Workweek Value to yield each Settlement Class Member's final Individual Settlement Share.

21. Individual PAGA Payment Calculations. Individual PAGA Payments will be calculated and apportioned from the PAGA Employee Amount based on the PAGA Employees' number of Pay Periods, as follows: The Settlement Administrator will divide the PAGA Employee Amount, i.e., 35% of the PAGA Amount, by the Pay Periods of all PAGA Employees to yield the "Pay Period Value," and multiply each PAGA Employee's individual Pay Periods by the Pay Period Value to yield each PAGA Employee's Individual PAGA Payment.

22. Tax Treatment of Individual Settlement Shares and Individual PAGA Payments. Each Individual Settlement Share will be allocated as follows: twenty percent (20%) wages and eighty percent (80%) penalties, interest, and non-wage damages. The portion allocated to wages will be reported on an IRS Form W-2 and the portions allocated to penalties, interest, and non-wage damages will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator will withhold the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages

portion of the Individual Settlement Shares, and issue checks to Settlement Class Members for their Individual Settlement Payments (i.e., payment of their Individual Settlement Share net of these taxes and withholdings). The Employer Taxes will be paid separately and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties and will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Settlement Administrator.

23. Administration of Taxes by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator will be responsible for issuing to Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, PAGA Employees, and Class Counsel any tax forms (i.e., IRS Forms W-2, IRS Forms 1099, etc.) as may be required by law for all amounts paid pursuant to this Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Administrator will also be responsible for calculating the Employer Taxes and forwarding all payroll taxes and other legally required withholdings to the appropriate government authorities.

24. Tax Liability. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendant, and Defendant's Counsel do not intend anything contained in this Settlement Agreement to constitute advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Settlement Agreement be relied on as such. Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Employees are not relying on any statement, representation, or calculation by Defendant, the Settlement Administrator, or Class Counsel in this regard. Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Employees understand and agree that Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Employees will be solely responsible for the payment of any taxes and penalties assessed on the payments described in this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Employees should consult with their tax advisors concerning the tax consequences of any payment they receive under the Settlement.

25. Circular 230 Disclaimer. EACH PARTY TO THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT (FOR PURPOSES OF THIS SECTION, THE "ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY" AND EACH PARTY TO THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT OTHER THAN THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY, AN "OTHER PARTY") ACKNOWLEDGES AND AGREES THAT (1) NO PROVISION OF THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, AND NO WRITTEN COMMUNICATION OR DISCLOSURE BETWEEN OR AMONG THE PARTIES OR THEIR ATTORNEYS AND OTHER ADVISORS, IS OR WAS INTENDED TO BE, NOR WILL ANY SUCH COMMUNICATION OR DISCLOSURE

CONSTITUTE OR BE CONSTRUED OR BE RELIED UPON AS, TAX ADVICE WITHIN THE MEANING OF UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT CIRCULAR 230 (31 CFR PART 10, AS AMENDED); (2) THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY (A) HAS RELIED EXCLUSIVELY UPON HIS, HER, OR ITS OWN, INDEPENDENT LEGAL AND TAX COUNSEL FOR ADVICE (INCLUDING TAX ADVICE) IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, (B) HAS NOT ENTERED INTO THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BASED UPON THE RECOMMENDATION OF ANY OTHER PARTY OR ANY ATTORNEY OR ADVISOR TO ANY OTHER PARTY, AND (C) IS NOT ENTITLED TO RELY UPON ANY COMMUNICATION OR DISCLOSURE BY ANY ATTORNEY OR ADVISOR TO ANY OTHER PARTY TO AVOID ANY TAX PENALTY THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY; AND (3) NO ATTORNEY OR ADVISOR TO ANY OTHER PARTY HAS IMPOSED ANY LIMITATION THAT PROTECTS THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF ANY SUCH ATTORNEY'S OR ADVISOR'S TAX STRATEGIES (REGARDLESS OF WHETHER SUCH LIMITATION IS LEGALLY BINDING) UPON DISCLOSURE BY THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY OF THE TAX TREATMENT OR TAX STRUCTURE OF ANY TRANSACTION, INCLUDING ANY TRANSACTION CONTEMPLATED BY THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

26. Settlement Awards Do Not Trigger Additional Benefits. All payments made under the Settlement shall be deemed to be paid to the payee solely in the year in which such payments actually are issued to the payee. It is expressly understood and agreed that payments made under this Settlement shall not in any way entitle Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, or any PAGA Employee to additional compensation or benefits under any new or additional compensation or benefits, or any bonus, contest, or other compensation or benefit plan or agreement in place during the Class Period, nor will it entitle Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, or any PAGA Employee to any increased retirement, 401K benefits or matching benefits, or deferred compensation benefits (notwithstanding any contrary language or agreement in any benefit or compensation plan document that might have been in effect during the Class Period).

///

///

27. Duties of the Parties with Respect to Obtaining Preliminary Approval of the Settlement. Plaintiffs will obtain a hearing date from the Court for Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement, which Class Counsel will be responsible for drafting, and submit this Settlement Agreement to the Court in support of said motion. Class Counsel will provide Defendant's Counsel a draft of the preliminary approval motion before filing it with the Court. Defendant agrees not to oppose the motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement consistent with this Settlement Agreement. By way of said motion, Plaintiffs will apply for the entry of the Preliminary Approval Order seeking the following:

a. Conditionally certifying the Class for settlement purposes only;

b. Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement;

c. Preliminarily appointing Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class;

d. Preliminarily appointing Class Counsel as counsel for the Class;

e. Approving as to form and content, the mutually-agreed upon and proposed Class Notice and directing its mailing by First Class U.S. Mail;

f. Approving the manner and method for Class Members to request exclusion from or object to the Class Settlement as contained herein and within the Class Notice; and

g. Scheduling a Final Approval Hearing at which the Court will determine whether Final Approval of the Settlement should be granted.

28. Notice of Settlement to the LWDA. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(s)(2), Class Counsel shall notify the LWDA of the Settlement.

29. Delivery of Class List. Within fourteen (14) calendar days of Preliminary Approval, Defendant will provide the Class List to the Settlement Administrator.

30. Notice by First-Class U.S. Mail.

a. Within ten (10) business days after receiving the Class List from Defendant, the Settlement Administrator will perform a search based on the National Change of Address Database or any other similar services available, such as provided by Experian, for information to update and correct for any known or identifiable address changes, and will mail a Class Notice in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese (in the form attached as **Exhibit A** to this Settlement Agreement) to all Class

Members via First-Class U.S. Mail, using the most current, known mailing addresses identified by the Settlement Administrator.

b. Any Class Notice returned to the Settlement Administrator as undeliverable on or before the Response Deadline will be sent promptly via First-Class U.S. Mail to the forwarding address affixed thereto and the Settlement Administrator will indicate the date of such re-mailing on the Class Notice. If no forwarding address is provided, the Settlement Administrator will promptly attempt to determine the correct address using a skip-trace or other search, using the name, address, and/or Social Security number of the Class Member, and perform a single re-mailing within five (5) calendar days.

c. Compliance with the procedures described herein above shall constitute due and sufficient notice to Class Members of the Settlement and shall satisfy the requirements of due process. Nothing else shall be required of or done by the Parties, Class Counsel, or Defendant's Counsel to provide notice of the Settlement.

31. Disputes Regarding Workweeks and/or Pay Periods. Class Members will have an opportunity to dispute the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods which have been credited to them, as reflected in their respective Class Notices, by submitting a timely and valid Dispute to the Settlement Administrator, by mail, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline. The date of the postmark on the return mailing envelope will be the exclusive means to determine whether a Dispute has been timely submitted. Absent evidence rebutting the accuracy of Defendant's records and data as they pertain to the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to be credited to a disputing Class Member, Defendant's records will be presumed to be correct and determinative of the dispute. However, if a Class Member produces information and/or documents to the contrary, the Settlement Administrator will evaluate the materials submitted by the Class Member and the Settlement Administrator will resolve and determine the number of eligible Workweeks and/or Pay Periods that the disputing Class Member should be credited with under the Settlement. The Settlement Administrator's decision on such disputes will be final and non-appealable.

///

///

32. Requesting Exclusion from the Class Settlement. Any Class Member wishing to be excluded from the Class Settlement must submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion to the Settlement Administrator, by mail, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline. The date of the postmark on the return mailing envelope will be the exclusive means to determine whether a Request for Exclusion has been timely submitted. The Settlement Administrator will certify jointly to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel the number of timely and valid Requests for Exclusion that are submitted, and also identify the individuals who have submitted a timely and valid Request for Exclusion in a declaration that is to be filed with the Court in advance of the Final Approval Hearing. At no time will any of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise encourage Class Members to request exclusion from the Class Settlement. Any Class Member who submits a Request for Exclusion is prohibited from making any objection to the Class Settlement. Any Class Member who submits a timely and valid Request for Exclusion will not be bound by the Class Settlement and will not be issued an Individual Settlement Payment. Any Class Member who does not affirmatively request exclusion from the Class Settlement by submitting a timely and valid Request for Exclusion will be bound by all of the terms of the Class Settlement, including and not limited to those pertaining to the Released Class Claims, as well as any judgment that may be entered by the Court if it grants Final Approval to the Settlement. Notwithstanding the above, all PAGA Employees will be bound to the PAGA Settlement and will be issued their Individual PAGA Payment, irrespective of whether they submit a Request for Exclusion.

33. Objecting to the Class Settlement. To object to the Class Settlement, Settlement Class Members must submit a timely and complete Notice of Objection to the Settlement Administrator, by mail, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline. The date of the postmark on the return mailing envelope will be the exclusive means to determine whether a Notice of Objection has been timely submitted. The Settlement Administrator will certify jointly to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel the number of Notices of Objection that are submitted (specifying which ones were timely and complete and which were not), and also attach them to a declaration that is to be filed with the Court in advance of the Final Approval Hearing. At no time will any of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise encourage Settlement Class Members to object to the Class Settlement or

appeal from the Final Approval Order and Judgment. Settlement Class Members, individually or through counsel, may also present their objection orally at the Final Approval Hearing, regardless of whether they have submitted a Notice of Objection.

34. Reports by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator shall provide weekly reports to counsel for the Parties providing: (a) the number of undeliverable and re-mailed Class Notices; (ii) the number of Class Members who have submitted Disputes; (iii) the number of Class Members who have submitted Requests for Exclusion; and (iv) the number of Settlement Class Members who have submitted Notices of Objection. Additionally, the Settlement Administrator will provide to counsel for the Parties any updated reports regarding the administration of the Settlement Agreement as needed or requested, and immediately notify the Parties when it receives a request from an individual or any other entity regarding inclusion in the Class and/or Settlement or regarding a Dispute.

35. Defendant's Right to Rescind. If more than ten percent (10%) of the Class Members submit timely and valid Requests for Exclusion, Defendant may elect to rescind the Settlement Agreement. Defendant must exercise this right of rescission in writing that is provided to Class Counsel within seven (7) calendar days of the Settlement Administrator notifying the Parties of the number of Class Members who have submitted timely and valid Requests for Exclusion following the Response Deadline. If Defendant exercises this option, Defendant shall pay any costs of settlement administration owed to the Settlement Administrator incurred up to that date.

36. Certification of Completion. Upon completion of administration of the Settlement, the Settlement Administrator will provide a written declaration under oath to certify such completion to the Court and counsel for all Parties.

37. Duties of the Parties with Respect to Obtaining Final Approval of the Settlement. After the Response Deadline, a Final Approval Hearing will be conducted to determine whether Final Approval of the Settlement should be granted, along with the amounts properly payable for: (a) Individual Settlement Shares; (b) Individual PAGA Payments; (c) LWDA Payment; (d) Attorneys' Fees and Costs; (e) Enhancement Payments; and (f) Settlement Administration Costs. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will be responsible for drafting the motion seeking Final Approval of the Settlement.

Class Counsel will provide Defendant's Counsel a draft of the final approval motion before filing it with the Court. By way of said motion, Plaintiffs will apply for the entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment, which will provide for, in substantial part, the following:

a. Approval of the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and directing consummation of its terms and provisions;

b. Certification of the Settlement Class;

c. Approval of the application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel;

d. Approval of the application for Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs;

e. Directing Defendant to fund all amounts due under the Settlement Agreement and ordered by the Court; and

f. Entering judgment in the Actions, while maintaining continuing jurisdiction, in conformity with California Rules of Court 3.769 and the Settlement Agreement.

38. Funding of the Gross Settlement Amount. No later than ten (10) business days after the Effective Date, Defendant will deposit the Gross Settlement Amount and Employer Taxes into a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") within the meaning of Treasury Regulation Section 1.468B-1, *et seq.*, to be established by the Settlement Administrator. By the same date, Defendant shall also provide all information necessary for the Settlement Administrator to calculate necessary payroll taxes including its official name, 8-digit state unemployment insurance tax ID number, and other information requested by the Settlement Administrator.

39. Distribution of the Gross Settlement Amount. Within ten (10) business days of the funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator will issue the Individual Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members, Individual PAGA Payments to PAGA Employees, LWDA Payment to the LWDA, Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs, Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel, and Settlement Administration Costs to itself. The Settlement Administrator shall also set aside the Employer Taxes and all employee-side payroll taxes, contributions, and withholding, and timely forward these to the appropriate government authorities.

40. Settlement Checks. The Settlement Administrator will be responsible for undertaking appropriate deductions, required tax reporting, and issuing the Individual Settlement Payments by way of check to the Settlement Class Members and the Individual PAGA Payments by way of check to the

PAGA Employees in accordance with this Settlement Agreement. When issuing payments, the Settlement Administrator may combine the Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment into one check if the intended recipient for both payments is one individual. Settlement Class Members and PAGA Employees are not required to submit a claim to be issued an Individual Settlement Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment. Each Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment check will be valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days from the date the checks are issued, and thereafter, shall be canceled. Any funds associated with such canceled checks shall be distributed by the Settlement Administrator to the State of California's Unclaimed Property Division in the name of the Settlement Class Member and/or PAGA Employee. The Parties agree that this disposition results in no "unpaid residue" under California Civil Procedure Code Section 384, as the entire Net Settlement Amount will be paid out to Settlement Class Members, whether or not they cash their settlement checks. Therefore, Defendant will not be required to pay any interest on such amounts. The Settlement Administrator shall undertake amended and/or supplemental tax filings and reporting required under applicable local, state, and federal tax laws that are necessitated due to the cancelation of any Individual Settlement Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment checks. Settlement Class Members whose Individual Settlement Payment checks are canceled shall, nevertheless, be bound by the Class Settlement, and PAGA Employees whose Individual PAGA Payment checks are canceled shall, nevertheless, be bound by the PAGA Settlement.

41. Class Settlement Release. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount and Employer Taxes, Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released Class Claims.

42. PAGA Settlement Release. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount and Employer Taxes, Plaintiffs, the State of California with respect to all PAGA Employees, and all PAGA Employees will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released PAGA Claims.

43. Plaintiffs' General Release. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount and Employer Taxes, Plaintiffs, individually and on their own behalf, will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, guarantees, costs, expenses, attorneys' fees, damages, or causes of action of any kind or nature whatsoever, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, asserted or unasserted, arising out of, relating to, or resulting from their employment and/or separation of employment with Defendant, which Plaintiffs, at any time up until the execution of the Settlement Agreement, had or claimed to have or may have. It is agreed that this is a general release and is to be broadly construed as a release of all claims, provided that, notwithstanding the foregoing, this Paragraph expressly does not include a release of any claims that cannot be released hereunder by law. Any and all rights granted under any state or federal law or regulation limiting the effect of the Settlement Agreement, including the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, ARE HEREBY EXPRESSLY WAIVED. Section 1542 of the California Civil Code reads as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

44. Final Approval Order and Judgment. The Parties shall provide the Settlement Administrator with a copy of the Final Approval Order and Judgment once it is entered by the Court, and the Settlement Administrator shall post the Final Approval Order and Judgment on its website for sixty (60) calendar days. No individualized notice of the Final Approval Order and Judgment to the Class will be required.

45. Continued Jurisdiction. After entry of the judgment pursuant to the Settlement, the Court will have continuing jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court and Section 664.6 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, for purposes of addressing: (a) the interpretation and enforcement of the terms of the Settlement, (b) settlement administration matters,

and (c) such post-judgment matters as may be appropriate under court rules or as set forth in this Settlement Agreement.

46. Effects of Termination or Rescission of Settlement. Termination or rescission of the Settlement Agreement shall have the following effects:

a. The Settlement Agreement shall be void and shall have no force or effect, and no Party shall be bound by any of its terms;

b. In the event the Settlement Agreement is terminated, Defendant shall have no obligation to make any payments to any Party, Class Member, or attorney, except that the terminating Party shall pay the Settlement Administrator for services rendered up to the date the Settlement Administrator is notified that the Settlement has been terminated;

c. The Preliminary Approval Order and Final Approval Order and Judgment, including any order certifying the Class, shall be vacated;

d. The Settlement Agreement and all negotiations, statements, and proceedings relating thereto shall be without prejudice to the rights of any of the Parties, all of whom shall be restored to their respective positions in the Actions prior to the execution of the Settlement Agreement;

e. Neither this Settlement Agreement, nor any ancillary documents, actions, statements, or filings in furtherance of the Settlement (including all matters associated with the mediation) shall be admissible or offered into evidence in the Actions or any other action for any purpose whatsoever; and

f. Any documents generated to bring the Settlement into effect, will be null and void, and any order or judgment entered by the Court in furtherance of this Settlement Agreement will likewise be treated as void from the beginning.

47. No Prior Assignments. The Parties and their counsel represent, covenant, and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity any portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action or right herein released and discharged.

48. Exhibits Incorporated by Reference. The terms of this Settlement include the terms set forth in any attached exhibits, which are incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein. Any exhibits to this Settlement Agreement are an integral part of the Settlement.

49. Entire Agreement. This Settlement Agreement and any attached exhibits constitute the entirety of the Parties' agreement relating to the settlement and transaction completed thereby, and all prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, representations, and statements, whether oral or written and whether by a Party or such Party's legal counsel, are merged herein. No other prior or contemporaneous written or oral agreements may be deemed binding on the Parties. The Parties expressly recognize California Civil Code Section 1625 and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1856(a), which provide that a written agreement is to be construed according to its terms and may not be varied or contradicted by extrinsic evidence, and the Parties agree that no such extrinsic oral or written representations or terms will modify, vary, or contradict the terms of this Settlement Agreement.

50. Interim Stay of Proceedings. The Parties agree to hold in abeyance all proceedings in the Actions (including with respect to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 583.310), except such proceedings necessary to implement and complete this Settlement Agreement, pending the Final Approval Hearing to be conducted by the Court.

51. Amendment or Modification. Prior to the filing of the motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement, the Parties may not amend or modify any provision of this Settlement Agreement except by written agreement signed by counsel for all Parties. After the filing of the motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement, the Parties may not amend or modify any provision of this Settlement Agreement except by written agreement signed by counsel for all the Parties and subject to Court approval. A waiver or amendment of any provision of this Settlement Agreement will not constitute a waiver of any other provision.

52. Authorization to Enter into Settlement Agreement. Counsel for all Parties warrant and represent they are expressly authorized by the Parties whom they represent to negotiate this Settlement Agreement and to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Settlement Agreement to effectuate its terms and to execute any other documents required to effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement. The Parties warrant that they understand and have full authority to enter into this Settlement Agreement, and further intend that this Settlement Agreement will be fully enforceable and binding on all Parties, and agree that it will be admissible and subject to disclosure in any proceeding to enforce its terms, notwithstanding any mediation confidentiality provisions that otherwise might apply under state or federal law.

53. Signatories. It is agreed that because the members of the Class are so numerous, it is impossible or impractical to have each Settlement Class Member or PAGA Employee execute this Settlement Agreement. The Class Notice will advise all Class Members of the binding nature of the Class Settlement as to the Settlement Class Members and the binding nature of the PAGA Settlement as to the PAGA Employees, and the releases provided for by this Settlement Agreement shall have the same force and effect as if this Settlement Agreement were executed by each Settlement Class Member and PAGA Employee.

54. Binding on Successors and Assigns. This Settlement Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors or assigns of the Parties hereto, as previously defined.

55. California Law Governs. All terms of this Settlement Agreement and attached exhibits hereto will be governed by and interpreted according to the laws of the State of California.

56. Execution and Counterparts. This Settlement Agreement is subject only to the execution of all Parties. However, this Settlement Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts. All executed counterparts and each of them, including facsimile, electronic, and scanned copies of the signature page, will be deemed to be one and the same instrument.

57. Acknowledgement that the Settlement is Fair and Reasonable. The Parties believe this Settlement Agreement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of the Actions and have arrived at this Settlement after arm's length negotiations and in the context of adversarial litigation, taking into account all relevant factors, present and potential. The Parties further acknowledge that they are each represented by competent counsel and that they have had an opportunity to consult with their counsel regarding the fairness and reasonableness of this Settlement Agreement. In addition, if necessary to obtain approval of the Settlement, the Mediator may execute a declaration supporting the Settlement and the reasonableness of the Settlement and the Court may, in its discretion, contact the Mediator to discuss the Settlement and whether or not the Settlement is objectively fair and reasonable.

58. Invalidity of Any Provision. Before declaring any provision of this Settlement Agreement invalid, the Court will first attempt to construe the provision as valid to the fullest extent possible consistent with applicable precedents so as to define all provisions of this Settlement Agreement valid and enforceable.

///

59. Enforcement Action. In the event that one or more of the Parties institutes any legal action or other proceeding against any other Party or Parties to enforce the provisions of this Settlement Agreement or to declare rights and/or obligations under this Settlement, the successful Party or Parties will be entitled to recover from the unsuccessful Party or Parties reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, including expert witness fees, in connection with any enforcement actions.

60. Plaintiffs' Cooperation. Plaintiffs agree to sign this Settlement Agreement and, by signing this Settlement Agreement, are hereby bound by the terms herein and agree to fully cooperate to implement the Settlement.

61. Non-Admission of Liability. The Parties enter into this Settlement Agreement to resolve the dispute that has arisen between them and to avoid the burden, expense, and risk of continued litigation. In entering into this Settlement Agreement, Defendant does not admit, and specifically denies, it has violated any federal, state, or local law; violated any regulations or guidelines promulgated pursuant to any statute or any other applicable laws, regulations, or legal requirements; breached any contract; violated or breached any duty; engaged in any misrepresentation or deception; or engaged in any other unlawful conduct with respect to its employees. Neither this Settlement Agreement, nor any of its terms or provisions, nor any of the negotiations connected with it, shall be construed as an admission or concession by Defendant of any such violations or failures to comply with any applicable law. Except as necessary in a proceeding to enforce the terms of this Settlement Agreement, this Settlement Agreement and its terms and provisions shall not be offered or received as evidence in any action or proceeding to establish any liability or admission on the part of Defendant or to establish the existence of any condition constituting a violation of, or a non-compliance with, federal, state, local, or other applicable law.

62. Captions. The captions and paragraph numbers in this Settlement Agreement are inserted for the reader's convenience, and in no way define, limit, construe, or describe the scope or intent of the provisions of this Settlement Agreement.

63. Mutual Preparation. The Parties have had a full opportunity to negotiate the terms and conditions of this Settlement Agreement. Accordingly, this Settlement Agreement will not be construed more strictly against one Party than another merely by virtue of the fact that it may have

been prepared by counsel for one of the Parties, it being recognized that, because of the arms-length negotiations between the Parties, all Parties have contributed equally to the preparation of this Settlement Agreement.

64. Representation By Counsel. The Parties acknowledge that they have been represented by counsel throughout all negotiations that preceded the execution of this Settlement Agreement, and that this Settlement Agreement has been executed with the consent and advice of counsel, and reviewed in full.

65. All Terms Subject to Final Court Approval. All amounts and procedures described in this Settlement Agreement herein will be subject to final Court approval.

66. Notices. All notices, demands, and other communications to be provided concerning the Settlement Agreement shall be in writing and deemed to have been duly given as of the third business day after mailing by First Class U.S. Mail, or the day sent by email or messenger, addressed as follows:

To Plaintiffs and Class Counsel:
Jonathan M. Genish
jgenish@blackstonepc.com
Ryan A. Quadrel
rquadrel@blackstonepc.com
Shelby L. Miner
sminer@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose
arose@blackstonepc.com
Jasmine Y. Kianfard
jkianfard@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Mehrdad Bokhour
mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com
BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 975-1493

Joshua S. Falakassa
josh@falakassalaw.com
FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.

1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (818) 456-6168

To Defendant:
Hardy Ray Murphy
hardy.murphy@ogletree.com
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.
400 South Hope Street, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 239-9800

Kyle A. Wende
kyle.wende@ogletree.com
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2800
Sacramento, California 95814
Telephone: (916) 840-3150

67. Cooperation and Execution of Necessary Documents. All Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other in good faith and use their best efforts to implement the Settlement, including and not limited to, executing all documents to the extent reasonably necessary to effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement. If the Parties are unable to reach agreement on the form or content of any document needed to implement the Settlement Agreement, or on any supplemental provisions that may become necessary to effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement, the Parties may seek the assistance of the Mediator and then the Court to resolve such disagreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto knowingly and voluntarily executed this Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement between Plaintiffs and Defendant:

IT IS SO AGREED.

PLAINTIFF ROBERT MACIAS

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Robert Macias

PLAINTIFF WALTER REDD

Dated: 09/04/2026

Walter Redd
Plaintiff Walter Redd

Docusign Envelope ID: 4D6EB54D-BD3B-83D8-8189-EBC7324B4451

1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (818) 456-6168

To Defendant:
Hardy Ray Murphy
hardy.murphy@ogletree.com
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.
400 South Hope Street, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 239-9800

Kyle A. Wende
kyle.wende@ogletree.com
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2800
Sacramento, California 95814
Telephone: (916) 840-3150

67. Cooperation and Execution of Necessary Documents. All Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other in good faith and use their best efforts to implement the Settlement, including and not limited to, executing all documents to the extent reasonably necessary to effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement. If the Parties are unable to reach agreement on the form or content of any document needed to implement the Settlement Agreement, or on any supplemental provisions that may become necessary to effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement, the Parties may seek the assistance of the Mediator and then the Court to resolve such disagreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto knowingly and voluntarily executed this Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement between Plaintiffs and Defendant:

IT IS SO AGREED.

PLAINTIFF ROBERT MACIAS

Dated: 9/1/2026

Signed by:
Robert Macias
C729AA0B12AC4CF...

Plaintiff Robert Macias

PLAINTIFF WALTER REDD

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Walter Redd

Docusign Envelope ID: 70057979-93A6-8AF7-80C1-8DDFAFD441BE

Dated: 9/18/2026

DEFENDANT LEFIELL MANUFACTURING CO.

DocuSigned by:
Raman Venkat
963874084885425...

Full Name: Raman Venkat

Title: CEO
On behalf of Defendant
LeFiell Manufacturing Co.

EXHIBIT A

NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Robert Macias v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.
Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 25STCV04710
Walter Redd v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.
Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case Nos. 25STCV06644 and 25STCV13876

PLEASE READ THIS CLASS NOTICE CAREFULLY.

You have received this Class Notice because Defendant's records indicate that you may be eligible to take part in the class action settlement reached in the above-referenced cases.

You do not need to take any action to receive a settlement payment.

This Class Notice is designed to advise you of your rights and options with respect to the settlement, and how you can request to be excluded from the Class Settlement, object to the Class Settlement, and/or dispute the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods that you are credited with, if you so choose.

YOU ARE NOTIFIED THAT: A class and representative action settlement has been reached between Plaintiffs Robert Macias ("Plaintiff Macias") and Walter Redd ("Plaintiff Redd") (together, "Plaintiffs") and LeFiell Manufacturing Co. ("Defendant") (Plaintiffs and Defendant are collectively referred to as the "Parties") in the cases entitled *Robert Macias v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV04710 ("Macias Action" or "Action"); *Walter Redd v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV06644 ("Redd Class Action"); and *Walter Redd v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV13876 ("Redd PAGA Action") (collectively, the "Actions"), which may affect your legal rights. On [date of Preliminary Approval], the Court granted preliminary approval of the settlement and scheduled a hearing on [hearing date] at [hearing time] ("Final Approval Hearing") to determine whether or not the Court should grant final approval of the settlement.

I. IMPORTANT DEFINITIONS

"**Class**" or "**Class Member(s)**" means all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the Class Period.

"**Class Period**" means the period from February 20, 2021 through July 7, 2026.

"**Class Settlement**" means the settlement and resolution of all Released Class Claims.

"**PAGA Employee(s)**" means all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period.

"**PAGA Period**" means the period from March 7, 2024 through July 7, 2026.

"**PAGA Settlement**" means the settlement and resolution of all Released PAGA Claims.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE ACTIONS

On February 20, 2025, Plaintiff Macias commenced a putative class action lawsuit by filing a Class Action Complaint ("Macias Operative Complaint") in the Macias Class Action. On March 7, 2025, Plaintiff Redd commenced a putative class action lawsuit by filing a Class Action Complaint ("Redd Class Operative Complaint") in the Redd Class Action. On May 12, 2025, Plaintiff Redd filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq*. The Redd Class Operative Complaint, Redd PAGA Operative Complaint, and Macias Operative Complaint are collectively referred to as the "Operative Complaints".

Plaintiffs contend that Defendant failed to properly pay minimum, overtime, and double-time wages, provide compliant meal and rest breaks and associated premiums, pay all sick time, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment and associated waiting-time penalties, provide accurate wage statements, and reimburse business expenses, and thereby engaged in unfair business practices in violation of the California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq*., and conduct that gives rise to penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 pursuant to California Labor

Code Section 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA"). Plaintiffs seek, among other things, recovery of unpaid wages and meal and rest period premiums, unreimbursed business expenses, restitution, penalties, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs.

Defendant denies all of the allegations in the Actions or that it violated any law.

On May 7, 2026, the Parties participated in mediation with a respected class action mediator, and as a result, the Parties reached a settlement. The Parties have since entered into a Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement").

On [Date of Preliminary Approval], the Court entered an order preliminarily approving the Settlement. The Court has appointed Apex Class Action, LLC as the administrator of the Settlement ("Settlement Administrator"), Plaintiffs Robert Macias and Walter Redd as representatives of the Class ("Class Representatives"), and the following Plaintiffs' attorneys as counsel for the Class ("Class Counsel"):

Jonathan M. Genish
Ryan A. Quadrel
Shelby L. Miner
Alexandra Rose
Jasmine Y. Kianfard
Blackstone Law, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Mehrdad Bokhour
BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (310) 975-1493

Joshua S. Falakassa
FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 520
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: (818) 456-6168

If you are a Class Member, you need not take any action to receive an Individual Settlement Payment, but you have the opportunity to request exclusion from the Class Settlement (in which case you will not receive an Individual Settlement Payment), object to the Class Settlement, and/or dispute the Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you, if you so choose, as explained more fully in Sections III and IV below. If you are a PAGA Employee, you do not need to take any action to receive an Individual PAGA Payment; you will not have the opportunity to object or seek exclusion from the PAGA Settlement and all PAGA Employees will be bound to the PAGA Settlement if the Court grants final approval of the Settlement.

The Settlement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in the Settlement is intended or will be construed as an admission by Defendant that the claims in the Actions have merit or that Defendant has any liability to Plaintiffs, Class Members, or PAGA Employees. Plaintiffs and Defendant, and their respective counsel, have concluded and agree that, in light of the risks and uncertainties to each side of continued litigation, the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interests of the Class Members, the State of California, and PAGA Employees.

III. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

A. Settlement Formula

The total gross settlement amount is Five Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($525,000.00) (the "Gross Settlement Amount"). The portion of the Gross Settlement Amount that is available for payment to Class Members

is referred to as the "Net Settlement Amount." The Net Settlement Amount will be the Gross Settlement Amount less the following payments, which are subject to approval by the Court: (1) attorneys' fees, in an amount not to exceed thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $183,750.00), and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses, in an amount not to exceed Forty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($40,000.00) to Class Counsel; (2) Enhancement Payments in amounts not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00) each to Plaintiffs (total, $20,000.00) for their services in the Actions; (3) the amount of Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00) allocated toward civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA Amount"), of which the LWDA will be paid 65% ($19,500.00) ("LWDA Payment") and the remaining 35% ($10,500.00) will be distributed to PAGA Employees ("PAGA Employee Amount"); and (4) Settlement Administration Costs in an amount not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00) to the Settlement Administrator.

Class Members are eligible to receive payment under the Class Settlement of their *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount ("Individual Settlement Share") based on the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period ("Workweeks"). The Settlement Administrator has divided the Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Class Members to yield the "Estimated Workweek Value," and multiplied each Class Member's individual Workweeks by the Estimated Workweek Value to yield an estimated Individual Settlement Share that each Class Member may be entitled to receive under the Class Settlement (which is listed in Section III.C below). Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion ("Settlement Class Members") will be issued their final Individual Settlement Payment.

Each Individual Settlement Share will be allocated as twenty percent (20%) as wages, which will be reported on an IRS Form W-2, and eighty percent (80%) as penalties, interest, and non-wage damages, which will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable). Each Individual Settlement Share will be subject to reduction for the employee's share of payroll taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Shares resulting in a net payment to the Settlement Class Member ("Individual Settlement Payment"). The employer's share of taxes and contributions in connection with the wages portion of Individual Settlement Shares ("Employer Taxes") will be paid by Defendant separately and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. W-2 wages paid in an Individual Settlement Share will not constitute eligible compensation under LeFiell's Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP).

PAGA Employees are eligible to receive payment under the PAGA Settlement of their *pro rata* share of the PAGA Employee Amount ("Individual PAGA Payment") based on number of pay periods each PAGA Employee worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the PAGA Period ("Pay Periods"). The Settlement Administrator had divided the PAGA Employee Amount, i.e., 35% of the PAGA Amount, by the Pay Periods of all PAGA Employees to yield the "PAGA Pay Period Value," and multiplied each PAGA Employee's individual Pay Periods by the Pay Period Value to yield each PAGA Employee's Individual PAGA Payment.

Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties, will not be subject to taxes or withholdings, and will be reported on IRS Form 1099 (if applicable).

If the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, Individual Settlement Payments will be mailed to Settlement Class Members and Individual PAGA Payments will be mailed to PAGA Employees at the address that is on file with the Settlement Administrator. **If the address to which this Class Notice was mailed is not correct, or if you move after you receive this Class Notice, you must provide your correct mailing address to the Settlement Administrator as soon as possible to ensure you receive any payment that you may be entitled to under the Settlement.**

B. Your Workweeks and Pay Periods (if applicable) Based on Defendant's Records

According to Defendant's records:

- **From February 20, 2021 through July 7, 2026 (i.e., the Class Period), you are credited as having worked [_____] Workweeks.**
- **From March 7, 2024 through July 7, 2026 (i.e., the PAGA Period), you are credited as having worked [_____] Pay Periods.**

If you wish to dispute the Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you, you must submit your dispute in writing to the Settlement Administrator ("Dispute"). The Dispute must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Macias v.*

LeFiell Manufacturing Co., Case No. 25STCV04710); (b) contain your full name, signature, address, telephone number, and the last four (4) digits of your Social Security number; (c) clearly state that you dispute the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you and what you contend is the correct number; and (d) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address listed in Section IV.B below, postmarked **on or before [Response Deadline]**.

C. Your Estimated Individual Settlement Share and Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable)

As explained above, your estimated Individual Settlement Share and Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable) is based on the number of Workweeks and Pay Periods (if applicable) credited to you.

Under the terms of the Settlement, your Individual Settlement Share is estimated to be $_____. The Individual Settlement Share is subject to reduction for the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Share and will only be distributed if the Court approves the Settlement and after the Settlement goes into effect.

Under the terms of the Settlement, your Individual PAGA Payment is estimated to be $_____ and will only be distributed if the Court approves the Settlement and after the Settlement goes into effect.

The settlement approval process may take multiple months. Your Individual Settlement Share and Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable) reflected in this Class Notice is only an estimate. Your actual Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable) may be higher or lower.

D. Release of Claims

Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount and Employer Taxes, Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released Class Claims.

Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount and Employer Taxes, Plaintiffs, the State of California with respect to all PAGA Employees, and all PAGA Employees will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released PAGA Claims.

"Released Class Claims" means any and all claims which were alleged or which could have been alleged based on the factual allegations in the Operative Complaints, arising during the Class Period, which specifically includes claims for Defendant's alleged failure to pay minimum, overtime, and double-time wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide accurate wage statements, pay all sick time, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226(e), 226.7, 227.3 246, 510, 512, 516, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, and California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq*.

"Released PAGA Claims" means any and all claims arising from any of the factual allegations in the Operative Complaints and PAGA Letters, arising during the PAGA Period, for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698 et seq., which specifically includes claims for Defendant's alleged failure to pay minimum, overtime, and double-time wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide accurate wage statements, maintain all required employment records, pay all sick time, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226(e), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 2800, and 2802.

"Released Parties" means Defendant and its current and former officers, directors, members, insurers, investors, shareholders, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, successors, and assigns, as well as Defendant's sole owner, the Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP) trust, and its trustees.

E. Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel

Class Counsel will seek attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount

(i.e., $183,750.00) and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed Forty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($40,000.00) (collectively, "Attorneys' Fees and Costs"), subject to approval by the Court. The Attorneys' Fees and Costs granted by the Court will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Class Counsel has been prosecuting the Actions on behalf of Plaintiffs, Class Members, and PAGA Employees on a contingency fee basis (that is, without being paid any money to date) and has been paying all litigation costs and expenses.

F. Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs

Plaintiffs will seek the amounts of Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00) each (total, $20,000.00) ("Enhancement Payments"), in recognition of their services in connection with the Actions. The Enhancement Payments will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court, and if awarded, will be paid to Plaintiffs in addition to any other payments that they are entitled to under the Settlement.

G. Settlement Administration Costs to Settlement Administrator

Payment to the Settlement Administrator is estimated not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00) ("Settlement Administration Costs") for the costs of the notice and settlement administration process, including and not limited to, the expense of notifying the Class Members of the Settlement, processing Requests for Exclusion, Notices of Objection, and Disputes, calculating Individual Settlement Shares, Individual Settlement Payments, and Individual PAGA Payments, and distributing payments and tax forms under the Settlement, and shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court.

IV. WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS AND OPTIONS AS A CLASS MEMBER?

A. Participate in the Settlement

If you want to participate in the Class Settlement and receive money from the Class Settlement, you do not have to do anything. You will automatically be included in the Class Settlement and issued your Individual Settlement Payment unless you decide to exclude yourself from the Class Settlement.

Unless you elect to exclude yourself from the Class Settlement and if the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, you will be bound by the terms of the Class Settlement and any judgment that may be entered by the Court based thereon, and you will release the Released Class Claims against the Released Parties as described in Section III.D above.

If you are a PAGA Employee and the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, you will automatically be included in the PAGA Settlement and issued your Individual PAGA Payment. This means you will be bound by the terms of the PAGA Settlement and any judgment that may be entered by the Court based thereon, and you will release the Released PAGA Claims against the Released Parties as described in Section III.D above.

As a Class Member and PAGA Employee (if applicable), you will not be separately responsible for the payment of attorney's fees or litigation costs and expenses, unless you retain your own counsel, in which event you will be responsible for your own attorney's fees and expenses.

B. Request Exclusion from the Class Settlement

Class Members may request to be excluded from the Class Settlement by submitting a letter ("Request for Exclusion") to the Settlement Administrator, at the following address:

[Settlement Administrator]
[Mailing Address]

A Request for Exclusion must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Macias v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Case No. 25STCV04710); (b) contain your full name, signature, address, telephone number, and last four (4) digits of your Social Security number; (c) clearly state that you do not wish to be included in the Class Settlement; and (d) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address above, postmarked **on or before [Response Deadline]**.

If the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, any Class Member who submits a timely and valid Request for Exclusion will not be issued an Individual Settlement Payment, will not be bound by the Class Settlement (and the release of Released Class Claims described in Section III.D above), and will not have any right to object to, appeal, or comment on the Class

Settlement. Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion will be deemed Settlement Class Members and will be bound by all terms of the Class Settlement, including those pertaining to the release of claims described in Section III.D above, as well as any judgment that may be entered by the Court based thereon. PAGA Employees will be bound to the PAGA Settlement (and the release of Released PAGA Claims described in Section III.D above) and will still be issued an Individual PAGA Payment, irrespective of whether they submit a Request for Exclusion.

C. Object to the Class Settlement

You can object to the Class Settlement as long as you have not submitted a Request for Exclusion by submitting a written objection ("Notice of Objection") to the Settlement Administrator.

The Notice of Objection must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Macias v. LeFiell Manufacturing Co.*, Case No. 25STCV04710); (b) contain your full name, signature, address, telephone number, and the last four (4) digits of your Social Security number; (c) contain a written statement of all grounds for the objection accompanied by any legal support for such objection; (d) contain copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based; and (e) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address listed in Section IV.B above, postmarked **on or before [Response Deadline]**.

You may also appear at the Final Approval Hearing and present your objection orally, regardless of whether you have submitted a Notice of Objection.

V. FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing in Department 1 of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, located at Spring Street Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012 on [**date**], at [**time**], to determine whether the Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court also will be asked to approve and grant the Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel, Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs, and Settlement Administration Costs to the Settlement Administrator.

The Final Approval Hearing may be continued without further notice to the Class Members and PAGA Employees. It is not necessary for you to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, although you may appear if you wish to.

You can find more information regarding appearing remotely through LA Court Connect online at: https://www.lacourt.org/lacceligibility/ui/civil.aspx?casetype=ci

VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The above is a summary of the basic terms of the Settlement. For the precise terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement, you should review the detailed Settlement Agreement and other papers, which are on file with the Court.

You may view the Settlement Agreement and other documents filed in the Actions by visiting Spring Street Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012, during normal business hours, or by online by visiting the following website: https://www.lacourt.org/casesummary/ui/

You may also visit the Settlement Administrator's website at _____ for key documents in the Actions.

PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK FOR INFORMATION REGARDING THIS SETTLEMENT.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, YOU MAY CALL THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR AT THE FOLLOWING TOLL-FREE NUMBER: [INSERT], OR YOU MAY ALSO CONTACT CLASS COUNSEL.

EXHIBIT 5

Outlook

Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

From no-reply@formassembly.com <no-reply@formassembly.com>
Date Thu 10/1/2026 9:18 AM
To Ana Turcios <aturcios@blackstonepc.com>

[External Email].

10/01/2026 09:17:46 AM

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

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

On 10/01/2026 09:17:46 AM your Proposed Settlement was successfully processed for case number LWDA-CM-1084761-25

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: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm