**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)
Jeffrey S. Herman (State Bar #280058)
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858) 551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Email: Kyle@bamlawca.com
Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
*Additional Counsel for Plaintiffs listed on following page*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT**

LYNN HILLEGEIST; MAUREEN LYTLE; PAMELA CASSADY; JOHN SELLERS; HOLLY MILLER; CATHERINE ROBERTSON; BAILEY KILMER, CUAUHTEMOC OLIVO, and JEANELLE WILSON, all individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ST. JOSEPH HEALTH NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, LLC; ST. JOSEPH HEALTH SYSTEM; PROVIDENCE ST. JOSEPH HEALTH; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **CV2201266**

**DECLARATION OF KYLE NORDREHAUG IN SUPPORT OF UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Hearing Date: November 30, 2026
Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Timothy Canning
Dept.: 4

Date Action Filed: August 25, 2022
Trial Date: Not set

Megan A. Yarnall (SBN #275319)
William H. Stein (SBN #322168)
**JANSSEN MALLOY LLP**
730 Fifth Street
P.O. Drawer 1288
Eureka, CA 95501
Telephone: (707) 445-2071

Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776)
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483)
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq. (SBN 297296)
Stephen M. Sloane, Esq. (SBN 141707)
Cassandra A. Castro, Esq. (SBN 334238)
**LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP**
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 432-0000
Facsimile: (310) 432-0001
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

I, Kyle Nordrehaug, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, counsel for Plaintiffs Catherine Robertson, Bailey Kilmer, Cuauhtemoc Olivo, Lynn Hillegeist, Maureen Lytle, Pamela Cassady, John Sellers, Holly Miller, and Jeanelle Wilson ("Plaintiffs") in this matter. As such, I am fully familiar with the facts, pleadings and history of this matter. The following facts are within my own personal knowledge, and if called as a witness, I could testify competently to the matters stated herein.

2. This declaration is being submitted in support of Plaintiffs' unopposed motion for preliminary approval of the proposed class action and PAGA settlement with Defendants St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC, St. Joseph Health System and Providence St. Joseph Health ("Defendants"), which motion seeks entry of an order: (1) preliminarily approving the proposed settlement of this class and PAGA action with Defendants; (2) for settlement purposes only, conditionally certifying the Class, which is comprised of "all individuals who are or previously were employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants during the Class Period (February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026), excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital - Eureka between August 24, 2018 and March 25, 2022 and who were not employed by Defendants at any other time during the Class Period and who did not opt-out of the *Martinez v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC* (Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV-20000424) class action settlement"; (3) provisionally appointing Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class; (4) provisionally appointing Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, Janssen Malloy LLP, and Lavi & Ebrahimian LLP as Class Counsel; (5) approving the form and method for providing class-wide notice; (6) directing that notice of the proposed settlement be given to the Class; (7) appointing ILYM Group, Inc. as Administrator, and (8) scheduling a final approval hearing date, proposed for May 10, 2027, to consider Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the settlement and for approval of attorneys' fees, expenses and the representative service awards. Attached hereto as Exhibit #1 is a copy of the fully executed Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") along with exhibits thereto. The form of the Agreement is based upon the Los Angeles County Superior

Court model form for a class and PAGA settlement. This Declaration incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning as set forth in the Agreement.

Fairness of Settlement

3. As consideration for this Settlement, the non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount of Eight Million Dollars ($8,000,000.00) (the "Gross Settlement Amount") is to be paid by Defendants, as set forth in the Agreement. The Gross Settlement Amount will settle all issues pending in the Action between the Parties and will be made in full and final settlement of the Released Class Claims and Released PAGA Claims in exchange for the payments to Participating Class Members and payment of the PAGA Penalties (75% to the LWDA and 25% to the Aggrieved Employees) from the Gross Settlement Amount, respectively. The Released Class Claims are appropriately tethered to the Third Amended Complaint. [1] The Gross Settlement Amount shall also

[1] The Released Class Claims are appropriately tethered to the Third Amended Complaint as follows: "all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on or arising from the facts stated in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the Class Period, including failure to pay minimum wages, straight time compensation, overtime compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), double-time compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), and interest thereon; failure to timely pay regular and final wages; the calculation of the regular rate of pay; wages lost from time rounding and timekeeping; non-compliant (e.g., missed, short, late, and/or interrupted) meal periods and rest periods; failure to provide meal periods; failure to authorize and permit rest periods; the calculation and payment of meal period and rest period premiums; payment for all hours worked, including off-the-clock work and uncompensated work time; failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements and paystubs, including wage statements and paystubs furnished or available in physical, electronic, or other forms; failure to pay sick pay wages; failure to properly calculate sick pay wages; failure to keep accurate records; failure to reimburse for all employment-related business expenses; unfair business practices; wage statement penalties, minimum-wage penalties, and waiting-time penalties; statutory penalties and civil penalties; liquidated or punitive damages; interest for claims for unpaid wages; attorneys' fees and costs; claims under the California Labor Code, including sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 223, 224, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227, 227.3, 233, 246, 246.5, 248.5, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1194.3, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198, and 2802; the Wage Orders of the California Industrial Welfare Commission, including Wage Order No. 5; and California Business and Professions Code section 17200, et seq. Except as expressly set forth in this

be used to pay: (a) the costs of administration of the settlement, (b) Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs requests, and (c) Class Representative Service Payments. (Agreement at ¶ 1.22.) The following is a table of the key Settlement terms and the proposed deductions:

**$8,000,000** (Gross Settlement Amount)

- $135,000 (Plaintiffs' collective proposed service awards - not to exceed amount)
- $62,000 (Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment - not to exceed amount)
- $2,666,666 (Class Counsel Fees Payment - not to exceed 1/3 of settlement)
- $200,000 (PAGA Payment - 75% to LWDA / 25% to Aggrieved Employees)
- $42,845 (Administration Expenses Payment - not to exceed amount)

**$4,893,489** (Net Settlement Amount)

4. The relief provided in the Settlement will benefit all members of the Class. The Settlement does not grant preferential treatment to Plaintiffs or segments of the Class in any way. Payments to the Class Members are all determined under a neutral methodology. Each Participating Class Member will receive the same opportunity to participate in and receive payment through a neutral formula that is based upon the Workweeks for that individual.

5. On December 9, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation with Hon. Carl J. West (Ret.), a respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class and representative actions. In preparation for the mediation, Defendants provided Class Counsel with payroll, time and employment data, along with other information regarding the Class Members, various internal documents, and other compensation and employment-related materials. Class Counsel analyzed the data with the assistance of damages expert Berger Consulting and prepared and submitted a mediation brief to the mediator. The final settlement terms were negotiated and set forth in the Agreement now presented for this Court's approval. Importantly, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel believe that this Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate.

---

Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or Class claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period. In addition, the Released Class Claims exclude the release of claims not permitted by law." (Agreement at ¶ 1.38.)

6. Based upon 7,144 Class Members who worked an estimated 1,204,556 work weeks (Agreement at ¶ 4.1), the Gross Settlement Amount provides an average value of $1,119 per Class Member and $6.64 per workweek and after deductions the Net Settlement Amount provides an average recovery of $684.97 per Class Member and a recovery of $4.06 per workweek. The calculations to compensate for the amount due for the Class at the time of the mediation were calculated by Berger Consulting, Plaintiffs' damage expert. As to the Class whose claims are at issue in this Action, Plaintiffs used this expert to analyze the data and determine the potential unpaid wages for the employees. The maximum potential damages were calculated to be $5,285,993 for the alleged unpaid wages for off-the-clock work at 5 minutes per week, $2,094,695 for the alleged underpaid meal premiums and sick pay due to the miscalculation of the regular rate, $11,100,586 for alleged missed meal period damages based upon the maximum 49% violation rate observed in the records and after deduction of premiums already paid by Defendants and after a reduction of 75% of the violations which were subject to health care worker meal waivers under *Gerard v. Orange Coast Memorial*, 6 Cal. 5th 443 (2018), $14,580,991 for alleged rest period damages based on 1 violation per pay period, $1,921,630 for alleged unreimbursed cell-phone expenses at $5 per month. As a result, the total damage valuation was calculated such that Defendants were subject to a maximum damage claim in the amount of $34,983,895. As to potential penalties, Plaintiffs calculated that potential waiting time penalties were a maximum of $59,234,597, and potential maximum wage statement penalties were $24,316,000.[2] Defendants vigorously disputed Plaintiffs' calculations and exposure theories. Consequently, the Gross Settlement Amount of $8,000,000 represents more than 22% of the maximum value of the alleged

[2] While Plaintiffs alleged claims for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code Sections 203 and 226, at mediation Plaintiffs recognized that these claims were subject to additional, separate defenses asserted by Defendants, including, a good faith dispute defense as to whether any premium wages for meal or rest periods or other wages were owed given Defendants' position that Plaintiffs and Class Members were properly compensated. *See Nordstrom Commission Cases*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 576, 584 (2010) ("There is no willful failure to pay wages if the employer and employee have a good faith dispute as to whether and when the wages were due.").

damages at issue in this case at the time this Settlement was negotiated.[3] Importantly, the recent decision that good faith belief of compliance by the employer in *Naranjo v. Spectrum Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 15 Cal. 5th 1056, 1065 (2024), could completely negate the claims for waiting time and wage statement penalties, even if wages were owed to the Class. The above maximum calculations should then be realistically risk-adjusted in consideration for both the risk of class certification and class-wide liability on all claims. Given the amount of the settlement as compared to the potential value of claims in this case and the defenses asserted by Defendants, this settlement is fair and reasonable.

Procedural History of the Litigation

7. On October 21, 2022, Plaintiff Robertson filed with the LWDA and served on Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 identifying the alleged Labor Code violations to recover civil penalties on behalf of Aggrieved Employees for alleged violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s). On July 14, 2026 (which the Agreement says was done on July 13, 2026), Plaintiffs filed with the LWDA and served on Defendants an amended notice to (1) provide greater detail about the alleged violations, (2) add Plaintiffs Kilmer, Olivo, Hillegeist, Lytle, Casady, Sellers and Miller, and (3) clarify the PAGA Period and Aggrieved Employee definition. These notices are attached hereto as Exhibit #3 for the Court's reference, and, along with the notice by Plaintiff Wilson attached to the Declaration of Stephen Sloane, are collectively referred to as the "PAGA Notice".

8. The Various Actions and the Allegations:

[3] Because the PAGA claim is not a class claim and primarily is paid to the State of California, Plaintiffs have not included the PAGA claim in their discussion of the value of the class claims. The PAGA claim is addressed below at ¶33.

A. **The Hillegeist Class Action**. On August 25, 2022, Plaintiffs Hillegeist, Lytle, Cassady, Sellers, and Miller filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendants in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Humboldt alleging various wage and hour violations against Defendants (the "Hillegeist Class Action"). On October 10, 2022, Plaintiffs Hillegeist, Lytle, Cassady, Sellers, and Miller filed a First Amended Class Action Complaint ("FAC") against Defendants for: (a) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages; (b) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages; (c) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (d) Failure to Permit Rest Breaks; (e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses; (f) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements; (g) Failure to Pay Wages Timely During Employment; (h) Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Separation of Employment; and (i) Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq*. On April 7, 2023, Plaintiffs Hillegeist, Lytle, Cassady, Sellers, and Miller filed a Second Amended Class Action Complaint against Defendants which removed the claim for Failure to Reimburse Business Expense.

B. **The Robertson Class Action**. On November 2, 2022, Plaintiff Robertson filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa (the "Robertson Class Action"). Plaintiff Robertson's Class Action Complaint asserted claims that Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC: (a) Violated California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.; (b) Failed to pay minimum wages in violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1; (c) Failed to pay overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code § 510, et seq.; (d) Failed to provide required meal periods in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order; (e) Failed to provide required rest periods in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the

applicable IWC Wage Order; (f) Failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code § 226; (g) Failed to reimburse employees for required expenses in violation of California Labor Code § 2802; (h) Failed to provide wages when due in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203; and (i) Failed to pay sick pay wages in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201-204, 233, 246.

C. **The Robertson PAGA Action**. On December 29, 2022, Plaintiff Robertson filed a separate Representative Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa (the "Robertson PAGA Action"). Plaintiff Robertson's Representative Action Complaint asserted one PAGA cause of action against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC for Civil Penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699, et seq. for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040 Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

D. **Coordination of Hillegeist and Robertson Actions**. On June 13, 2023, Defendants filed a Petition to Coordinate the Hillegeist Class Action and the Robertson Class Action. On September 1, 2023, the Court granted Defendants' Petition for Coordination, assigning the matters the special title of "St. Joseph Health Wage and Hour Cases," JCCP No. 5291, assigned to Presiding Judge Gregory J. Kreis of the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Humboldt.

E. **The Wilson Class Action**. On August 12, 2024, Plaintiff Wilson filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa (the "Wilson Class Action"). Plaintiff Wilson's Class Action Complaint

asserted claims against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC for: (a) Failure to Pay Wages for All Hours Worked at Minimum Wage in Violation of Labor Code Sections 1194 and 1197; (b) Failure to Authorize or Permit Rest Periods in Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7; (c) Failure to Indemnify Employees for Employment-Related Losses/Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code Section 2802; (d) Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code Section 226; and, (e) Unfair Business Practices, in Violation of Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq*. On November 19, 2024, Plaintiff Wilson filed a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint ("Wilson FAC") against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC. Plaintiff Wilson's FAC, as amended, added a cause of action for Civil Penalties Pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq*.

9. **The Operative Complaint Combines All Actions, Parties and Claims**. As part of this Agreement, the Parties stipulated to the filing of a Third Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint in the Hillegeist Class Action that adds the claims and parties from the Robertson Class Action, Robertson PAGA Action, and Wilson Class Action, adds Plaintiffs Kilmer and Olivo as named plaintiffs and Class Representatives, and includes all Released Class Claims and Released PAGA Claims to ensure alignment between released claims and all alleged claims. The Third Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint was filed on August 5, 2026 and is the operative complaint in the Action (the "Operative Complaint").

10. Over the course of litigation, the Parties engaged in the investigation of the claims, including both formal and informal discovery and the production of documents, class data, and other information, allowing for the full and complete analysis of liabilities and defenses to the claims in the Action. The information for mediation obtained by Plaintiffs included: (1) data concerning the class; (2) a sampling of payroll data and time punch data for the Class covering 654 employees, 259,691 shifts and 69,661 workweeks covering the date range of 2/18/2018 - 9/30/2025;

(3) Defendants' wage and hour policies; (4) the employment files for the Plaintiffs; and, (5) samples of wage statements provided by Defendants. As such, Class Counsel received the data and information for the Class, which was sufficient for Plaintiffs' expert to prepare the valuations of the claims for the Class.

11. Class Counsel has extensive experience in litigating wage and hour class and representative actions in California. The Parties have vigorously litigated the Action since inception. During the course of litigation, the Parties each performed analysis of the merits and value of the claims. Plaintiffs and Defendants have engaged in significant research and investigation in connection with the Action. Class Counsel has thoroughly analyzed the value of the claims during the prosecution of this Action and utilized an expert to perform an analysis of the data and valuation of the claims.

12. Plaintiffs and Defendants agreed to discuss resolution of the Action through a mediation. Prior to mediation, the Parties engaged in the above investigation and the exchange of documents and information in connection with the Action. On December 9, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Hon. Carl J. West (Ret.), a respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. Following the mediation, the Parties agreed to settle the Action based upon a mediator's proposal which was memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding. The Parties then negotiated the final terms of the settlement as set forth in the Agreement. At all times, the negotiations were arm's length and contentious.

13. Although a settlement has been reached, Defendants deny any liability or wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims alleged in the Action and further deny that, for any purpose other than settlement, the Action is appropriate for class and/or representative treatment. Defendants contend, among other things, that they have complied at all times with the California Labor Code, applicable Wage Order, and all other laws and regulations. Further, Defendants contend that class certification is inappropriate for any reason other than for settlement. Plaintiffs contend that Defendants violated California wage and hour laws. Plaintiffs further contend that the Action is appropriate for class certification on the basis that the claims meet the requisites for class certification. Without admitting that class certification is proper, Defendants

have stipulated that the above Class may be certified for settlement purposes only. (Agreement at ¶ 2.13.) The Parties agree that certification for settlement purposes is not an admission that class certification is proper. Further, the Agreement is not admissible in this or any other proceeding as evidence that the Class could be certified absent a settlement. Solely for purposes of settling the Action, the Parties stipulate and agree that the requisites for establishing class certification with respect to the Class are satisfied.

14. Class Counsel has conducted an investigation into the facts of the class action. Both formal and informal discovery was obtained, which included the production of thousands of pages of relevant documents and data. Class Counsel engaged in a thorough review and analysis of the relevant documents and data with the assistance of an expert. Accordingly, the agreement to settle did not occur until Class Counsel possessed sufficient information to make an informed judgment regarding the likelihood of success on the merits and the results that could be obtained through further litigation. In addition, Class Counsel previously negotiated settlements with other employers in actions involving nearly identical issues and analogous defenses. Based on the foregoing data and their own independent investigation, evaluation and experience, Class Counsel believes that the settlement with Defendants on the terms set forth in the Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interest of the Class in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant delay, defenses asserted by Defendants, and potential appellate issues.

Settlement Terms and Plan of Allocation

15. The Gross Settlement Amount is Eight Million Dollars ($8,000,000). (Agreement at ¶ 1.22.) Under the Settlement, the Gross Settlement Amount consists of the following elements: (1) payment of the Individual Class Payments to the Participating Class Members; (2) Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment; (3) Administration Expenses Payment; (4) the Class Representative Service Payments to the Plaintiffs; and (5) the PAGA Penalties payment, which is to be allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees and 75% to the

LWDA.[4] (Agreement at ¶ 1.22.) The Gross Settlement Amount does not include Defendants' share of employer-side payroll taxes which will be paid separately and not out of the Gross Settlement Amount. (Agreement at ¶ 3.1.) The Gross Settlement Amount shall not revert to Defendants. (Agreement at ¶ 3.1.)

16. Defendants shall fund the Gross Settlement Amount and the amount necessary to pay payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date. (Agreement at ¶ 4.3.) Within 14 days after Defendants fund the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for Individual Class Payments to the Class. (Agreement at ¶ 5.1.)

17. The amount remaining in the Gross Settlement Amount after the deduction of Court-approved amounts for Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Class Representative Service Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment (called the "Net Settlement Amount") shall be allocated to Class Members as their Individual Class Payments. (Agreement at ¶¶ 1.28 and 3.2.) From the Net Settlement Amount, the Individual Class Payment for each Participating Class Member will be calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Workweeks. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(e).) Workweeks will initially be based on Defendants' records, however, Class Members will have the right to challenge the number of Workweeks.

18. Class Members may choose to opt-out of the Settlement by following the directions in the Class Notice. (Agreement at ¶ 8.5, Ex. A.) The Class Notice provides that Class Members shall have sixty (60) days from the date that the Class Notice is mailed to them (the "Response Deadline") to request exclusion (opt-out) or to submit a written objection. (Agreement at ¶¶ 1.42, 8.5, 8.7.) All Class Members who do not "opt out" will be deemed Participating Class Members

[4] The PAGA claim in this matter was initiated prior to June 2024, and therefore the prior version of Labor Code § 2699 applies requiring the 75/25 allocation.

who will be bound by the Settlement and will be entitled to receive an Individual Class Payment. (Agreement at ¶ 8.5(c).) All Aggrieved Employees will be paid their allocation of the PAGA Penalties and will be subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims regardless of any request for exclusion from the Class. (Agreement at ¶¶ 6.3 and 8.5(d).) Finally, the Class Notice will advise the Class Members of their right to object to the Settlement and/or dispute their Workweeks. (Agreement at ¶¶ 8.6 and 8.7, Ex. A.)

19. A Participating Class Member must cash his or her Individual Class Payment check within 180 days after it is mailed. (Agreement at ¶ 5.2.) Any settlement checks not cashed within 180 days will be voided and any funds represented by such checks sent to a Court-approved nonprofit organization or foundation consistent with Code of Civil Procedure Section 384(b) ("Cy Pres Recipients"). The Parties propose Legal Services of Northern California and Boys and Girls Club of the Redwoods as the Cy Pres Recipients, with each Cy Pres Recipient receiving fifty percent of the available funds. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the intended Cy Pres Recipients. (Agreement at ¶ 5.4.)

20. Subject to Court approval, the Parties have agreed on ILYM Group, Inc. to administer the settlement in this action ("Administrator"). (Agreement at ¶ 1.2.) The Administrator will be paid for settlement administration in an amount not to exceed $42,845 with any difference between this amount and the actual expense remaining part of the Net Settlement Amount. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(c).) ILYM Group, Inc. provided an estimate of $38,950 for administration expenses.

21. Subject to Court approval, the Agreement provides for Class Counsel to be awarded a sum not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, as the Class Counsel Fees Payment. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(b).) Class Counsel will also be allowed to apply separately for an award of Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment in an amount not to exceed $62,000. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(b).) Subject to Court approval, the Agreement provides for a payment of no more than $15,000 each to the Plaintiffs as their Class Representative Service Payments. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(a).)

22. Subject to Court approval, the PAGA Penalties will be paid from the Gross

Settlement Amount for PAGA penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code Section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"). The PAGA Penalties are $200,000, to be allocated 75% ($150,000) to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% ($50,000) to the Individual PAGA Payments. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(d).) The Individual PAGA Payments will be calculated by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($50,000.00) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(d).) As set forth in the accompanying proof of service, the LWDA has been served with this motion and the Agreement.

Risks of Continued Litigation and Standards for Approval

23. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of continuing to litigate and trying the Action against Defendants through possible appeals which could take several years. Class Counsel has also taken into account the uncertain outcome and risk of litigation, especially in complex actions such as the Action. Class Counsel is also mindful of and recognize the inherent problems of proof under, and alleged defenses to, the claims asserted in the Action. Based upon their evaluation, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have determined that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is in the best interest of the Class Members.

24. A number of defenses asserted by Defendants present serious threats to the claims of the Plaintiffs and the other Class Members. Defendants asserted that Defendants' practices complied with all applicable labor laws. Defendants argued that Class Members were paid for all time worked and that all work time was properly recorded and wages for that time were correctly compensated. Defendants contend that their meal and rest period policies fully complied with California law and that Defendants did not fail to provide the opportunity for legally required meal and rest breaks and that most of the meal periods were subject to health care worker meal waivers under *Gerard v. Orange Coast Mem'l Med. Ctr.*, 6 Cal. 5th 443 (2018). Defendants could argue that the payment of significant meal and rest period premiums is also evidence of Defendants' lawful practices Defendants contend that there was no failure to pay for business expenses and any

cell phone usage was merely convenient and voluntary such that reimbursement was not legally required. Finally, Defendants could argue that the Supreme Court decision in *Brinker v. Superior Court,* 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012), weakened Plaintiffs' claims, on liability, value, and class certifiability as to the meal and rest period claims. Defendants also argue that based on their facially lawful practices, Defendants acted in good faith and without willfulness, which if accepted would negate the claims for waiting time penalties and/or inaccurate wage statements. See e.g. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 15 Cal. 5th 1056, 1065 (May 6, 2024) ("if an employer reasonably and in good faith believed it was providing a complete and accurate wage statement in compliance with the requirements of section 226, then it has not knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with the wage statement law.") Defendants' defenses could eliminate or substantially reduce any recovery to the Class. While Plaintiffs believe that these defenses could be overcome, Defendants maintain these defenses have merit and therefore present a serious risk to recovery by the Class.

25. There was also a significant risk that, if the Action was not settled, Plaintiffs would be unable to certify a class and maintain that certification through trial, and thereby not recover on behalf of any employees other than themselves. At the time of the mediation, Defendants forcefully opposed the propriety of class certification, arguing that individual issues precluded class certification. Further, as demonstrated by the California Supreme Court decision in *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.*, 59 Cal. 4th 1 (2014), there are significant hurdles to overcome for a class-wide recovery even where the class has been certified. While other cases have approved class certification in wage and hour claims, class certification in this action was hotly disputed and the maintenance of a certified class through trial was by no means a foregone conclusion.

26. This settlement is therefore certainly entitled to preliminary approval. Were this case to go to trial, the Plaintiffs and the other class members would need to prove, among other things, that wages were owed on a class-wide basis. This was and is a substantial risk.

27. Plaintiffs will apply to the Court for a Class Representative Service Payment in consideration for their service and for the risks undertaken on behalf of the Class. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(a).) Plaintiffs performed their duties admirably by working with Class Counsel over the course

of litigation, and risked an adverse judgment on behalf of the Class. The Declarations of the Plaintiffs are submitted herewith in support. At this stage, the requested service award is within the accepted range of awards for purposes of preliminary approval. *See e.g. Louie v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc*., 2008 WL 4473183, *7 (S.D.Cal. 2008) (awarding $25,000 service award to each of six plaintiffs in overtime class action); *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*, 2007 WL 221862, *16-17 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (awarding $25,000 service award in overtime class action and a pool of $100,000 in enhancements).

28. The stage of the proceedings at which this Settlement was reached also militates in favor of preliminary approval and ultimately, final approval of the Settlement. Class Counsel has conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of the class action. Class Counsel engaged in both formal and informal discovery to obtain necessary information. Class Counsel conducted a review and analysis of the relevant documents and data with the assistance of an expert. Class Counsel was also experienced with these claims. Accordingly, the agreement to settle did not occur until Class Counsel possessed sufficient information to make an informed judgment regarding the likelihood of success on the merits and the results that could be obtained through further litigation.

29. Based on the foregoing data and their own independent investigation and evaluation, Class Counsel is of the opinion that the Settlement with Defendants for the consideration and on the terms set forth in the Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interest of the Class in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant delay, defenses asserted by Defendants, and numerous potential appellate issues. There can be no doubt that Counsel for both Parties possessed sufficient information to make an informed judgment regarding the likelihood of success on the merits and the results that could be obtained through further litigation.

Class Certification Issues

30. Plaintiffs contend that the proposed settlement meets all of the requirements for class

certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 as demonstrated below, and therefore, the Court may appropriately approve the Class as defined in the Agreement. This Court should conditionally certify the Class for settlement purposes only, defined as follows:

> All individuals who are or previously were employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants during the Class Period, excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital - Eureka between August 24, 2018 and March 25, 2022 and who were not employed by Defendants at any other time during the Class Period and who did not opt-out of the *Martinez v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC* (Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV-20000424) class action settlement.

(Agreement at ¶ 1.5.)

The Class Period is from February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026. (Agreement at ¶ 1.13).

a. **Numerosity** - Plaintiffs assert that the 7,144 current and former employees that comprise the Class can be identified based on Defendants' records and are sufficiently numerous for class certification.

b. **Common Issues Predominate** - Plaintiffs contend that common questions of law and fact are present, specifically the common questions of whether Defendants' practices were lawful, whether Defendants failed to provide meal and rest periods to Class Members, whether Class Members were lawfully compensated for all hours worked, whether Defendants miscalculated the regular rate when paying meal premiums and/or sick pay, whether Defendants failed to provide required expense reimbursement, and whether Class Members are entitled to damages and penalties as a result of these practices. Plaintiffs contend that certification of this Class is appropriate because Defendants allegedly engaged in uniform practices with respect to the Class Members. As a result, these common questions of liability could be answered on a class wide basis. Defendants dispute that common questions predominate but will not oppose such a finding for purposes of this Settlement only.

c. **Typicality** - In this Action, Plaintiffs contend that the typicality requirement

is fully satisfied. Plaintiffs, like every other member of the Class, were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees, and, like every other member of the Class, were subject to the same employment policies and practices. Plaintiffs, like every other member of the Class, also claim owed compensation as a result of the Defendants' allegedly uniform company policies and practices. Thus, the claims of Plaintiffs and the members of the Class arise from the same course of conduct by Defendants, involve the same issues, and are based on the same legal theories. Defendants dispute that the typicality requirement is satisfied but do not oppose a finding of typicality for purposes of this Settlement only.

d. **Adequacy** - Plaintiffs contend that the Class Members are adequately represented here because Plaintiffs and Class Counsel (a) do not have any conflicts of interest with other class members, and (b) will prosecute the case vigorously on behalf of the class. This requirement is met here. First, Plaintiffs are well aware of their duties as the representatives of the Class and have actively participated in the prosecution of this case to date. Plaintiffs effectively communicated with Class Counsel, provided documents and information to Class Counsel, and participated in the investigation and resolution of the Action. The personal involvement of the Plaintiffs was essential to the prosecution of the Action and the monetary settlement reached. Second, Plaintiffs retained competent counsel who are experienced in employment class and representative actions and who have no conflicts. Third, there is no antagonism between the interests of the Plaintiffs and those of the Class. Both the Plaintiffs and the Class Members seek monetary relief under the same set of facts and legal theories. Under such circumstances, there can be no conflicts of interest, and adequacy of representation is satisfied.

31. Class Counsel's Adequacy of Representation and Absence of Conflict: Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP is experienced in prosecuting class action lawsuits and can competently represent the Class. Other lawyers at my firm and I have extensive class litigation experience. We have handled a number of class actions and complex cases and have acted both as counsel and as lead and co-lead counsel in a variety of these matters. We have successfully prosecuted and obtained significant recoveries in numerous class action lawsuits and other lawsuits involving complex issues of law and fact. My firm is particularly experienced in wage and hour

employment law class actions, including claims for misclassification, overtime, expense reimbursement, unlawful deduction of wages, and missed rest and meal periods. Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP has been involved as class counsel in hundreds of wage and hour class actions. Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP has been found to be adequate counsel by the courts throughout California. We have been approved as experienced class counsel by both state and federal courts in California in contested class certification proceedings. A true and correct copy of the resume of my firm is attached hereto as Exhibit #2. The Class in this settlement is defined as "all individuals who are or previously were employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants during the Class Period, excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital - Eureka between August 24, 2018 and March 25, 2022 and who were not employed by Defendants at any other time during the Class Period and who did not opt-out of the Martinez v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC (Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV-20000424) class action settlement." I have reviewed my firm's cases and representation of other plaintiffs and there is no conflict or representation which would prevent my firm from representing the interests of the Class this case. My firm only represents employees, and not employers. My firm has never represented Defendants nor any affiliate of the Defendants. My firm's only interest in the subject matter of this litigation is to ensure a recovery to the Class and to maximize that recovery. Finally, our allegiance to the Class and the claims of the Class is not inconsistent with our allegiance to pursue the claims on behalf of other employees and classes as the claims are all against different and distinct employers. I can think of no conflict that would arise in our representation of the Class and our adequate representation of the Class is evidenced by the successful prosecution of the class claims to reach an excellent recovery for the Class. Moreover, neither the Plaintiffs nor Class Counsel have any affiliation with either the proposed Cy Pres Recipients nor the Administrator for this settlement. Thus, the adequacy requirement for my firm is satisfied for purposes of this Settlement.

32. The Class Notice, drafted jointly and agreed upon by the Parties through their respective counsel and to be approved by the Court, includes all relevant information. (*See* Exhibit "A" to the Agreement.) In accordance with the Agreement, Defendants will provide to the

Administrator a confidential electronic spreadsheet containing the Class Data. (Agreement at ¶ 4.2.) Within 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will mail the Class Notice to all Class Members via first-class U.S. Mail using the most current mailing address information available. (Agreement at ¶ 8.4(b).) The Class Notice will include, among other information: (i) information regarding the Action; (ii) the impact on the rights of the Class Members if they do not opt out, including a description of the applicable release; (iii) information to the Class Members regarding how to opt out and how to object to the Settlement; (iv) the estimated Individual Class Payment for each of the Class Members; (v) the amount of attorneys' fees and expenses to be sought; (vi) the amount of the Plaintiffs' service award request; and (vii) the anticipated expenses of the Administrator. The Class Notice will state that the Class Members shall have sixty (60) days from the date that the Class Notice is mailed to them (the "Response Deadline") to request exclusion (opt-out) or to submit a written objection. (Agreement at ¶¶ 1.42, 8.5, 8.7.) Class Members shall be given the opportunity to object to the Settlement and the request for attorneys' fees and expenses, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing. (Agreement at ¶ 8.7.) Class Members who do not submit a timely and proper request to opt-out will automatically receive a payment of their Individual Class Payment. This notice program was designed to meaningfully reach the Class Members and it advises them of all pertinent information concerning the Settlement.

33. The PAGA Claim -

a. **Approval of PAGA Settlements**. The decision in *O'Connor v. Uber*, 201 F.Supp.3d 1110, 1133 (N.D. Cal. 2016), and the LWDA's Response therein is illustrative. The LWDA first states that "when viewing the monetary relief allocated to PAGA claims under a settlement, the LWDA recognizes that the PAGA sum need not necessarily be viewed through the same lens as the relief obtained by absent class members on other claims (i.e., the percentage of recovery-to-exposure on the PAGA claims need not necessarily equal the percentage of recovery on the other claims)." (LWDA Response at p.3). The LWDA also indicated that the payment of money to the aggrieved employees furthers the purposes of PAGA and that the Court considers that primary consideration. "The LWDA recognizes that this Court does not review the PAGA

allocation in isolation, but rather reviews the settlement as a whole, to determine whether it is fundamentally fair, reasonable and adequate, with primary consideration for the interests of absent class members." (LWDA Response at p.4).

b. **Valuation of the PAGA Claim**. For mediation, Plaintiffs calculated the value of the alleged PAGA claim as to Aggrieved Employees for civil penalties to be between $23,135,350 and $46,270,700 for a single violation in every one of the 462,707 pay periods at issue for the 6,903 Aggrieved Employees in the PAGA Period, depending on whether the violation was $50 per pay period as in the case of Labor Code § 558(a)(1) or the standard amount of $100 per pay period for violation of Labor Code § 1198. This valuation assumed that PAGA civil penalties would be awarded at the maximum rate per pay period but without stacking.[5] The PAGA allocation in the Settlement is the amount of $200,000. This allocation is justified by several important considerations. First, the PAGA claim was subject to the same risks as the underlying class claims. Second, Defendants asserted additional defenses to the PAGA claim, not only as to liability but also as to the amount of the penalties. Defendants argued that significant PAGA penalties would be unlikely and would be reduced under such particular "circumstances" under Cal. Labor Code §2699(e)(2) and/or "would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory" under Cal. Labor Code §2699(e)(2). Defendants could also argue that no penalties prior to the PAGA notification should be awarded, and I am aware of one trial court which has so ruled. These additional defenses present a risk to the PAGA claim and the potential that some or all of the PAGA penalties sought may not be awarded. Third, in *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*, 30 Cal. App. 5th 504 (2018), the court affirmed a judgment which only provided for a PAGA penalty of $5 per violation. Therefore, at trial, any PAGA penalties awarded could be significantly less than Plaintiffs' calculation even where Plaintiffs prevailed on the PAGA claim. Even if we assume that

[5] Stacking is where more than one civil penalty is imposed in a pay period for the same conduct. The valuation of between $23,135,350 and $46,270,700 is the civil penalty amount without stacking. If stacking is permitted, then the valuation increases with each additional penalty added to each pay period. Plaintiffs, however, are not aware of any PAGA award which permitted stacking and in the cases cited herein, only one penalty per pay period was assessed, and the recent 2024 amendments to the PAGA statute cast further doubt on stacking of penalties.

violations for all 462,707 pay periods were established, using the valuation from *Carrington* results in a potential recovery of only $2,313,535 under PAGA. This means that the PAGA allocation in the Agreement is a reasonable percentage of this potential PAGA recovery. Fourth, the interests of PAGA are also served by the Class recovery under the reasoning of the LWDA in *O'Connor v. Uber*.

c. **Comparable PAGA Settlements**. In reaching the settlement of the PAGA claim, Class Counsel was also aware of what allocations other Courts have approved for similar PAGA settlements as compared to the total settlement amount. A class settlement that allocates approximately 2.5% of the total settlement value to resolve the PAGA claims applicable to the class is also supported by what has been approved in other wage-and-hour class settlements. Indeed, Courts typically approve PAGA settlement amounts in the range of 2 percent of the total settlement. See *Davis v. Brown Shoe Co.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149010 (E.D. Cal. 2015) (PAGA Payment of $5,000 in a $1.5 million class settlement); *Zamora v. Ryder Integrated Logistics, Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 184096 (S.D. Cal. 2014) ($7,500 payment to LWDA for PAGA on a $1.5 million class settlement); *Lusby v. Gamestop Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42637 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (PAGA Payment of $5,000 in a $500,000 class settlement); *Cruz v. Sky Chefs, Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist Lexis 17693 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (approving payment of $10,000 to the LWDA for PAGA out of $1,750,000 class settlement); *Chu v. Wells Fargo Investments, LLC*, 2011 WL 672645, *1 (N.D. Cal. 2011) (approving PAGA payment of $7,500 to the LWDA out of $6.9 million common-fund settlement); Franco v. Ruiz Food Products, Inc., 2012 WL 5941801, *13 (E.D. Cal. 2012) (approving PAGA payment of $7,500 to the LWDA out of $2.5 million common-fund settlement); *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.*, 2009 WL 928133, *9 (N.D. Cal. 2009) (approving PAGA allocation that was .49% of $408,420.32 gross settlement); *Garcia v. Gordon Trucking, Inc.*, 10-cv-00324-AWI-SKO, Dkt. 149-3, 165 (E.D. Cal.) (approving a class settlement of $3,700,000, with $10,000 allocated to the PAGA claim); *McKenzie v. Federal Express Corp.*, CV 10-02420 GAF (PLAx), Dkt. 139 & 141 (C.D. Cal.) (court approved a settlement in an amount of $8.25 million, with $82,500 allotted to the PAGA claim); *DeStefan v Frito-Lay*, 8:10-cv-00112-DOC (C.D. Cal.) (court approved a class settlement of $2 million, with $10,000 allocated to PAGA); *Martino v. Ecolab Inc.*, No.

3:14CV04358 (N.D. Cal. 2017) ($100,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.48% of $21,000,000 settlement amount); *East v. Comprehensive Educational Services Inc.*, Fresno Superior Court Case No. 11-CECG-04226 (2015) ($10,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.13% of $7,595,846 settlement amount); *Bararsani v. Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage Company*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC495767 (2016) ($10,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.22% of $4,500,000 settlement amount); *Moppin v. Los Robles Medical Center*, No. 5:15CV01551 (C.D. Cal. 2017) ($15,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.40% of $3,775,000 settlement amount); *Scott-George v. PVH Corporation*. No., 2:13CV00441 (E.D. Cal. 2017) ($15,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.46% of $3,250,000 settlement amount); *Nehrlich v. RPM Mortgage Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2013-00666783-CU-OE-CXC (2017) ($10,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.40% of $2,500,000 settlement amount); *Rubio v. KTI Incorporated*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS-14-06132 (2015) ($1,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.18% of $550,000 settlement amount); *Gray v. Mountain View Child Care Inc.*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS-14-02285 (2016) ($2,500 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.37% of $675,000 settlement amount); *Perez v. West Coast Liquidators Inc. d/b/a Big Lots*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS-14-17863 (2016) ($3,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.33% of $900,000 settlement amount); *Penaloza vs. PPG Industries Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC471369 (2013) ($5,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.38% of $1,300,000 settlement amount); *Mejia v. DHL Express (USA) Inc*., No. 2:15CV00890 (C.D. Cal. 2017) ($5,000 allotted as PAGA penalties or 0.34% of $1,450,000 settlement amount).

34. Attorneys' Fees - The Class Counsel Fees Payment is capped at one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount. A fee award that is capped at one-third of the common fund is fair and reasonable, and at the time of final approval, my firm will present lodestar to further support the reasonableness of the requested fee award. My firm has been regularly awarded attorney's fees equal to one-third of the common fund in Court-approved wage and hour class settlements. Some of the class action awards obtained by Class Counsel in similar employment actions throughout the state bear out the reasonableness of a fee and costs award equivalent to one-third (1/3) of the total

settlement value: On December 4, 2018, in *Panda Express Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4919) Judge Carolyn Kuhl awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 1, 2019, in *Solarcity Wage and Hour Cases* (San Mateo Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4945) Judge Marie Weiner awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On July 30, 2019, in *Erickson v. John Muir Health*, (Contra Costa Superior Court Case No. MSC18-00307) Judge Edward Weil awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On December 18, 2019, in *Velasco v. Lemonade Restaurant Group*, (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC672235) Judge William Highberger awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On January 31, 2020, in *El Pollo Loco Wage and Hour Cases* (Orange County Superior Court Case No. JCCP 4957) Judge William Claster awarded Class Counsel a one-third award in a wage and hour class settlement. On December 3, 2020, in *Blackshear v. California Fine Wine &* Spirits (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2018-00245842) Judge Christopher Krueger awarded BNBD a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On June 2, 2021, in *Pacia v. CIM Group, L.P.* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC709666), Judge Amy D. Hogue awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 8, 2021, *in Securitas Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. JCCP4837) Judge David Cunningham awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On March 17, 2022, in *See's Candies Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. JCCP5004) Judge Maren Nelson awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On April 12, 2022, in *O'Donnell v, Okta, Inc.*, (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-20-587665) Judge Richard Ulmer awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On June 30, 2022, in *Armstrong, et al. v. Prometric LLC* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV29967), Judge Maren E. Nelson awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action. On July 13, 2022, in *Crum v. S&D Carwash Management LLC*, (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 2019-00251338), Judge Christopher E. Krueger awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On August 10, 2022, in *Spears, et al. v. Health Net of California, Inc.*, (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2017-

00210560-CU-OE-GDS), Judge Christopher E. Krueger awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On September 7, 2022, in *Lucchese, et al. v. Kone, Inc.*, (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-20-588225), Judge Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On November 4, 2022, in *Infinity Energy Wage and Hour Cases* (San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP5139), Judge Keri Katz awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On February 1, 2023, in *Hogan v. AECOM Tecnical Services, Inc.* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV40072), Judge Stuart Rice awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 28, 2023, in *Farthing v. Milestone Technologies* (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-591251), Judge Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On March 2, 2023, in *Leon v. Calaveras Materials* (Kings County Superior Court Case No. 21C-0105), Judge Melissa D'Morias awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On June 20, 2023, in *Gonzalez v. Pacific Western Bank* (San Bernardino County Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2127657) Judge David Cohn awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement, On June 30, 2023, in *Aguirre v. Headlands Ventures* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2021-00297290), Judge Jill Talley approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On August 5, 2023, in *Correia v. Gallo Glass Company* (Stanislaus County Superior Court Case No. CV-21-006459) Judge Sonny Sandhu approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On September 15, 2023, in *Moran v. Sharp Healtcare* (San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2019-00050203), Judge Richard Whitney awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On October 10, 2023, in *Arango v. Schlumberger Technology*, (Orange County Case No. 30-2019-01056839-CU-OE-CXC), Judge William Claster approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action. On October 16, 2023, in *Flores v. Walmart*, (San Bernardino County Superior Court Case No. CIVDS2023061) Judge Joseph T. Ortiz awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On October 20, 2023, in *Pond v. Glen Ivy Hot Springs* (Riverside County Superior Court Case No. CVRI2104986), Judge Harold W. Hopp awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 17, 2023, in *Silva v. Woodward HRT*

(Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 21STCV42692), Judge Maren Nelson awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 20, 2023, in *Steele v. Legoland California* (San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2021-00052868), Judge Carolyn M. Caietti awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 29, 2023, in *Ochoa-Andrade v. See's Candies* (San Mateo County Superior Court Case no. 22-CIV-02481), Judge Marie Weiner approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On August 9, 2024, in *Cranton v. Grossmont Hospital* (San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2022-00001574), Judge Gregory Pollack approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On September 12, 2024, in *Murdock v. Aspen Surgery Center* (Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. MSC21-02047), Judge Charles Treat approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On October 8, 2024, in *Rattler v. Pacific Coast Container* (Alameda Superior Court Case No. 22CV015216), Judge Michael Markman approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On January 14, 2025, in *Curry v. United Health Care Staffing* (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-597339), Judge Curtis Karnow approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On January 17, 2025, in *Virgen v. Curaleaf* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2022-00314655), Judge Lauri Damrell approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 7, 2025, in *Wong v. Nurse Logistics* (Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 22CV408939), Judge Theodore Zayner approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On June 27, 2025, in *Macias v. Positive Behavior* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2023-00337859), Judge Lauri Damrell approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 14, 2025, in *Watson v. San Diego Dialysis* (San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2024-00002851), Judge Wendy M. Behan approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 26, 2026, in *Rugama-Hernandez v. P&B Intermodel Services* (Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No, 24STCV07771), Judge Timothy Patrick Dillon approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. A fee award equal to one-third of the common fund is therefore reasonable in light of the fees that have been awarded in other similar cases.

35. Class Representative Service Payment - The reasonableness of the requested Class Representative Service Payment is also established by reference to the amounts that other California courts have found to be reasonable in wage and hour class action settlements: *Andrews v. Plains All Am. Pipeline L.P.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172183, at *11 (C.D. Cal. 2022) (finding that the requested service awards of $15,000 each are appropriate); *Reynolds v. Direct Flow Med., Inc.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149865, at *19 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (granting request for $12,500 service award); *Zamora v. Balboa Life & Casualty, LLC*, Case No. BC360036, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Mar. 7, 2013)(awarding $25,000 service award); *Aguiar v. Cingular Wireless, LLC*, Case No. CV 06-8197 DDP (AJWx)(C.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2011)(awarding $14,767 service award); *Magee v. American Residential Services, LLC*, Case No. BC423798, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Apr. 21, 2011)(awarding $15,000 service award); *Mares v. BFS Retail & Commercial Operations, LLC*, Case No. BC375967, Los Angeles County Superior Court (June 24, 2010)(awarding $15,000 service award).

36. Potentially Related Other Actions - I am not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement. (Agreement at ¶ 2.14.)

37. Administration - After seeking bids from qualified administrators, the estimate from ILYM Group was selected, as it provided for an estimate of $38,950 to perform the settlement administration for up to 1,321 individuals, with any difference between the actual expenses and the not to exceed budget to be retained in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to the Class. I have used ILYM Group successfully as the administrator in more than twenty class settlements in the last couple years and know them to be competent and experienced. My firm has no relationship or connection with ILYM Group, and thus no conflict of interest exists. Submitted in support of the motion is the Declaration of Anthony Rogers from ILYM Group which includes the estimate for administration from ILYM Group for this matter.

Service on the LWDA:

38. At the same time as the filing and service of this declaration, I am also serving the LWDA with the entire motion for preliminary approval which includes the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement. This service is verified by the accompanying proof of service.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 27th day of October, 2026, at South Lake Tahoe, California.

By:

Attorney for Plaintiffs

**EXHIBIT #1**

# CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between plaintiffs Catherine Robertson, Bailey Kilmer, Cuauhtemoc Olivo, Lynn Hillegeist, Maureen Lytle, Pamela Cassady, John Sellers, Holly Miller, and Jeanelle Wilson ("Plaintiffs") and Defendants St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC, St. Joseph Health System and Providence St. Joseph Health ("Defendants"). The Agreement refers to Plaintiffs and Defendants collectively as the "Parties," or individually as "Party."

## 1. DEFINITIONS

In addition to other terms defined in this Agreement, the terms below have the following meaning in this Agreement:

1.1. "Action" collectively means the Plaintiffs' lawsuits alleging wage and hour violations against Defendants captioned: (1) *Lynn Hillegeist, Maureen Lytle, Pamela Cassady, John Sellers, and Holly Miller vs. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC, St. Joseph Health System, Providence St. Joseph Health,* Case No. CV2201266, initiated on August 25, 2022, and pending in Superior Court of the State of California, County of Humboldt as part of JCCP No. 5291; (2) *Catherine Robertson vs. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC,* Case No. 22CV001339, initiated on November 2, 2022 in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa, and pending in Superior Court of the State of California, County of Humboldt as part of JCCP No. 5291; and (3) *Jeanelle Wilson vs. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC,* Case No. 24CV001378, initiated on August 12, 2024, and pending in the in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa.

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

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

1.4. "Aggrieved Employees" means all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendants who were classified as non-exempt in the State of California during the PAGA Period, excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital – Eureka from October 21, 2021 to March 25, 2022 and who did not work after March 25, 2022.

1.5. "Class" means all individuals who are or previously were employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants during the Class Period, excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital – Eureka between August 24, 2018 and March 25, 2022 and who were not employed by Defendants at any other time during the Class Period and who did not opt-out of the *Martinez v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC* (Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV-20000424) class action settlement.



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2ae09e4f5e

1.6. "Class Counsel" means Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, Aparajit Bhowmik, Nicholas J. De Blouw, Jeffrey S. Herman, Sergio J. Puche, Trevor G. Moran of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP ("BNBD"); Megan Yarnall, Patrick Griego, and William H. Stein of Janssen Malloy LLP ("JM"); and Joseph Lavi, Vincent Granberry, Malcom E. Clayton, and Stephen M. Sloane of Lavi & Ebrahimian LLP ("LE").

1.7. "Class Counsel Fees Payment" and "Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment" mean the amounts to be paid to Class Counsel for fees and expenses, respectively, as approved by the Court, to compensate Class Counsel for their legal work in connection with the Action, including their pre-filing investigation, their filing of the Action, all related litigation activities, all Settlement work, all post-Settlement compliance procedures, and related litigation expenses billed in connection with the Action.

1.8. "Class Data" means Class Member identifying information in Defendants' possession including the Class Member's name, last-known mailing address, Social Security number, email address (if known and available to Defendants), and number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods.

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

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

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

1.12. "Class Notice Packet" means the Class Notice to be provided to the Class Members by the Administrator in the form set forth as Exhibit A to this Agreement (other than formatting changes to facilitate printing by the Administrator).

1.13. "Class Period" means the period of time from February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026.

1.14. "Class Representative(s)" means the named Plaintiff(s) in the Operative Complaint in the Action seeking Court approval to serve as Class Representative(s).

1.15. "Class Representative Service Payment(s)" means the service payment(s) made to the



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2ae9e4f55

Plaintiff(s) as Class Representative(s) in order to compensate for initiating the Action, performing work in support of the Action, undertaking the risk of liability for Defendants' expenses, and for the general release of all claims by the Plaintiff(s).

1.16. "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of Humboldt.

1.17. "Defendants" means St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC, St. Joseph Health System, and Providence St. Joseph Health.

1.18. "Defense Counsel" means Todd Nunn and Dale A. Bellitto of Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP.

1.19. "Effective Date" means the date by when both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment on its Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement; and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) 65 calendar days following the deadline for filing a notice of appeal from the Judgment; or (b) if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.

1.20. "Final Approval" means the Court's order granting final approval of the Settlement substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C to this Agreement and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.21. "Final Approval Hearing" means the Court's hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement to determine whether to approve finally and implement the terms of this Agreement and enter the Judgment.

1.22. "Gross Settlement Amount" means Eight Million Dollars ($8,000,000.00) which is the total amount to be paid by Defendants as provided by this Agreement except as provided in Paragraph 9 below. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payments, and the Administration Expenses Payment. This Gross Settlement Amount is an all-in amount without any reversion to Defendants, and excludes any employer payroll taxes, if any, due on the portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages which shall not be paid from the Gross Settlement and shall be the separate additional obligation of Defendants.

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

1.24. "Individual PAGA Payment" means the Aggrieved Employee's pro rata share of 25% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period.



Doc ID: [illegible]

1.25. "Judgment" means the judgment entered by the Court based upon Final Approval substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C to this Agreement and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.26. "LWDA" means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

1.27. "LWDA PAGA Payment" means the 75% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).

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

1.29. "Non-Participating Class Member" means a Class Member who opts out of the Class Settlement by submitting a valid and timely Request for Exclusion to the Administrator.

1.30. "PAGA Pay Period" means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendants for at least one day during the PAGA Period.

1.31. "PAGA Period" means the period of time from October 21, 2021 to the earlier of preliminary approval or February 9, 2026.

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

1.33. "PAGA Notice" means Plaintiff Robertson's October 21, 2022 letter to Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC and the LWDA, Plaintiff Wilson's August 12, 2024 letter to Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC and the LWDA, and Plaintiffs' July 13, 2026 letter to Defendants and the LWDA, providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a).

1.34. "PAGA Penalties" means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees ($50,000.00) and the 75% to LWDA ($150,000.00) in settlement of PAGA claims.

1.35. "Participating Class Member" means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.

1.36. "Plaintiffs" means Catherine Robertson, Bailey Kilmer, Cuauhtemoc Olivo, Lynn Hillegeist, Maureen Lytle, Pamela Cassady, John Sellers, Holly Miller, and Jeanelle Wilson, the named plaintiffs in the Action.

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



Doc ID: [illegible]

Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit B to this Agreement and incorporated by this reference herein.

1.38. "Released Class Claims" means all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on or arising from the facts stated in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the Class Period, including failure to pay minimum wages, straight time compensation, overtime compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), double-time compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), and interest thereon; failure to timely pay regular and final wages; the calculation of the regular rate of pay; wages lost from time rounding and timekeeping; non-compliant (e.g., missed, short, late, and/or interrupted) meal periods and rest periods; failure to provide meal periods; failure to authorize and permit rest periods; the calculation and payment of meal period and rest period premiums; payment for all hours worked, including off-the-clock work and uncompensated work time; failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements and paystubs, including wage statements and paystubs furnished or available in physical, electronic, or other forms; failure to pay sick pay wages; failure to properly calculate sick pay wages; failure to keep accurate records; failure to reimburse for all employment-related business expenses; unfair business practices; wage statement penalties, minimum-wage penalties, and waiting-time penalties; statutory penalties and civil penalties; liquidated or punitive damages; interest for claims for unpaid wages; attorneys' fees and costs; claims under the California Labor Code, including sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 223, 224, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227, 227.3, 233, 246, 246.5, 248.5, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1194.3, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198, and 2802; the Wage Orders of the California Industrial Welfare Commission, including Wage Order No. 5; and California Business and Professions Code section 17200*, et seq.* Except as expressly set forth in this Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or Class claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period. In addition, the Released Class Claims exclude the release of claims not permitted by law.

1.39. "Released PAGA Claims" means all claims for PAGA Penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on or arising from the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice, which occurred during the PAGA Period including claims for PAGA Penalties for unpaid wages, including failure to pay minimum wages, straight time compensation, overtime compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), double-time compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), and interest; the calculation of the regular rate of pay; noncompliant (e.g., missed, short, late, and/or interrupted) meal periods and rest periods; failure to provide meal periods; failure to authorize and permit rest periods; the calculation and payment of meal period and rest period premiums; failure to reimburse for all employment-related business expenses;



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2aeb94f55e

payment for all hours worked, including off-the-clock work and rounded time; failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements; failure to keep accurate records; failure to pay sick pay wages; failure to properly calculate sick pay wages; failure to timely pay wages; and failure to timely pay final wages. The Released PAGA Claims include claims for PAGA Penalties for violation of the Wage Orders of the California Industrial Welfare Commission and the following California Labor Code sections: 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2698 et seq., and 2699, *et seq*., and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B). The Released PAGA Claims do not include other PAGA claims, underlying wage and hour claims, claims for wrongful termination, discrimination, unemployment insurance, disability and worker's compensation, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

1.40. "Released Parties" means Defendants and each of their past, present and future agents, employees, servants, officers, directors, partners, trustees, representatives, shareholders, stockholders, attorneys, parents, subsidiaries, equity sponsors, related companies/ corporations and/or partnerships, divisions, assigns, predecessors, successors, insurers, consultants, service providers, joint venturers, joint employers, co-employers, dual employers, alleged joint employers, alleged co-employers, alleged dual employers, affiliates, alter-egos, and affiliated organizations, and all of their respective past, present and future employees, directors, officers, agents, attorneys, stockholders, fiduciaries, parents, subsidiaries, and assigns.

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

1.42. "Response Deadline" means sixty (60) calendar days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice Packet to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) submit Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) submit his or her Objection to the Settlement. Class Members to whom Class Notice Packets are re-sent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have an additional fourteen (14) calendar days beyond the Response Deadline.

1.43. "Settlement" means the disposition of the Action and all related claims effectuated by this Agreement and the Judgment.

1.44. "Workweek" means any week during the Class Period in which a Class Member worked for Defendants as a Class Member for at least one day.

## 2. RECITALS

**The *Hillegeist* Class Action**

2.1. On August 25, 2022, Plaintiffs Hillegeist, Lytle, Cassady, Sellers, and Miller filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendants in the Superior Court of the State of



Doc ID: [illegible]

California, County of Humboldt alleging various wage and hour violations against Defendants (the "Hillegeist Class Action").

2.2. On October 10, 2022, Plaintiffs Hillegeist, Lytle, Cassady, Sellers, and Miller filed a First Amended Class Action Complaint ("FAC") against Defendants for:

(a) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
(b) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
(c) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
(d) Failure to Permit Rest Breaks;
(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
(f) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
(g) Failure to Pay Wages Timely During Employment;
(h) Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Separation of Employment; and
(i) Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq*.

2.3. On April 7, 2023, Plaintiffs Hillegeist, Lytle, Cassady, Sellers, and Miller filed a Second Amended Class Action Complaint ("SAC") against Defendants which removed the claim for Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses.

**The *Robertson* Class Action**

2.4. On November 2, 2022, Plaintiff Robertson filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa (the "*Robertson* Class Action"). Plaintiff Robertson's Class Action Complaint asserted claims that Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC:

(a) Violated California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.;
(b) Failed to pay minimum wages in violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1.
(c) Failed to pay overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code § 510, *et seq*.;
(d) Failed to provide required meal periods in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
(e) Failed to provide required rest periods in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
(f) Failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code § 226;
(g) Failed to reimburse employees for required expenses in violation of California Labor Code § 2802;
(h) Failed to provide wages when due in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203; and
(i) Failure to pay sick pay wages in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201-204, 233, 246.



Doc ID: [illegible]

**The *Robertson* PAGA Action**

2.2. On December 29, 2022, Plaintiff Robertson filed a separate Representative Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa (the "*Robertson* PAGA Action"). Plaintiff Robertson's Representative Action Complaint asserted one PAGA cause of action against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC for Civil Penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq*. for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, *et seq*., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040 Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

**Coordination of *Hillegeist* and *Robertson* Actions**

2.3. On June 13, 2023, Defendants filed a Petition to Coordinate the *Hillegeist* Class Action and the *Robertson* Class Action.

2.4. On September 1, 2023, the Court granted Defendants' Petition for Coordination, assigning the matters the special title of "St. Joseph Health Wage and Hour Cases," JCCP No. 5291, assigned to Presiding Judge Gregory J. Kreis of the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Humboldt.

**The *Wilson* Class Action**

2.6. On August 12, 2024, Plaintiff Wilson filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa (the "*Wilson* Class Action"). Plaintiff Wilson's Class Action Complaint asserted claims against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC for:

(a) Failure to Pay Wages for All Hours Worked at Minimum Wage in Violation of Labor Code Sections 1194 and 1197;
(b) Failure to Authorize or Permit Rest Periods in Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7;
(c) Failure to Indemnify Employees for Employment-Related Losses/Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code Section 2802
(d) Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code Section 226; and,
(e) Unfair Business Practices, in Violation of Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq*.

2.7. On November 19, 2024, Plaintiff Wilson filed a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint ("*Wilson* FAC") against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC. Plaintiff Wilson's FAC, as amended, added a cause of action for Civil



Doc ID: [illegible]

Penalties Pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq*.

**Pleading Amendment**

2.9. As part of this Agreement, the Parties stipulate to the filing of a Third Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint ("TAC") in the *Hillegeist* Class Action that adds the claims and parties from the *Robertson* Class Action, *Robertson* PAGA Action, and *Wilson* FAC, and adds Plaintiffs Kilmer and Olivo as named plaintiffs and Class Representatives, and will include all Released Class Claims and Released PAGA Claims to ensure alignment between released claims and all alleged claims. The TAC shall be the operative complaint in the Action (the "Operative Complaint").

2.7. Defendants deny the allegations in the Operative Complaint, deny any failure to comply with the laws identified in the Operative Complaint, and deny any and all liability for the causes of action alleged in the Operative Complaint.

**Mediation and Settlement**

2.11. On December 9, 2025 the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Hon. Carl J. West, a respected mediator of wage and hour representative and class actions. Following the mediation, each side, represented by its respective counsel, were able to agree to settle the Action based upon a mediator's proposal which was memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding. This Agreement replaces and supersedes the Memorandum of Understanding and any other agreements, understandings, or representations between the Parties related to the Action.

2.12. Prior to mediation, Plaintiffs obtained sufficient documents and information to sufficiently investigate the claims such that Plaintiffs' investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 ("*Dunk/Kullar"*).

2.13. This Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or will be construed as an admission by Defendants that the claims in the Action of Plaintiffs or the Class have merit or that Defendants bear any liability to Plaintiffs or the Class on those claims or any other claims, or as an admission by Plaintiffs that Defendants' defenses in the Action have merit. The Parties agree to certification of the Class for purposes of this Settlement only. If for any reason the Settlement does not become effective, Defendants reserve the right to contest certification of any class for any reason and reserve all available defenses to the claims in the Action.

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



Doc ID: [illegible]

## 3. MONETARY TERMS

3.1. Gross Settlement Amount. Except as otherwise provided by Paragraph 9 below, Defendants promise to pay $8,000,000.00 and no more as the Gross Settlement Amount. This amount is all-inclusive of all payments contemplated in this resolution, excluding any employer-side payroll taxes on the portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages which shall be separately paid by Defendants to the Administrator. Defendants have no obligation to pay the Gross Settlement Amount (or any payroll taxes) prior to the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.3 of this Agreement. The Administrator will disburse the entire Gross Settlement Amount without asking or requiring Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees to submit any claim as a condition of payment. None of the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendants.

3.2. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, the Administrator will make the following payments out of the Gross Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in the Final Approval.

(a) To Plaintiffs: Class Representative Service Payments to the Class Representatives of not more than $15,000.00 each (in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representatives are entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member). Defendants will not oppose Plaintiffs' request for a Class Representative Service Payments that does not exceed this amount. As part of the motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment, Plaintiffs will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payments no later than sixteen (16) court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves Class Representative Service Payments less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payments using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiffs assume full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payments.

(b) To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be $2,666,666.00, and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than $62,000.00. The Class Counsel Fees Payment shall be allocated among Class Counsel as follows: 50% to BNBD, 35% to JM, and 15% to LE. Defendants will not oppose requests for these payments provided that do not exceed these amounts. Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel will file a motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment no later than sixteen (16) court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiffs' Counsel arising from any claim to any portion of any Class Counsel Fee Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2ae9e4f55

Counsel Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and holds Defendants harmless, and indemnifies Defendants, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these payments.

(c) To the Administrator: An Administration Expenses Payment not to exceed $42,845 except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Expenses Payment is less, or the Court approves payment less than $42,845, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members.

(d) To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of $200,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 75% ($150,000.00) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% ($50,000.00) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

i. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($50,000.00) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

ii. If the Court approves PAGA Penalties of less than the amount requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

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

i. Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. 20% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form. 80% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for non-wages, expense reimbursement, interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.

ii. Effect of Non-Participating Class Members on Calculation of Individual Class Payments. Non-Participating Class Members will not receive any Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will retain amounts equal to their Individual Class



Doc ID: [illegible]

Payments in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members on a pro rata basis.

## 4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING

4.1. Class Workweeks and Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods. Based on their records, Defendants have represented that, through December 9, 2025, the Class consists of 7,144 Class Members who collectively worked a total of 1,204,556 Workweeks, and 6,903 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 462,707 PAGA Pay Periods.

4.2. Class Data. Not later than fifteen (15) days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, Defendants will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of this Settlement and for no other purpose, and restrict access to the Class Data to Administrator employees who need access to the Class Data to effect and perform under this Agreement. Defendants have a continuing duty to immediately notify Class Counsel if it discovers that the Class Data omitted Class Member identifying information and to provide corrected or updated Class Data as soon as reasonably feasible. Without any extension of the deadline by which Defendants must send the Class Data to the Administrator, the Parties and their counsel will expeditiously use best efforts, in good faith, to reconstruct or otherwise resolve any issues related to missing or omitted Class Data.

4.3. Funding of the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendants shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendants' share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than thirty (30) days after the Effective Date but in no event earlier than January 1, 2027.

## 5. PAYMENTS FROM THE GROSS SETTLEMENT AMOUNT

5.1. Within fourteen (14) days after Defendants fund the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment.

5.2. The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and/or Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Class Members via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. The face of each check shall prominently state the "void date", which is one hundred eighty (180) days after the date of mailing, when the check will be voided. The Administrator will cancel all checks not cashed by the void date. The Administrator will send checks for Individual Class Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator will send checks for Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as Aggrieved Employees (including those for



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2aeb94f55

whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. Before mailing any checks, the Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National Change of Address Database. If a Participating Class Member's or Aggrieved Employee's check is not cashed within one hundred twenty (120) days after its last mailing to the affected individual, the Administrator will also send the individual a notice informing him or her that unless the check is cashed by the void date, it will expire and become non-negotiable and offer to replace the check if it was lost or misplaced but not cashed.

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

5.4. For any Class Member whose Individual Class Payment check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to a Court-approved nonprofit organization or foundation consistent with Code of Civil Procedure Section 384(b) ("Cy Pres Recipient"). The Parties propose Legal Services of Northern California and Boys and Girls Club of the Redwoods as the Cy Pres Recipients, with each Cy Pres Recipient receiving fifty percent of the available funds. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the intended Cy Pres Recipients.

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

6. **RELEASE OF CLAIMS.** Effective on the date when Defendants fully fund the entire Gross Settlement Amount and fund all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiffs, Participating Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, and the LWDA will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

6.1. Plaintiffs' Release. Plaintiffs and their respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns generally, release and discharge Released Parties from all claims, transactions, or occurrences that occurred during the Class Period, including, but not limited to: (a) all claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged, based on or arising from the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and (b) all PAGA claims that were, or reasonably could have been,



Doc ID: [illegible]

alleged based on or arising from facts stated in the Operative Complaint and Plaintiffs' PAGA Notice ("Plaintiffs' Release"). Plaintiffs' Release does not extend to any claims or actions to enforce this Agreement, or to any claims for vested benefits, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social security benefits, or workers' compensation benefits that arose at any time, or based on occurrences outside the Class Period, or claims that cannot be released as a matter of law. Plaintiffs acknowledge that Plaintiffs may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiffs now know or believe to be true but agree, nonetheless, that Plaintiffs' Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiffs' discovery of them.

(a) Plaintiffs' Waiver of Rights Under Civil Code Section 1542. For purposes of Plaintiffs' Release, Plaintiffs expressly waive and relinquish the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

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

6.2. Release by Participating Class Members. All Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from the Released Class Claims.

6.3. Release of PAGA Claims. All Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims

**7. MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL.** The Parties agree to jointly prepare and file a motion for preliminary approval ("Motion for Preliminary Approval") that complies with the Court's procedures and instructions.

7.1. Defendants' Responsibilities. Following the execution of the Agreement, but prior to Preliminary Approval, Defendants shall confirm in writing the number of Class Members and the number of Workweeks for the Class during the Class Period.

7.2. Plaintiffs' Responsibilities. Plaintiffs will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all documents necessary for obtaining Preliminary Approval, including: (i) a draft of the notice, and memorandum in support of the Motion for Preliminary Approval that includes an analysis of the Settlement under *Dunk/Kullar* and a request for approval of the PAGA Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699, subd. (f)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2ae9e4f55

Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of Settlement; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from the Administrator attaching its "not to exceed" bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve; competency; operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data; amounts of insurance coverage for any data breach, defalcation of funds or other misfeasance; all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members and/or the proposed Cy Pres Recipients; and the nature and extent of any financial relationship with Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, or Defense Counsel; (v) a signed declaration from Plaintiffs confirming willingness and competency to serve and disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members and/or the Administrator and/or the proposed Cy Pres Recipients; (vi) a signed declaration from each Class Counsel firm attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members and timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (initial notice of violations (Labor Code section 2699.3, subd. (a)), Operative Complaint (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(1)), this Agreement (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(2)); and (vii) all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with Class Members, the Administrator and/or the Cy Pres Recipients, if any. In their Declarations, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall aver that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

7.3. Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel is responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval promptly after the full execution of this Agreement; obtaining a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and for appearing in Court to advocate in favor of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Defense Counsel must be given an opportunity to review and propose comments on the Motion for Preliminary Approval before it is filed. Defendants will be given a draft at least five days before the filing deadline to provide comments. Class Counsel is also responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval to the Administrator.

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

## 8. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

8.1. Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected ILYM Group, Inc. to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, ILYM Group, Inc. agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for payment of Administration Expenses. The Administrator's duties will include preparing, printing, and mailing the Class Notice



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2aeb94f55e

Packet to all Class Members; conducting a National Change of Address search to update Class Member addresses before mailing the Class Notice Packets; re-mailing Class Notice Packets that are returned to the Class Member's new address; setting up a toll-free telephone number and email and a fax number to receive communications from Class Members; receiving and reviewing for validity completed Requests for Exclusion; providing the Parties with weekly status reports about the delivery of Class Notice Packets and receipt of Requests for Exclusion, objections and disputes; calculating Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments; issuing the checks to effectuate the payments due under the Settlement; issuing the tax reports required under this Settlement; and otherwise administering the Settlement pursuant to this Agreement. The Parties and their Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.

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

8.3. Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") under US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1.

8.4. Notice to Class Members.

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

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

(c) Not later than seven (7) days after the Administrator's receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notices to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2aeb94f55e

(d) The deadlines for Class Members' written objections, Challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods, and Requests for Exclusion will be extended an additional fourteen (14) days beyond the Response Deadline provided in the Class Notice for all Class Members whose notice is re-mailed. The Administrator will inform the Class Member of the extended deadline with the re-mailed Class Notice.

(e) If the Administrator, the Parties, Defense Counsel, or Class Counsel are contacted by or otherwise discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class Data and should have received Class Notices, the Parties will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith. in an effort to agree on whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class Members, and the Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the Class Notice, or the deadline dates in the Class Notice, which ever are later.

8.5. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

(a) Class Members who wish to exclude themselves (opt-out of) the Class Settlement must send the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than the Response Deadline (plus an additional fourteen [14] days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed). A Request for Exclusion is a letter from a Class Member or his/her representative that reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the Settlement and includes the Class Member's name, address, and email address or telephone number. To be valid, a Request for Exclusion must be timely faxed, emailed, or postmarked by the Response Deadline.

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

(c) Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the Participating Class Members' Releases under Paragraph 6.2 of the Agreement, regardless of whether the Participating Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbcaf2ae094df5e

(d) Every Class Member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion is a Non-Participating Class Member and shall not receive an Individual Class Payment or have the right to object to the class action components of the Settlement. Because future PAGA claims are subject to claim preclusion upon entry of the Judgment, Non-Participating Class Members who are Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release the claims identified in Paragraph 6.3 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment. If a Class Member submits both a Request for Exclusion and an objection, only the Request for Exclusion will be accepted, and the objection will be void.

8.6. Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks. Each Class Member shall have until the Response Deadline (plus an additional fourteen [14] days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to challenge the number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if any) allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via fax, email, or mail. The Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member to submit supporting documentation. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Workweeks contained in the Class Notice are correct so long as they are consistent with the Class Data. The Administrator's determination of each Class Member's allocation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. The Administrator shall promptly provide copies of all challenges to calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination as to the challenges.

8.7. Objections to Settlement.

(a) Only Participating Class Members may object to the class action components of the Settlement and/or this Agreement, including contesting the fairness of the Settlement, and/or amounts requested for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Class Representative Service Payment.

(b) Participating Class Members may send written objections to the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail. In the alternative, or in addition to a written objection, Participating Class Members may appear in Court (or hire an attorney to appear in Court) to present verbal objections at the Final Approval Hearing. A Participating Class Member who elects to send a written objection to the Administrator must do so not later than the Response Deadline (plus an additional fourteen [14] days for Class Members whose Class Notice was re-mailed).

(c) Non-Participating Class Members have no right to object to any of the class action components of the Settlement. If a Class Member submits both a Request for Exclusion and an objection, only the Request for Exclusion will be accepted, and the objection will be void.



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2ae094f55e

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

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

(b) Request for Exclusion (Opt-Outs) and Exclusion List. The Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than seven (7) days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing: (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"); (b) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion; and (c) copies of all Requests for Exclusion from Settlement submitted (whether valid or invalid).

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

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

(e) Administrator's Declaration. Not later than seven (7) days before the date by which Plaintiffs are required to file the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Administrator will provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its due diligence and compliance with all of its obligations under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, its mailing of Class Notice, the Class Notices returned as undelivered, the re-mailing of Class Notices, attempts to locate Class Members, the total number of Requests for



Doc ID: [illegible]

Exclusion from Settlement it received (both valid or invalid), the number of written objections and attach the Exclusion List. The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration(s) in Court.

(f) Final Report by Administrator. Within ten (10) days after the Administrator disburses all funds of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing its disbursements by employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least seven (7) days before any deadline set by the Court, the Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration in Court. If a second declaration attesting to the distribution of uncashed checks is required, the Administrator shall provide this second declaration at least seven (7) days before any deadline for a second declaration and Class Counsel shall be responsible for filing the second declaration with the Court.

9. **CLASS SIZE MODIFICATION AND ESCALATOR CLAUSE**. Based on its records through December 9, 2025, Defendants provided figures as to the Class size and number of Workweeks as set forth in paragraph 4.1 above. If the actual number of Workweeks during the Class Period increases by more than ten (10) percent above 1,204,556 Workweeks, Defendants shall have the option of increasing the Gross Settlement Amount by the percentage increase over the ten (10) percent cushion or ending the Class Period on December 9, 2025.

10. **DEFENDANTS' RIGHT TO WITHDRAW**. If the number of valid Requests for Exclusion identified in the Exclusion List exceeds 5% of the total of all Class Members, Defendants may, but are not obligated to, elect to withdraw from the Settlement. The Parties agree that, if Defendants withdraw, the Settlement shall be void ab initio, have no force or effect whatsoever, and that neither Party will have any further obligation to perform under this Agreement; provided, however, Defendants will remain responsible for paying all Administration Expenses incurred as of the date Defendants make this election to withdraw. Defendants must notify Class Counsel and the Court of their election to withdraw not later than seven (7) days after the Administrator sends the final Exclusion List to Defense Counsel. Invalid Requests for Exclusion will have no effect on this threshold for an election.

11. **MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL**. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, not later than sixteen (16) court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs will file in Court, a motion for final approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the PAGA settlement under Labor Code section 2699(l), a Proposed Final Approval Order and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiffs shall provide drafts of these documents to Defense Counsel not later than seven (7) days prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval.



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766075e788841dbef2aeb94f55e

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

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

11.3. Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court. The Parties agree that, after entry of Judgment, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the Parties, Action, and the Settlement under C.C.P. section 664.6 solely for purposes of: (i) enforcing this Agreement and/or Judgment, (ii) addressing settlement administration matters, and (iii) addressing such post-Judgment matters as are permitted by law.

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

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



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2aeb94f55e

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

**13. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS**

13.1. No Admission of Liability, Class Certification or Representative Manageability for Other Purposes. This Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or should be construed as an admission by Defendants that any of the allegations in the Operative Complaint have merit or that Defendants have any liability for any claims asserted; nor should it be intended or construed as an admission by Plaintiffs that Defendants' defenses in the Action have merit. The Parties agree that class certification and representative treatment is for purposes of this Settlement only. If, for any reason the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval, Final Approval, or Judgment pursuant to this Agreement, Defendants reserve the right to contest certification of any class for any reasons, and Defendants reserve all available defenses to the claims in the Action, and Plaintiffs reserve the right to move for class certification on any grounds available and to contest Defendants' defenses. In such a case, the Parties will be returned to their respective statuses as of the date and time immediately prior to the execution of this Agreement and will proceed in all respects as if this Agreement had not been executed. The Settlement, this Agreement, and the Parties' willingness to settle the Action will have no bearing on, and will not be admissible in connection with, any litigation (except for proceedings to enforce or effectuate the Settlement and this Agreement).

13.2. Nullification of Settlement. This Agreement shall be null and void if (i) the Court does not enter Preliminary Approval as provided above, (ii) the Court does not finally approve this Agreement as provided above, (iii) the Court does not enter a Judgment that becomes final within the meaning of the "Effective Date" definition above, or (iv) the Settlement does not become final for any other reason. In such a case, the Parties will be returned to their respective statuses as of the date and time immediately prior to the execution of this Agreement and will proceed in all respects as if this Agreement had not been executed.

13.3. Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval. The Parties agree, and shall and hereby do direct their respective counsel , until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement is filed, that they will not disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly, specifically or generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity except: (1) to the Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement confidential; (2) counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. The Parties agree not to, and shall and do



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2ae09e4f5e

direct their respective counsel not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any conversation or other communication, before the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, with any third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class Counsel's communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

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

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

13.6. Attorney Authorization. The Plaintiffs and Defendants separately warrant and represent that they have authorized Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, respectively, to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any amendments to this Agreement.

13.7. Cooperation. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts, in good faith, to implement the Settlement by, among other things, modifying the Settlement Agreement, submitting supplemental evidence, and supplementing points and authorities as requested by the Court. In the event the Parties are unable to agree upon the form or content of any document necessary to implement the Settlement, or on any modification of the Agreement that may become necessary to implement the Settlement, the Parties will first seek the assistance of a mediator and then the Court for resolution.

13.8. Prior Assignments. The Parties separately represent and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity and portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action, or right released and discharged by the Party in this Settlement.

13.9. Tax Advice. Neither Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendants, nor Defense Counsel are providing any advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Settlement be relied upon as such within the meaning of United States Treasury Department Circular 230 (31 CFR Part 10, as amended) or otherwise.

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



Doc ID: d5829901d2a659d766675e788841dbef2aeb94f55e

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*To Plaintiffs and the Class:*

Norman B. Blumenthal
Kyle R. Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Tel.: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232
E-Mail: norm@bamlawca.com
kyle@bamlawca.com



Doc ID: [illegible]

Megan A. Yarnall
Janssen Malloy LLP
730 Fifth Street
P.Q. Drawer 1288
Eureka, CA 95501
Tel.: (707) 445-2071
E-Mail: myarnall@janssenlaw.com

Joseph Lavi
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel.: (310) 432-0000
Fax: (310) 432-0001
E-mail: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com

*To Defendants:*

Todd Nunn
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111
Tel: (206) 288-0123
E-Mail: todd.nunn@arnoldporter.com

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

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

13.21. Fair Settlement. The Parties believe and warrant that this Agreement reflects a fair, reasonable, and adequate settlement of the Action and have arrived at this Agreement through arms-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors, both current and potential.



Doc ID: [illegible]

**14. EXECUTION BY PARTIES AND COUNSEL**

The Parties and their counsel hereby execute this Agreement.

Dated: 07/23/2026

Catherine Robertson (Jul 23, 2026 16:55:24 PDT)

Plaintiff Catherine Robertson

Dated: 07/24/2026

Bailey Kilmer

Bailey Kilmer (Jul 24, 2026 17:41:59 CDT)

Plaintiff Bailey Kilmer

Dated: 07/23/2026

Cuauhtemoc Olivo

Plaintiff Cuauhtemoc Olivo

Dated: _____

Plaintiff Lynn Hillegeist

Dated: _____

Plaintiff Maureen Lytle

Dated: _____

Plaintiff Pamela Cassady

Dated: _____

Plaintiff John Sellers

Dated: _____

Plaintiff Holly Miller

Dated: _____

Plaintiff Jeanelle Wilson

Dated: _____

_____[name]
For Defendants
St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC,
St. Joseph Health System, and
Providence St. Joseph Health

## 14. EXECUTION BY PARTIES AND COUNSEL

The Parties and their counsel hereby execute this Agreement.

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Catherine Robertson

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Bailey Kilmer

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Cuauhtemoc Olivo

Dated: 07 / 23 / 2026

Lynn Hillegeist
_____
Plaintiff Lynn Hillegeist

Dated: 07 / 24 / 2026

Maureen E Lytle
_____
Plaintiff Maureen Lytle

Dated: 07 / 26 / 2026

P Cassady
_____
Plaintiff Pamela Cassady

Dated: 07 / 23 / 2026

_____
Plaintiff John Sellers

Dated: 07 / 24 / 2026

_____
Plaintiff Holly Miller

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Jeanelle Wilson

Dated: _____

_____
_____[name]
For Defendants
St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC,
St. Joseph Health System, and
Providence St. Joseph Health



Doc ID: [illegible]

**14. EXECUTION BY PARTIES AND COUNSEL**

The Parties and their counsel hereby execute this Agreement.

Dated: _____ _____
Plaintiff Catherine Robertson

Dated: _____ _____
Plaintiff Bailey Kilmer

Dated: _____ _____
Plaintiff Cuauhtemoc Olivo

Dated: _____ _____
Plaintiff Lynn Hillegeist

Dated: _____ _____
Plaintiff Maureen Lytle

Dated: _____ _____
Plaintiff Pamela Cassady

Dated: _____ _____
Plaintiff John Sellers

Dated: _____ _____
Plaintiff Holly Miller

Dated: 07/24/2026 _____
Plaintiff Jeanelle Wilson

Dated: _____ _____
_____[name]
For Defendants
St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC,
St. Joseph Health System, and
Providence St. Joseph Health



Doc ID: b5821b91d9d859176675e388814beaf2ee94d64e

Docusign Envelope ID: 213D8B24-735E-8160-830B-CDE8D57E1B88

## 14. EXECUTION BY PARTIES AND COUNSEL

The Parties and their counsel hereby execute this Agreement.

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Catherine Robertson

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Bailey Kilmer

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Cuauhtemoc Olivo

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Lynn Hillegeist

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Maureen Lytle

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Pamela Cassady

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff John Sellers

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Holly Miller

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Jeanelle Wilson

Dated: 8/7/2026

DocuSigned by:
Amy Dinsmore
E372B1AEF59D4E1...
Amy Dinsmore [name]
For Defendants
St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC,
St. Joseph Health System, and
Providence St. Joseph Health

Dated: 7/27/26

Kyle Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: _____

_____
Megan A. Yarnall
Janssen Malloy LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: _____

_____
Joseph Lavi
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Stephen M. Sloane, Esq.
Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: _____

_____
Todd Nunn
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
Attorney for Defendant

Dated: _____

Kyle Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: 07 / 27 / 2026

Megan A. Yarnall
Janssen Malloy LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: 07/24/2026

Joseph Lavi
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Stephen M. Sloane, Esq.
Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: _____

Todd Nunn
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
Attorney for Defendant



Doc ID: b5821b91d9d859176675e388814beaf2ee94d64e

Docusign Envelope ID: 213D8B24-735E-8160-830B-CDE8D57E1B88

Dated: _____

Kyle Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: _____

Megan A. Yarnall
Janssen Malloy LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: _____

Joseph Lavi
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Stephen M. Sloane, Esq.
Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: 08/07/2026

Todd Nunn
Todd Nunn (Aug 10, 2026 18:53:33 PDT)

Todd Nunn
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
Attorney for Defendant

**EXHIBIT A**

[NOTICE OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL]



Doc ID: [illegible]

**EXHIBIT "A"**

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL**

***Hillegeist v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC, et al.,***
**Superior Court of the State of California,**
**County of Humboldt, Case No. CV2201266**

***The Superior Court for the State of California authorized this Notice. Read it carefully! It's not junk mail, spam, an advertisement, or solicitation by a lawyer. You are not being sued.***

**YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS MAY BE AFFECTED WHETHER YOU ACT OR DO NOT ACT. PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY.**

**You may be eligible to receive money** from an employee class action lawsuit ("Action") against Defendants St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC, St. Joseph Health System and Providence St. Joseph Health ("Defendants") for alleged wage and hour violations. The Action is brought by Plaintiffs Catherine Robertson, Bailey Kilmer, Cuauhtemoc Olivo, Lynn Hillegeist, Maureen Lytle, Pamela Cassady, John Sellers, Holly Miller, and Jeanelle Wilson ("Plaintiffs") ("Plaintiff") and seeks payment of (1) wages and other relief for a Class of all individuals who are or previously were employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants during the Class Period (February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026), excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital – Eureka between August 24, 2018 and March 25, 2022 and who were not employed by Defendants at any other time during the Class Period and who did not opt-out of the *Martinez v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC* (Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV-20000424) class action settlement ("Class Members"), and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA") for all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendants who were classified as non-exempt in the State of California during the PAGA Period (October 21, 2021 to February 9, 2026), excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital – Eureka from October 21, 2021 to March 25, 2022 and who did not work after March 25, 2022 ("Aggrieved Employees"). While Defendants dispute Plaintiffs' claims in the Action and deny all liability, in order to resolve the Action, the Parties have reached a proposed Settlement.

The proposed Settlement includes the following: (1) a Class Settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual Class Payments to Class Members, and (2) a PAGA Settlement requiring the payment of PAGA Penalties to be allocated to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and to Aggrieved Employees.

Based on Defendants' records, and the Parties' current assumptions, **your Individual Class Payment is estimated to be <<$_____>> (less withholding) and your share of the PAGA Penalties ("Individual PAGA Payment") is estimated to <<be $_____>>.** The actual amount you may receive likely will be different and will depend on a number of factors. (If no amount is stated for your Individual PAGA Payment, then according to Defendants' records

you are not eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment under the Settlement because you didn't work during the PAGA Period.)

The above estimates are based on Defendants' records showing that **you worked <<_____>> Workweeks during the Class Period** and **you worked <<_____>> PAGA Pay Periods**. If you believe that you worked more workweeks and/or pay periods during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section 5 of this Notice below.

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

If you worked for Defendants during the Class Period and/or the PAGA Period, you have two basic options under the Settlement:

(1) **Do Nothing**. You don't have to do anything to participate in the proposed Settlement and be eligible for an Individual Class Payment and/or an Individual PAGA Payment (if any). As a Participating Class Member, though, you will give up your right to assert Class Period wage claims and PAGA Period penalty claims (if any) against Defendants as described below in Section 4 below.

(2) **Opt-Out of the Class Settlement**. You can exclude yourself from the Class Settlement (opt-out) by submitting the written Request for Exclusion or otherwise notifying the Administrator in writing. If you opt-out of the Settlement, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment, however you will preserve your right to personally pursue wage claims against Defendants, and, if you are an Aggrieved Employee, remain eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement.

**Defendants will not retaliate against you for any actions you take with respect to the proposed Settlement.**

| **SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT:** | |
|---|---|
| **You Don't Have to Do Anything to Participate in the Settlement** | If you do nothing, you will be a Participating Class Member, eligible for an Individual Class Payment and an Individual PAGA Payment (if any). In exchange, you will give up your right to assert the wage claims against Defendants that are covered by this Settlement (Released Class Claims).<br><br>Additional information is set forth below. |
| **You Can Opt-out** | If you don't want to fully participate in the proposed Settlement, you |

| | |
|---|---|
| **of the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement**<br><br>**The Opt-out Deadline is _____, 2026** | can opt-out of the Class Settlement by sending the Administrator a written Request for Exclusion. **If you request exclusion, you will receive no money from the Settlement for an Individual Class Payment and you will not be bound by the Class Settlement.** Once excluded, you will be a Non-Participating Class Member and no longer eligible for an Individual Class Payment. Non-Participating Class Members cannot object to any portion of the proposed Settlement. See Section **7** of this Notice.<br><br>However, you cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement. If you are also an Aggrieved Employee and exclude yourself, you will still be paid your Individual PAGA Payment and will remain subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims regardless of whether you submit a Request for Exclusion. |
| **Participating Class Members Can Object to the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement**<br><br>**Written Objections Must be Submitted by _____, 2026** | All Class Members who do not opt-out ("Participating Class Members") can object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement. The Court's decision whether to finally approve the Settlement will include a determination of how much will be paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiffs who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You can object to the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs if you think they are unreasonable.<br><br>See Section **8** of this Notice. |
| **You Can Participate in the Final Approval Hearing** | The Court's Final Approval Hearing is scheduled to take place on _____, at 9:00 a.m., at the Humboldt County Superior Court, located at 825 5th Street, Eureka, CA 95501, in Courtroom 4 before Judge _____. This hearing may change as explained below in Section 9.<br><br>You don't have to attend but you do have the right to appear (or hire an attorney to appear on your behalf at your own cost), in person or by using the Court's virtual appearance platform. Participating Class Members can verbally object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing. See Section **9** of this Notice |
| **You Can Challenge the Calculation of Your Workweeks / PAGA Pay Periods**<br><br>**Written Challenges Must be Submitted by _____** | The amount of your Individual Class Payment and your Individual PAGA Payment (if any) depend on how many Workweeks you worked at least one day during the Class Period and how many PAGA Pay Periods you worked during the PAGA Period, respectively. The number of Workweeks during the Class Period and number of PAGA Period Pay Periods you worked according to Defendants' records is stated on the first page of this Notice. If you disagree with either of these numbers, you must challenge it by _____, 2026. See Section **5** of this Notice |

## 1. Why did I get this Notice?

A proposed class action settlement (the "Settlement") of the above-captioned action pending in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Humboldt (the "Court"), has been reached between Plaintiffs and Defendants and has been granted preliminary approval by the Court. You may be entitled to receive money from this Settlement.

You have received this Notice because you have been identified as a member of the Class, which is defined as:

> All individuals who are or previously were employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants during the Class Period (February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026), excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital – Eureka between August 24, 2018 and March 25, 2022 and who were not employed by Defendants at any other time during the Class Period and who did not opt-out of the *Martinez v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC* (Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV-20000424) class action settlement.
>
> The Class Period is February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026.

So far, the Court has made no determination whether Defendants or Plaintiffs are correct on the merits. In the meantime, Plaintiffs and Defendants hired an experienced, neutral mediator in an effort to resolve the Action by negotiating an end to the case by agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations were successful. By signing a written Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") and agreeing to jointly ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Action and enforcing the Agreement, Plaintiffs and Defendants have negotiated a proposed Settlement that is subject to the Court's Final Approval. Both sides agree the proposed Settlement is a compromise of disputed claims. By agreeing to settle, Defendants does not admit any violations or concede the merit of any claims. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel strongly believe the Settlement is a good deal for you because they believe that: (1) Defendants have agreed to pay a fair, reasonable and adequate amount considering the strength of the claims and its defenses, and the risks and uncertainties of continued litigation; and (2) Settlement is in the best interests of the Class Members. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine Final Approval.

## 2. What is this class action lawsuit about?

On August 25, 2022, Plaintiffs Hillegeist, Lytle, Cassady, Sellers, and Miller filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendants in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Humboldt ("Hillegeist Class Action"). The Hillegeist Class Action asserts class claims for unfair competition, failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide required meal periods, failure to provide required rest periods, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to reimburse employees for required expenses, failure to pay wages timely during employment, and failure to provide wages when due upon termination.

On November 2, 2022, Plaintiff Robertson filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa (the "Robertson Class Action"). The Robertson Class Action Complaint asserts similar wage and hour claims as the Hillegeist Class Action. On December 29, 2022, Plaintiff Robertson filed a separate Representative Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Napa (the "Robertson PAGA Action"), which alleged one PAGA cause of action against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC for Civil Penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699, et seq. for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040 Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). On August 12, 2024, Plaintiff Wilson filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC alleging similar wage and hour claims ("Wilson Class Action").

On September 1, 2023, the Court granted Defendants' Petition for Coordination, assigning the matters the special title of "St. Joseph Health Wage and Hour Cases," JCCP No. 5291, assigned to Presiding Judge Gregory J. Kreis of the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Humboldt.

On _____, 2026, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint in the Hillegeist Class Action that adds the claims and parties from the Robertson Class Action, Robertson PAGA Action, and Wilson Class Action, and adds Plaintiffs Kilmer and Olivo as named plaintiffs and Class Representatives. This Second Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint in the Hillegeist Class Action is referred to as the "Operative Complaint".

Defendants deny that they have done anything wrong and dispute all the claims in the Action. Specifically, Defendants contend that Plaintiffs and the Class Members were, at all times, properly compensated for wages under California law; that Plaintiffs and the Class Members were provided with meal and rest periods in compliance with California law; that Defendants did not fail to pay to Plaintiffs or any Class Members any wages allegedly due during employment and at the time of their termination; that Defendants complied with California wage statement and record requirements; that Defendants did not violate California Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*; that Defendants are not liable for any of the penalties sought or that could have been sought in the Operative Complaint; and that this Action cannot be maintained as a class or representative action.

The Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement on <<INSERT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL DATE>>. At that time, the Court also preliminarily approved the Plaintiffs to serve as the Class Representatives, and the law firm of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, Janssen Malloy LLP, and Lavi & Ebrahimian LLP to serve as Class Counsel.

The Court has not ruled on the merits of Plaintiffs' claims. However, to avoid additional expense, inconvenience, and interference with the business operations of Defendants, the Parties concluded that it is in their best interests and the interests of the Class to settle the Actions now on the terms summarized in this Notice. The Settlement was reached after mediation and arm's-length negotiations between the Parties. The Plaintiffs and Class Counsel think the settlement is in the best interest of all Class Members.

Accordingly, the Settlement constitutes a compromise of disputed claims and should not be construed as an admission of liability on the part of Defendants, who expressly deny all liability.

## 3. What are the terms of the Settlement?

Gross Settlement Amount. **Defendants have agreed to pay an "all in" amount of Eight Million Dollars ($8,000,000.00) (the "Gross Settlement Amount") to fund the settlement of the Action.** The Gross Settlement Amount includes all payments of Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Representative Service Payments, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the PAGA Penalties payment for civil penalties under PAGA. Any employer-side payroll taxes on the portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages shall be separately paid by Defendants. Defendants shall fund the Gross Settlement Amount and the amount necessary to pay payroll taxes no sooner than January 1, 2027 and within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date. The Effective Date is the date 65 days after the deadline to appeal the Judgment, unless there is an appeal, in which case the Effective Date is the date the Judgment is final and no longer subject to appeal. The Administrator will mail checks for all settlement payments within fourteen (14) days of the funding of the settlement by Defendants.

Court Approved Deductions from Gross Settlement Amount. The proposed payments, subject to Court approval, will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount before payments of Individual Class Payments are made to Class Members who do not request exclusion ("Participating Class Members"). At the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve the following deductions from the Gross Settlement, the amounts of which will be decided by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing:

- Administration Expenses Payment. Payment to the Administrator, estimated not to exceed $42,845, for expenses, including expenses of notifying the Class Members of the Settlement, processing Request for Exclusions, and distributing settlement checks and tax forms.

- Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Payment to Class Counsel of reasonable attorneys' fees not to exceed one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which presently equals $2,666,666, and an additional amount to reimburse actual litigation costs incurred by the Plaintiffs not to exceed $62,000. Class Counsel has been prosecuting the Action on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class on a contingency fee basis (that is, without being paid any money to date) and has been paying all litigation costs and expenses. The attorneys' fees awarded will be allocated 50% to Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 35% to Janssen Malloy LLP, and 15% to Lavi & Ebrahimian LLP. The amounts stated are what Class Counsel will be requesting and the final amounts to be paid will be decided at the Final Approval Hearing.

- Class Representative Service Payments. Class Representative Service Payments in an amount not more than $15,000 to each of the nine named Plaintiffs as service awards, or such lesser amount as may be approved by the Court, to compensate them for services on behalf of the Class in initiating and prosecuting the Action, and for the risks they undertook. The amount stated is what Plaintiffs will be requesting and the final amount to be paid will

be decided at the Final Approval Hearing.

- PAGA Penalties. A payment of $200,000 relating to Plaintiffs' claim under PAGA, 75% ($150,000) of which will be paid to the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"). The remaining 25% ($50,000) will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($50,000.00) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. "PAGA Pay Period" means any pay period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendants for at least one day during the PAGA Period. The PAGA Period is October 21, 2021 to February 9, 2026.

Participating Class Members have the right to object to any of these deductions. The Court will consider all objections.

Calculation of Payments to Class Members. After all of the payments of the court-approved Attorneys' Fees and Costs, the Class Representative Service Payments, the PAGA Penalties, and the Administration Expenses Payment are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the remaining portion, the "Net Settlement Amount", shall be distributed as Individual Class Payments to the Participating Class Members. The Net Settlement Amount is estimated to be at least $4,893,489. The Administrator will pay an Individual Class Payment from the Net Settlement Amount to each Participating Class Member. The Individual Class Payment for each Participating Class Member calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Workweeks. "Workweek" means any week during the Class Period in which a Class Member worked for Defendants as a Class Member for at least one day. The number of Workweeks will be based on Defendants' records, however, Class Members may challenge the number of Workweeks worked as explained below.

**If the Settlement is approved by the Court and you do not exclude yourself, you will automatically be mailed a check for your Individual Class Payment to the same address as this Class Notice. You do not have to do anything to receive a payment.** If your address has changed, you must contact the Administrator to inform them of your correct address to ensure you receive your payment.

Tax Matters. Twenty Percent (20%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment is in settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). Accordingly, the Wage Portion is subject to wage withholdings, and shall be reported on IRS Form W-2. Eighty Percent (80%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment is in settlement of claims for alleged claims for non-wages, expense reimbursement, interest and penalties due to employees (collectively the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portion and any Individual PAGA Payment shall not be subject to wage withholdings and shall be reported on IRS Form 1099. The employee portion of all applicable income and payroll taxes will be the responsibility of the Participating Class Members. Neither Class Counsel nor Defendants' Counsel intend anything contained in this Class Notice to constitute advice regarding taxes or taxability. The tax issues for each Participating Class Member are unique to him/her, and each Participating Class Member may

wish to consult a tax advisor concerning the tax consequences of the payments received under the Settlement.

Conditions of Settlement. This Settlement and your receipt of the Individual Class Payment are conditioned upon the Court entering an order granting final approval of the Settlement and entering a Judgment.

The Proposed Settlement Will be Void if the Court Denies Final Approval. It is possible the Court will decline to grant Final Approval of the Settlement or decline to enter a Judgment. It is also possible the Court will enter a Judgment that is reversed on appeal. Plaintiffs and Defendants have agreed that, in either case, the Settlement will be void: Defendants will not pay any money and Class Members will not release any claims against Defendants.

Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check issued will show the date when the check expires (the void date). If you don't cash it by the void date, your check will be automatically cancelled, and the funds represented by such checks will be sent to two Court-approved charities in equal distributions pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 384 (the "Cy Pres Recipients"). The Parties agreed to propose Legal Services of Northern California and Boys and Girls Club of the Redwoods as the Cy Pres Recipients, with each Cy Pres Recipient receiving fifty percent of the available funds. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the intended Cy Pres Recipients.

## 4. What Do I Release Under the Settlement?

Released Class Claims. Effective on the date when Defendants fully fund the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from the Released Class Claims. The "Released Class Claims" are all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on or arising from the facts stated in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the Class Period, including failure to pay minimum wages, straight time compensation, overtime compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), double-time compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), and interest thereon; failure to timely pay regular and final wages; the calculation of the regular rate of pay; wages lost from time rounding and timekeeping; non-compliant (e.g., missed, short, late, and/or interrupted) meal periods and rest periods; failure to provide meal periods; failure to authorize and permit rest periods; the calculation and payment of meal period and rest period premiums; payment for all hours worked, including off-the-clock work and uncompensated work time; failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements and paystubs, including wage statements and paystubs furnished or available in physical, electronic, or other forms; failure to pay sick pay wages; failure to properly calculate sick pay wages; failure to keep accurate records; failure to reimburse for all employment-related business expenses; unfair business practices; recordkeeping penalties; wage statement penalties, minimum-wage penalties, and waiting-time penalties; statutory penalties and civil penalties; liquidated or punitive damages; interest for claims

for unpaid wages; attorneys' fees and costs; claims under the California Labor Code, including sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 223, 224, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227, 233, 246, 246.5, 248.5, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1194.3, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198, and 2802; the Wage Orders of the California Industrial Welfare Commission, including Wage Order No. 5; and California Business and Professions Code section 17200*, et seq.* Except as expressly set forth in the Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or Class claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period. In addition, the Released Class Claims exclude the release of claims not permitted by law.

This means that, if you do not timely and formally exclude yourself from the settlement, you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendants and any other Released Party about the Released Class Claims resolved by this Settlement. It also means that all of the Court's orders in the Action will apply to you and legally bind you.

Released PAGA Claims. Effective on the date when Defendants fully fund the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims. The "Released PAGA Claims" are all claims for PAGA Penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on or arising from the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice, which occurred during the PAGA Period including claims for PAGA Penalties for unpaid wages, including failure to pay minimum wages, straight time compensation, overtime compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), double-time compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), and interest; the calculation of the regular rate of pay; noncompliant (e.g., missed, short, late, and/or interrupted) meal periods and rest periods; failure to provide meal periods; failure to authorize and permit rest periods; the calculation and payment of meal period and rest period premiums; failure to reimburse for all employment-related business expenses; payment for all hours worked, including off-the-clock work and rounded time; failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements; failure to keep accurate records; failure to pay sick pay wages; failure to properly calculate sick pay wages; failure to timely pay wages; and failure to timely pay final wages. The Released PAGA Claims include claims for PAGA Penalties for violation of the Wage Orders of the California Industrial Welfare Commission and the following California Labor Code sections: 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2698 et seq., and 2699, *et seq*., and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B). The Released PAGA Claims do not include other PAGA claims, underlying wage and hour claims, claims for wrongful termination, discrimination, unemployment insurance, disability and worker's compensation, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

Released Parties. Released Parties are defined as: Defendants and each of their past, present and future agents, employees, servants, officers, directors, partners, trustees, representatives, shareholders, stockholders, attorneys, parents, subsidiaries, equity sponsors, related companies/

corporations and/or partnerships, divisions, assigns, predecessors, successors, insurers, consultants, service providers, joint venturers, joint employers, co-employers, dual employers, alleged joint employers, alleged co-employers, alleged dual employers, affiliates, alter-egos, and affiliated organizations, and all of their respective past, present and future employees, directors, officers, agents, attorneys, stockholders, fiduciaries, parents, subsidiaries, and assigns.

## 5. How much will my payment be?

**Defendants' records reflect that you worked <<_____>> Workweeks during the Class Period (February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026).**

**Based on this information, your estimated Individual Class Payment from the Net Settlement Amount is <<_____>>.**

**[Defendants' records reflect that you worked <<_____>> PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period (October 21, 2021 to February 9, 2026). Based on this information your estimated Individual PAGA Payment is <<_____>>.]**

If you wish to challenge the information set forth above, then you must submit a written, signed dispute challenging the information along with supporting documents, to the Administrator at the address provided in this Class Notice no later than the Response Deadline, which is _____ [sixty (60) days after the mailing of the Class Notice or an additional 14 days in the case of re-mailing]. You may also fax the dispute to _____ or email the dispute to _____ by no later than the Response Deadline. Any dispute should include credible written evidence and will be resolved by the Administrator.

## 6. How can I get a payment?

To get money from the Settlement, you do not have to do anything. A check for your Individual Class Payment will be mailed automatically to the same address as this Class Notice. If your address is incorrect or has changed, you must notify the Administrator. The Administrator is: ILYM Group, Inc., _____ (800) _____.

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on _____, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. to decide whether to approve the Settlement and fix the amounts to be paid as attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel and as a service payment to Plaintiffs. If the Court approves the Settlement and there are no objections or appeals, payments will be mailed on approximately January 15, 2027. If there are objections or appeals, resolving them can take time and delay the settlement, perhaps more than a year. Please be patient.

## 7. What if I don't want to be a part of the Settlement?

If you do not wish to participate in the Settlement, you may exclude yourself from the Settlement or "opt out." **If you opt out, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment from the Settlement, and you will not be bound by its terms, which means you will retain the right to sue Defendants for the Released Class Claims.** However, Aggrieved Employees who opt out will still be paid their Individual PAGA Payment and will remain bound by the release of the

Released PAGA Claims regardless of whether they submit a request for exclusion.

To opt out of the class portion of the settlement, you must submit to the Administrator a written, signed and dated request for exclusion ("opt-out") postmarked no later than the Response Deadline which is _____ [sixty (60) days after the mailing of the Class Notice or an additional 14 days in the case of re-mailing]. You may also fax your request to opt out to _____ or email to _____ by no later than the Response Deadline. The request to opt-out should state in substance that you wish to be excluded from the class settlement in the *Hillegeist v. St. Joseph Health Northern California,* lawsuit. The request to opt-out should state the Class Member's full name, address, and telephone number or email address. Please include the name and number of the case, which is *Hillegeist v. St. Joseph Health Northern California,* Case No. CV2201266. The request to opt-out must be completed and signed by you. No other person may opt-out for a living member of the Class.

The address for the Administrator is _____. Written requests for exclusion that are postmarked after _____, or are incomplete or unsigned will be rejected, and those Class Members will remain bound by the Settlement and the release described above.

## 8. How do I Object to the Settlement?

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. At least sixteen (16) court days before the Final Approval Hearing, scheduled for _____, Class Counsel and Plaintiffs will file in Court a Motion for Final Approval that includes, among other things, the reasons why the proposed Settlement is fair, and a request stating (i) the amount Class Counsel is requesting for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses; and (ii) the amount Plaintiffs are requesting as Class Representative Service Payments. Upon reasonable request, Class Counsel (whose contact information is below) will send you copies of these documents at no cost to you. You can also view them on Class Counsel's website at www.bamlawca.com under "Class Notices" for *Hillegeist v. St. Joseph Health Northern California.*

A Participating Class Member who disagrees with any aspect of the Agreement, the Motion for Final Approval, or the attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and service payments may wish to object, for example, that the proposed Settlement is unfair, or that the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs are too high or too low. **The Response Deadline for sending written objections to the Administrator is_____**[sixty (60) days after the mailing of the Class Notice or an additional 14 days in the case of re-mailing]. You may also fax the dispute to _____ or email to_____. Be sure to tell the Administrator what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. Make sure you identify the Action, *Hillegeist v. St. Joseph Health Northern California*, Case No. CV2201266, and include your name, current address, telephone number, email address, and approximate dates of employment for Defendants and sign the objection. The Administrator's contact information is as follows:

Administrator:
Name of Company: _____
Email Address: _____

Mailing Address: _____
Telephone Number: _____
Fax Number: _____

Alternatively, a Participating Class Member can object (or personally retain a lawyer to object at your own cost) by attending the Final Approval Hearing. You (or your attorney) should be ready to tell the Court what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. If you do wish to appear at the hearing, check the Court's website for the most current information concerning appearances and procedures at the Court - https://www.humboldt.courts.ca.gov/general-information/remote-and-telephonic-appearances/judicial-assignmentscalendars. You may also have the option to appear at the hearing by audio or video. For assistance in making an appearance at the Final Approval Hearing, please contact Class Counsel below. See Section 9 of this Notice (immediately below) for specifics regarding the Final Approval Hearing.

The addresses for Parties' counsel are as follows:

**CLASS COUNSEL**:

Kyle Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Tel.: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232
E-Mail: kyle@bamlawca.com

Megan A. Yarnall
Janssen Malloy LLP
730 Fifth Street
P.Q. Drawer 1288
Eureka, CA 95501
Tel.: (707) 445-2071
E-Mail: myarnall@janssenlaw.com

Joseph Lavi
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Lavi & Ebrahimian, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel.: (310) 432-0000
Fax: (310) 432-0001
E-mail: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com

**COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS:**

Todd Nunn
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111

## 9. Can I Attend the Final Approval Hearing?

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing at 9:00 a.m. (Pacific Standard Time) on _____, in Courtroom 4 of the Superior Court of California, County of Humboldt, located at 825 5th Street, Eureka, CA 95501, before Judge _____. At this hearing the

Court will consider whether the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The purpose of this hearing is for the Court to determine whether to grant final approval of the Settlement and to fix the amounts to be paid as attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel and as service payment to Plaintiffs. If there are objections, the Court will consider them. **You are not required to attend** the Final Approval Hearing, although any Class Member is welcome to attend the hearing. Check the Court's website for the most current information concerning appearances and procedures at the Court - https://www.humboldt.courts.ca.gov/general-information/remote-and-telephonic-appearances/judicial-assignmentscalendars .

It's possible the Court will reschedule the Final Approval Hearing. If the hearing is continued, notice will be posted on Class Counsel's website at www.bamlawca.com under "Class Notices" for *Hillegeist v. St. Joseph Health Northern California.*

## 10. How Can I Get More Information?

You may call the Administrator at _____ or write to *Hillegeist v. St. Joseph Health Northern California,* Administrator, c/o _____.

This Class Notice summarizes the proposed settlement. More details are in the Agreement. You may receive a copy of the Agreement, the Judgment, the motion for final approval or other Settlement documents by going to Class Counsel's website at www.bamlawca.com under "Class Notices" for *Hillegeist v. St. Joseph Health Northern California,* where these documents will be posted as they become available. If you wish to view the Court files in person, you must go to the Clerk's Office at the Main Courthouse, 825 5th Street, Eureka, CA 95501.

**PLEASE DO NOT CALL THE COURT ABOUT THIS NOTICE.**

IMPORTANT:

- **What if Your Address Changes -** To receive your check, you should immediately notify the Administrator if you move or otherwise change your mailing address.

- **What if You Fail To Cash a Check -** Settlement checks will be null and void 180 days after issuance if not deposited or cashed, and this expiration date is printed on the check. In such event, the Administrator shall direct all unclaimed funds to be paid in equal distributions to the Cy Pres Recipients, which are proposed to be Legal Services of Northern California and Boys and Girls Club of the Redwoods.

- **What if You Lose Your Check -** If your check is lost or misplaced, you should contact the Administrator immediately to request a replacement.

**EXHIBIT B**

[ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL]



Doc ID: [illegible]

**EXHIBIT "B"**

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

| | |
|---|---|
| LYNN HILLEGEIST; MAUREEN LYTLE; PAMELA CASSADY; JOHN SELLERS; HOLLY MILLER; CATHERINE ROBERTSON; BAILEY KILMER, CUAUHTEMOC OLIVO, and JANELLE WILSON, all individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,<br><br>Plaintiffs,<br><br>vs.<br><br>ST. JOSEPH HEALTH NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, LLC; ST. JOSEPH HEALTH SYSTEM; PROVIDENCE ST. JOSEPH HEALTH; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20, INCLUSIVE,<br><br>Defendants. | CASE NO.: **CV2201266**<br><br>**[PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER**<br><br>Hearing Date:<br>Hearing Time:<br><br>Judge: Hon. _____<br>Dept.: 4<br><br>Date Action Filed: August 25, 2022<br>Trial Date: Not set |

This matter, having come before the Honorable _____ of the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Humboldt, on _____[DATE], for the motion by Plaintiffs Catherine Robertson, Bailey Kilmer, Cuauhtemoc Olivo, Lynn Hillegeist, Maureen Lytle, Pamela Cassady, John Sellers, Holly Miller, and Jeanelle Wilson ("Plaintiffs") for preliminary approval of the class settlement with Defendants St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC, St. Joseph Health System and Providence St. Joseph Health ("Defendants"). The Court, having considered the briefs, argument of counsel and all matters presented to the Court and good cause appearing, hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

1. The Court preliminarily approves the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") attached as Exhibit ___ to the Declaration of Kyle Nordrehaug in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement. This is based on the Court's determination that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is within the range of possible final approval, pursuant to the provisions of Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and California Rules of Court, rule 3.769.

2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Agreement.

3. The Gross Settlement Amount is Eight Million Dollars ($8,000,000). It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount and terms are fair, adequate and reasonable as to all potential Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability and damages issues. It further appears that investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court

that settlement at this time will avoid substantial additional costs by all Parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the Action. It further appears that the Settlement has been reached as the result of serious and non-collusive, arm's-length negotiations. The Court therefore preliminarily finds that the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability, and damages issues.

4. The Agreement specifies an attorneys' fees award not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, an award of litigation expenses incurred, not to exceed $62,000, and proposed Class Representative Service Payments to the Plaintiffs in an amount not to exceed $15,000 each. The Court will not approve the amount of attorneys' fees and costs, nor the amount of any service award, until the Final Approval Hearing.

5. The Court recognizes that Plaintiffs and Defendants stipulate and agree to certification of a class for settlement purposes only. This stipulation will not be deemed admissible in this or any other proceeding should this Settlement not become final. For settlement purposes only, the Court conditionally certifies the following Class: "all individuals who are or previously were employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants during the Class Period (February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026), excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital – Eureka between August 24, 2018 and March 25, 2022 and who were not employed by Defendants at any other time during the Class Period and who did not opt-out of the *Martinez v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC* (Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV-20000424) class action settlement." The Class Period is February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026.

6. The Court concludes that, for settlement purposes only, the Class meets the requirements for certification under section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure in that: (a) the Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable; (b) common questions of law and fact predominate, and there is a well-defined community of interest amongst the members of the Class with respect to the subject matter of the

litigation; (c) the claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the members of the Class; (d) the Plaintiffs can fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the efficient resolution of this controversy; and (f) counsel for the Class is qualified to act as counsel for the Class and the Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class.

7. The Court provisionally appoints Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class. The Court provisionally appoints Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, Janssen Malloy LLP, and Lavi & Ebrahimian LLP as Class Counsel for the Class.

8. The Court approves settlement of the PAGA claim pursuant to the terms of the Agreement. The California Labor and Workforce Development Agency was served with a copy of the Agreement in accordance with Labor Code section 2699(l)(2) and has not indicated any opposition to the settlement of the PAGA claim.

9. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the Court Approved Notice of Proposed Settlement of Class Action and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval ("Class Notice") attached to the Agreement as Exhibit A. The Court finds that the Class Notice appears to fully and accurately inform the Class of all material elements of the proposed Settlement, of the Class Members' right to be excluded from the Class by submitting a written opt-out request, and of each Class Member's right and opportunity to object to the Settlement. The Court further finds that the distribution of the Class Notice substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Agreement and this Order meets the requirements of due process, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court orders the mailing of the Class Notice by first class mail, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.

10. The Court hereby appoints ILYM Group, Inc. as the Administrator. No later than fifteen (15) days after preliminary approval of the Settlement by the Court, Defendants shall provide to the Administrator an electronic spreadsheet with the Class Data. The Administrator will perform address updates and verifications as necessary prior to the mailing of the Class

Notice. Using best efforts to mail it as soon as possible, and in no event later than 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will mail the Class Notice Packets to all Class Members via first-class U.S. Mail. Before mailing Class Notices, the Administrator shall update Class Member addresses using the National Change of Address database.

11. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure for exclusion from the Settlement. Any Class Member may individually choose to opt out of and be excluded from the Class as provided in the Class Notice by following the instructions for requesting exclusion from the Class that are set forth in the Class Notice. All Requests for Exclusion must be postmarked by no later than the Response Deadline, which is sixty (60) calendar days after the date of the mailing of the Class Notice and be received by the Administrator. If the Class Notice Packet is re-mailed, the Response Deadline will be extended an additional 14 days. Any such person who chooses to opt out of and be excluded from the Class will not be entitled to any recovery under the Settlement and will not be bound by the class portion of the Settlement or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. Class Members who have not requested exclusion shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Agreement and the Judgment. A Request for Exclusion may only opt out that particular individual, and any attempt to effect an opt out of a group, class, or subclass of individuals is not permitted and will be deemed invalid. Subject to the Court's final approval of the Settlement, the Aggrieved Employees will be paid their allocation of the PAGA Penalties and will remain bound by the release of the Released PAGA Claims.

12. Any Class Member who has not opted out ("Participating Class Member") may appear at the final approval hearing and may object or express their views regarding the Settlement and may present evidence and file briefs or other papers that may be proper and relevant to the issues to be heard and determined by the Court as provided in the Class Notice. Participating Class Members will have until the Response Deadline, which is sixty (60) calendar days from the date of the mailing of the Class Notices, to submit their written objections to the Administrator in accordance with the instructions in the Class Notice. If the Class Notice Packet is re-mailed, the Response Deadline for written objections will be extended an additional 14 days.

Alternatively, Participating Class Members may appear at the Final Approval Hearing to make an oral objection.

13. A Final Approval Hearing shall be held before this Court on _____ _____, 9:00 a.m. in Department 4 at the Humboldt County Superior Court to determine all necessary matters concerning the Settlement, including: whether the proposed settlement of the Action on the terms and conditions provided for in the Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable and should be finally approved by the Court; whether the Final Approval Order and Judgment should be entered herein; whether the plan of allocation contained in the Agreement should be approved as fair, adequate and reasonable to the Class Members; and to finally approve attorneys' fees and costs, the service award, and the expenses of the Administrator. All papers in support of the motion for final approval and for attorneys' fees, costs and service awards, to be heard at the Final Approval Hearing, shall be filed with the Court and served on all counsel no later than sixteen (16) court days before the hearing.

14. Neither the Settlement nor any exhibit, document, or instrument delivered thereunder shall be construed as a concession or admission by Defendants in any way that the claims asserted have any merit or that this Action was properly brought as a class or representative action, and shall not be used as evidence of, or used against Defendants as, an admission or indication in any way, including with respect to any claim of any liability, wrongdoing, fault or omission by Defendants or with respect to the truth of any allegation asserted by any person. Defendants have denied that they have done anything wrong and dispute all the claims in this Action. Whether or not the Settlement is finally approved, neither the Settlement, nor any exhibit, document, statement, proceeding or conduct related to the Settlement, nor any reports or accounts thereof, shall in any event be construed as, offered or admitted in evidence as, received as or deemed to be evidence for any purpose adverse to the Defendants, including, but not limited to, evidence of a presumption, concession, indication or admission by Defendants of any liability, fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession or damage.

15. In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, or the Settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, canceled or fails to become effective for any reason, this Order shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated, and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement, and expressly reserve their respective rights regarding the prosecution and defense of this Action, including all available defenses and affirmative defenses, and arguments that any claim in the Action could not be certified as a class action and/or managed as a representative action. In such an event, the Court's orders regarding the Settlement, including this Order, shall not be used or referred to in litigation for any purpose.

16. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the final approval hearing and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to Class Members and retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement.

17. The Action is otherwise stayed and all trial and related pre-trial dates, if any, are vacated, subject to further orders of the Court at the Final Approval Hearing.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: _____

_____
HON.
JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

**EXHIBIT C**

[FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT]



Doc ID: [illegible]

**EXHIBIT "C"**

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

LYNN HILLEGEIST; MAUREEN LYTLE; PAMELA CASSADY; JOHN SELLERS; HOLLY MILLER; CATHERINE ROBERTSON; BAILEY KILMER, CUAUHTEMOC OLIVO, and JANELLE WILSON, all individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ST. JOSEPH HEALTH NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, LLC; ST. JOSEPH HEALTH SYSTEM; PROVIDENCE ST. JOSEPH HEALTH; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **CV2201266**

**[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

Hearing Date:
Hearing Time:

Judge: Hon. _____
Dept.: 4

Date Action Filed: August 25, 2022
Trial Date: Not set

The motion of Plaintiffs Catherine Robertson, Bailey Kilmer, Cuauhtemoc Olivo, Lynn Hillegeist, Maureen Lytle, Pamela Cassady, John Sellers, Holly Miller, and Jeanelle Wilson ("Plaintiffs") for an order finally approving the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") with Defendants St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC, St. Joseph Health System and Providence St. Joseph Health ("Defendants") and for an award of attorneys' fees and costs, service payments, and the fees of the Administrator duly came on for hearing on _____ before the Honorable _____.

**I.**

**FINDINGS**

Based on the oral and written argument and evidence presented in connection with the motion, the Court makes the following findings:

1. All terms used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in the Agreement.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation pending before the California Superior Court for the County of Humboldt, and over all Parties to this litigation, including the Class.

3. Based on a review of the papers submitted by Plaintiffs and a review of the applicable law, the Court finds that the Gross Settlement Amount of Eight Million Dollars ($8,000,000) and the terms set forth in the Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate.

4. The Court further finds that the Settlement was the result of arm's-length negotiations conducted after Class Counsel had adequately investigated the claims and became familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of those claims. In particular, the amount of the Settlement, the significant risks relating to certification, liability, and damages issues, and the assistance of an experienced mediator in the settlement process, among other factors, support the Court's conclusion that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

**Preliminary Approval of the Settlement**

5. On _____, the Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement. At this same time, the Court approved conditional certification of the Class for settlement purposes

only.

**Notice to the Class**

6. In compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order, the Class Notice was mailed by first class mail to members of the Class at their last known addresses on or about _____. Mailing of the Class Notice to their last known addresses was the best notice option under the circumstances and was reasonably calculated to communicate actual notice of the litigation and the proposed settlement to the Class. The Class Notice given to the Class Members fully and accurately informed the Class Members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and of their opportunity to object to or comment thereon or to seek exclusion from the Settlement; constituted valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Class Members; and complied fully with the laws of the State of California, the United States Constitution, due process and other applicable law. The Class Notice fairly and adequately described the Settlement and provided Class Members adequate instructions and a variety of means to obtain additional information.

7. The Response Deadline for opting out of the Class or submitting written objections to the Settlement was _____, which was extended by 14 days for re-mailed Class Notices. There was an adequate interval between mailing of the Class Notice and the response deadline to permit Class Members to choose what to do and act on their decision. A full opportunity has been afforded to the Participating Class Members to participate in this hearing, and all Participating Class Members and other persons wishing to be heard have been heard. Class Members also have had a full and fair opportunity to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement and Class. Accordingly, the Court determines that all Class Members who did not timely and properly submit a request for exclusion are bound by the Settlement and this Final Approval Order and Judgment.

**Fairness Of Settlement**

8. The Agreement is entitled to a presumption of fairness. *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1801 (1996).

a. The settlement was reached through arm's-length bargaining between the

parties during an all-day mediation before Hon. Carl J. West (ret.), a respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. There has been no collusion between the parties in reaching the proposed settlement.

b. Plaintiffs' investigation and discovery have been sufficient to allow the Court and counsel to act intelligently.

c. Counsel for both parties are experienced in similar employment class action litigation. All counsel recommended approval of the Agreement.

d. The percentage of objectors and requests for exclusion is small. ____ objections were received. _____ requests for exclusion were received.

e. The participation rate was high. _____ Participating Class Members will be mailed a settlement payment, representing _____% of the overall Class.

9. The consideration to be given to the Class Members under the terms of the Agreement is fair, reasonable and adequate considering the strengths and weaknesses of the claims asserted in this action and is fair, reasonable and adequate compensation for the release of Class Members' claims, given the uncertainties and significant risks of the litigation and the delays which would ensue from continued prosecution of the action.

10. The Agreement is approved as fair, adequate and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class Members.

**Attorneys' Fees and Costs**

11. An award of $2,666,666 for attorneys' fees, representing one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, and $_____ for litigation costs and expenses, is reasonable, in light of the contingent nature of Class Counsel's fee, the hours worked by Class Counsel, and the results achieved by Class Counsel. The requested awards have been supported by Class Counsel's lodestar and billing statement.

**Class Representative Service Payment**

12. The Agreement provides for Class Representative Service Payments of not more than $15,000 to each of the Plaintiffs, subject to the Court's approval. The Court finds that Class

Representative Service Payments in the amount of $_____ each to the Plaintiffs are reasonable in light of the risks and burdens undertaken by the Plaintiffs in the litigation and for their time and effort in bringing and prosecuting this matter on behalf of the Class.

**Administration Expenses Payment**

13. The Administrator shall calculate and administer the payment to be made to the Participating Class Members in the manner set forth in the Agreement, transmit payment for attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, transmit the Class Representative Service Payments to the Plaintiffs, distribute the PAGA Penalties, issue any required tax reporting forms, calculate withholdings and perform the other remaining duties set forth in the Agreement. The Administrator has documented $_____ in fees and expenses, and this amount is reasonable in light of the work performed by the Administrator.

**PAGA Penalties**

14. The Agreement provides for PAGA Penalties out of the Gross Settlement Amount of $200,000, which shall be allocated with 75% ($150,000) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% ($50,000) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments to be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($50,000.00) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. "Aggrieved Employees" are individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendants who were classified as non-exempt in the State of California during the PAGA Period (October 21, 2021 to February 9, 2026), excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital – Eureka from October 21, 2021 to March 25, 2022 and who did not work after March 25, 2022. All Aggrieved Employees will be sent their share of the PAGA Penalties and will be subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims as set forth below, whether or not they opt out of the Settlement.

**II.**

## ORDERS

Based on the foregoing findings, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

15. The certification of the Class for the purposes of settlement is confirmed. The Class is defined as follows:

> All individuals who are or previously were employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants during the Class Period (February 28, 2018 to February 9, 2026), excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital – Eureka between August 24, 2018 and March 25, 2022 and who were not employed by Defendants at any other time during the Class Period and who did not opt-out of the *Martinez v. St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC* (Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV-20000424) class action settlement.

16. All persons who meet the foregoing definition are members of the Class, except for those individuals who filed a valid request for exclusion ("opt out") from the Class. [INSERT REFERENCE TO IDENTIFY ANY OPT OUTS].

17. The Agreement is hereby finally approved as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interest of the Class. Defendants shall fund the Gross Settlement Amount and the amount necessary to pay Defendants' share of payroll taxes thereon no later than thirty (30) days after the Effective Date but in no event earlier than January 1, 2027.

18. Class Counsel are awarded attorneys' fees in the amount of $2,666,666 and costs in the amount of $_____. The attorneys' fees awarded shall be allocated among Class Counsel as follows: 50% to Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 35% to Janssen Malloy LLP, and 15% to Lavi & Ebrahimian LLP. The costs awarded shall be allocated among Class Counsel as follows: $_____ to Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, $_____ to Janssen Malloy LLP, and $_____ to Lavi & Ebrahimian LLP. Class Counsel shall not seek or obtain any other compensation or reimbursement from Defendants, Plaintiffs or members of the Class.

19. The payment of the Class Representative Service Payments in the amount of $_____ to each of the Plaintiffs is approved.

20. The payment of $_____ to the Administrator for its fees and expenses is approved.

21. The Court confirms its approval of the PAGA Penalties in the amount of $200,000 and these penalties shall be allocated in accordance with the Agreement.

22. The Agreement and this Settlement are not an admission by Defendants, nor is this Final Approval Order and Judgment a finding, of the validity of any claims in the Action or of any wrongdoing by Defendants or that this Action is appropriate for class treatment (other than for settlement purposes). Neither this Final Approval Order and Judgment, the Agreement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Agreement is, may be construed as, or may be used as an admission by or against Defendants of any fault, wrongdoing or liability whatsoever. Defendants have denied that they have done anything wrong and dispute all the claims in this Action. The entering into or carrying out of the Agreement, and any negotiations or proceedings related thereto, shall not in any event be construed as, or deemed to be evidence of, an admission or concession with regard to the denials or defenses by Defendants. Notwithstanding these restrictions, Defendants may file in the Action or in any other proceeding this Final Approval Order and Judgment, the Agreement, or any other papers and records on file in the Action as evidence of the Settlement to support a defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, release, or other theory of claim or issue preclusion or similar defense as to the Released Class Claims and/or the Released PAGA Claims.

23. Notice of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment shall be given to all Parties by Class Counsel on behalf of Plaintiffs and all Class Members. The Final Approval Order and Judgment shall be posted on the website as set forth in the Class Notice to the Class. It shall not be necessary to send notice of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment to individual Class Members. Plaintiffs shall serve this Final Approval Order and Judgment on the LWDA.

24. If the Settlement does not become final and effective in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, then this Final Approval Order and Judgment, and all orders entered in connection herewith, shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated, and the Parties shall

revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement, and expressly reserve their respective rights regarding the prosecution and defense of this Action, including all available defenses and affirmative defenses, and arguments that any claim in the Action could not be certified as a class action and/or managed as a representative action.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDICATED AND DECREED THAT:**

25. Except as set forth in the Agreement and this Final Approval Order and Judgment, Plaintiffs, and all members of the Class, shall take nothing in the Action.

26. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, the Court shall retain jurisdiction to construe, interpret, implement and enforce the Agreement, to hear and resolve any contested challenge to a claim for settlement benefits, and to supervise and adjudicate any dispute arising from or in connection with the distribution of settlement benefits.

27. The Parties are authorized to agree to and to adopt such amendments, modifications and expansions of the Agreement and all exhibits attached thereto which are consistent with this Final Approval Order and Judgment and as approved by the Court.

28. Each party shall bear its own attorneys' fees and costs, except as otherwise provided in the Agreement and in this Final Approval Order and Judgment.

29. Effective on the date when Defendants fully fund the entire Gross Settlement Amount and fund all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from the Released Class Claims. The "Released Class Claims" are all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on or arising from the facts stated in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the Class Period, including failure to pay minimum wages, straight time compensation, overtime compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), double-time compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), and interest thereon;

failure to timely pay regular and final wages; the calculation of the regular rate of pay; wages lost from time rounding and timekeeping; non-compliant (e.g., missed, short, late, and/or interrupted) meal periods and rest periods; failure to provide meal periods; failure to authorize and permit rest periods; the calculation and payment of meal period and rest period premiums; payment for all hours worked, including off-the-clock work and uncompensated work time; failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements and paystubs, including wage statements and paystubs furnished or available in physical, electronic, or other forms; failure to pay sick pay wages; failure to properly calculate sick pay wages; failure to keep accurate records; failure to reimburse for all employment-related business expenses; unfair business practices; recordkeeping penalties; wage statement penalties, minimum-wage penalties, and waiting-time penalties; statutory penalties and civil penalties; liquidated or punitive damages; interest for claims for unpaid wages; attorneys' fees and costs; claims under the California Labor Code, including sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 223, 224, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227, 233, 246, 246.5, 248.5, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1194.3, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198, and 2802; the Wage Orders of the California Industrial Welfare Commission, including Wage Order No. 5; and California Business and Professions Code section 17200*, et seq.* Except as expressly set forth in the Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or Class claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period. In addition, the Released Class Claims exclude the release of claims not permitted by law.

30. "Released Parties" are defined as: Defendants and each of their past, present and future agents, employees, servants, officers, directors, partners, trustees, representatives, shareholders, stockholders, attorneys, parents, subsidiaries, equity sponsors, related companies/ corporations and/or partnerships, divisions, assigns, predecessors, successors, insurers, consultants, service providers, joint venturers, joint employers, co-employers, dual employers, alleged joint employers, alleged co-employers, alleged dual employers, affiliates, alter-egos, and

affiliated organizations, and all of their respective past, present and future employees, directors, officers, agents, attorneys, stockholders, fiduciaries, parents, subsidiaries, and assigns.

31. Effective on the date when Defendants fully fund the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims. The "Released PAGA Claims" are all claims for PAGA Penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on or arising from the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice, which occurred during the PAGA Period including claims for PAGA Penalties for unpaid wages, including failure to pay minimum wages, straight time compensation, overtime compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), double-time compensation (including failures allegedly caused by rounding, regular rate calculation, invalid alternative workweek schedules, or otherwise), and interest; the calculation of the regular rate of pay; noncompliant (e.g., missed, short, late, and/or interrupted) meal periods and rest periods; failure to provide meal periods; failure to authorize and permit rest periods; the calculation and payment of meal period and rest period premiums; failure to reimburse for all employment-related business expenses; payment for all hours worked, including off-the-clock work and rounded time; failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements; failure to keep accurate records; failure to pay sick pay wages; failure to properly calculate sick pay wages; failure to timely pay wages; and failure to timely pay final wages. The Released PAGA Claims include claims for PAGA Penalties for violation of the Wage Orders of the California Industrial Welfare Commission and the following California Labor Code sections: 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 218, 221, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2698 et seq., and 2699, et seq., and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B). The Released PAGA Claims do not include other PAGA claims, underlying wage and hour claims, claims for wrongful termination, discrimination,

unemployment insurance, disability and worker's compensation, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

32. As of the Effective Date and upon full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount by Defendants, Plaintiffs release and discharge the Defendants and the Released Parties per the Plaintiffs' Release, as set forth fully in paragraph 6.1 of the Agreement.

**LET JUDGMENT BE FORTHWITH ENTERED ACCORDINGLY. IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: _____

_____
HON. _____
JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

**EXHIBIT #2**

**Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP**
2255 Calle Clara, La Jolla, California 92037
Tel: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (885) 551-1232

# FIRM RESUME

Areas of Practice: Employee, Consumer and Securities Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Civil Litigation, Business Litigation.

## ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES

**Norman B. Blumenthal**
Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)
Practice Areas: Consumer and Securities Class Action, Civil Litigation, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Transactional Law
Admitted: 1973, Illinois; 1976, California
Biography: Law Clerk to Justice Thomas J. Moran, Illinois Supreme Court, 1973-1975, while on Illinois Court of Appeals. Instructor, Oil and Gas Law: California Western School of Law, 1981; University of San Diego School of Law, 1983. Sole Practitioner 1976-1987. Partner, Blumenthal & Ostroff, 1988-1995. Partner, Blumenthal, Ostroff & Markham, 1995-2001. Partner, Blumenthal & Markham, 2001-2007. Partner, Blumenthal & Nordrehaug, 2007. Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2018. Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 2018 - present.
Member: San Diego County, Illinois State and American Bar Associations; State Bar of California.
Educated: University of Wisconsin (B.A., 1970); Loyola University of Chicago (J.D., 1973); Summer Intern (1971) with Harvard Voluntary Defenders

**Kyle R. Nordrehaug**
Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)
Practice Areas: Consumer and Securities Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Civil Litigation
Admitted: 1999, California
Biography: Associate, Blumenthal, Ostroff & Markham, 1999-2001. Associate, Blumenthal & Markham, 2001-2007. Partner, Blumenthal & Nordrehaug, 2007. Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2017
Member: State Bar of California, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, Third Circuit Court of Appeals
Educated: University of California at Berkeley (B.A., 1994); University of San Diego School of Law (J.D. 1999)
Awards: Top Labor & Employment Attorney 2016; Top Appellate Reversal - Daily Journal 2015; Super Lawyer 2015-2018

**Aparajit Bhowmik**
Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2006, California
Educated: University of California at San Diego (B.A., 2002); University of San Diego School of Law (J.D. 2006)
Biography: Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2017
Awards: Rising Star 2015

**Nicholas J. De Blouw**
Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2011, California
Educated: Wayne State University (B.A. 2008); California Western School of Law (J.D. 2011)

**Piya Mukherjee**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2010, California
Educated: University of California, San Diego (B.S. 2006); University of Southern California, Gould School of Law (J.D. 2010)

**Victoria Rivapalacio**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2011, California
Educated: University of California at San Diego (B.A., 2003); George Washington University Law School (J.D. 2010)

**Ricardo Ehmann**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2018, California; 2004, Nevada
Educated: University of California, San Diego (B.A. 1998); Loyola Law School (J.D. 2001)

**Jeffrey S. Herman**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2011, California; 2016 Arizona
Educated: University of Michigan (B.A. 2008); California Western School of Law (J.D. 2011)

**Charlotte James**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2016, California
Educated: San Diego State University; California Western School of Law

**Christine Levu**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2012, California
Educated: University of California, Irvine; California Western School of Law

**Andrew Ronan**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2016, California
Educated: Arizona State University; University of San Diego School of Law

**Scott Blumenthal**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2020, New Mexico
Educated: University of Southern California; California Western School of Law

**Sergio Julian Puche**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2013, California
Educated: University of California, Irvine; California Western School of Law

**Trevor Moran**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2020, California
Educated: University of Rhode Island; California Western School of Law

**Adolfo Sanchez Contreras**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2024, California; 2014, Mexico
Educated: The Juarez University

**Justin Hewgill**
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2008, California,
Education: University of California, Riverside (B.A. 2005); University of California, Berkeley, School of Law (2005)

## REPORTED CASES

Sakkab v. Luxottica Retail N. Am., Inc., 803 F.3d 425 (9th Cir. 2015) (The panel reversed the district court's order granting Luxottica Retail North America, Inc.'s motion to compel arbitration of claims and dismissing plaintiff's first amended complaint, in a putative class action raising class employment-related claims and a non-class representative claim for civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act.);
Securitas Security Services USA, Inc. v. Superior Court, 234 Cal. App. 4th 1109 (Cal. Feb. 27, 2015) (Court of Appeal concluded the trial court correctly ruled that *Iskanian* rendered the PAGA waiver within the parties' dispute resolution agreement unenforceable. However, the Court of Appeal then ruled the trial court erred by failing to invalidate the non-severable class action waiver from the agreement and remanded the entire complaint, including class action and PAGA claims, be litigated in the Superior Court);
Sussex v. United States Dist. Court for the Dist. of Nev., 781 F.3d 1065 (9th Cir. 2015) (The panel determined that the district court clearly erred in holding that its decision to intervene mid-arbitration was justified under Aerojet-General. Specifically, the panel held that the district court erred in predicting that an award issued by the arbitrator would likely be vacated because of his "evident partiality" under 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(2).);

Provost v. YourMechanic, Inc., 2020 Cal. App. Lexis 955 (Oct. 15, 2020) (Court of Appeals affirmed denial of arbitration of PAGA claim, and held in a case of first impression, that there was no additional standing rules for PAGA claim brought by independent contractor);
In re Tobacco Cases II, 41 Cal. 4th 1257 (2007); Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court, 24 Cal. 4th 906 (2001); Rocker v. KPMG LLP, 148 P.3d 703; 122 Nev. 1185 (2006); PCO, Inc. v. Christensen, Miller, Fink, Jacobs, Glaser, Weil & Shapiro, LLP, 150 Cal. App. 4th 384 (2007); Hall v. County of Los Angeles, 148 Cal. App. 4th 318 (2007); Coshow v. City of Escondido, 132 Cal. App. 4th 687 (2005); Daniels v. Philip Morris, 18 F.Supp 2d 1110 (S.D. Cal.1998); Gibson v. World Savings & Loan Asso., 103 Cal. App. 4th 1291 (2003); Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles, 75 Cal. App. 4th 445 (1999); Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles, 100 Cal.App. 4th 431 (2002); Norwest Mortgage, Inc. v. Superior Court, 72 Cal.App.4th 214 (1999); Hildago v. Diversified Transp. Sya, 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 3207 (9th Cir. 1998); Kensington Capital Mgal. v. Oakley, Inc., 1999 U.S. Dist LEXIS 385; Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P90, 411 (1999 C.D. Cal.); Lister v. Oakley, Inc., 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 384; Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P90,409 (C.D Cal. 1999); Olszewski v. Scripps Health, 30 Cal. 4th 798 (2003); Steroid Hormone Product Cases, 181 Cal. App. 4th 145 (2010); Owen v. Macy's, Inc., 175 Cal. App. 4th 462 (2009); Taiheiyo Cement Corp. v. Superior Court, 117 Cal. App. 4th 380 (2004); Taiheiyo Cement Corp. v. Superior Court, 105 Cal.App. 4th 398 (2003); McMeans v. Scripps Health, Inc., 100 Cal. App. 4th 507 (2002); Ramos v. Countrywide Home Loans, 82 Cal.App. 4th 615 (2000); Tevssier v. City of San Diego, 81 Cal.App. 4th 685 (2000); Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court, 70 Cal. App. 4th 299 (1999); Silvas v. E*Trade Mortg. Corp., 514 F.3d 1001 (9th Cir. 2008); Silvas v. E*Trade Mortg. Corp., 421 F. Supp. 2d 1315 (S.D. Cal. 2006); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26544 (S.D. Cal. 2009); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 251 F.R.D. 514 (S.D. Cal. 2008); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 247 F.R.D. 598 (S.D. Cal. 2007); Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27365 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Wise v. Cubic Def. Applications, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11225 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Gabisan v. Pelican Prods., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1391 (S.D. Cal. 2009); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 630 F. Supp. 2d 1222 (S.D. Cal. 2009); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102380 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Louie v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Weltman v. Ortho Mattress, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20521 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Weltman v. Ortho Mattress, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60344 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Curry v. CTB McGraw-Hill, LLC, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5920; 97 A.F.T.R.2d (RIA) 1888; 37 Employee Benefits Cas. (BNA) 2390 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Reynov v. ADP Claims Servs. Group, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94332 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 248 (9th Cir. 2010); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38889 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 57766 (S.D. Cal. 2007); Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers, LLC, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29503 (D. Nev. 2009); Picus v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 256 F.R.D. 651 (D. Nev. 2009); Tull v. Stewart Title of Cal., Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14171 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Keshishzadeh v. Gallagher, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 46805 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Keshishzadeh v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 116380 (S.D. Cal. 2010); In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL Docket No. 1850 (All Cases), 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94603 (D.N.J. 2008); In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig., 629 F.3d 333 (3rd. Cir. 2010); Puentes v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc., 160 Cal. App. 4th 638 (2008); Rezec v. Sony Pictures Entertainment, Inc., 116 Cal. App. 4th 135 (2004); Badillo v. Am. Tobacco Co., 202 F.R.D. 261 (D. Nev. 2001); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin., 2010 U.S. App. Lexis 23025 (9th Cir. 2010); Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 36650 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Rix v. Lockheed Martin Corp., 2011 U.S. Dist Lexis 25422 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Weitzke v. Costar Realty Info., Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist Lexis 20605 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Goodman v. Platinum Condo. Dev., LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36044 (D. Nev. 2011); Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand

Towers, LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14502 (D. Nev 2011); Smith v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 117869 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Dobrosky v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., *LLC*, No. EDCV 13-0646 JGB (SPx), 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106345 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2014); Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC - Class Certification Granted, Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC, No. EDCV 16-1133 JGB (KKx), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73656 (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2017); Nelson v. Avon Products, Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court for The Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02276-BLF, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51104 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2015); Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works Inc., Class Certification Granted, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23179 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2017); Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Summary Judgment *Sua Sponte* Granted for Plaintiff, Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Inc., 870 F. Supp. 2d 856 (C.D. Cal. 2012)

**CLASS ACTION & REPRESENTATIVE CASES**

4G Wireless Wage Cases, Orange County Superior Court, JCCP No. 4736; Classic Party Rentals Wage & Hour Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP No. 4672; Abu-Arafeh v. Norco Delivery Service, Inc.,San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-540601; Aburto v. Verizon, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 11-cv-0088; Adkins v. Washington Mutual Bank, Class Certification Granted, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC819546; Agah v. CompUSA,U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SA CV05-1087 DOC (Anx); Akers v. The San Diego Union Tribune, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No 37-2010-00088571; Altman v. SolarCity Corporation, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00023450-CU-OE-CTL; Aquino v. Macy's West Stores, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00395420; Baker v. Advanced Disability Management, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00160711; Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 07 cv 0938; Bates v. Verengo, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00619985-CU-OE-CXC; Battle v. Charming Charlie Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00005608; Behar v. Union Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00317275; Bell v. John Stweart Company, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG14728792; Bennett v. Custom Built Personal Training Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. M127596; Bermant v. Bank of America, Investment Services, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court, Civil Action No. BC342505; Bethley v. Raytheon Company, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV10-01741; Betorina v. Randstad US, L.P. , U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:15-cv-03646-MEJ; Beverage v. Edcoa Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 2013-00138279; Bova v. Washington Mutual Bank / JP Morgan Chase, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 07-cv-2410; Bowden v. Sunset Parking Services, LLC & LAZ Parking California, LLC - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101751-CU-OE-CTL; Briseno v. American Savings Bank, Class Certification Granted, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 774773; Brueske v. Welk Resorts, San Diego Superior Court, Case No 37-2010-00086460; Bueche v. Fidelity National Management Services, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-01114; Bunch v. Pinnacle Travel Services, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC552048; Butler v. Stericycle, Inc & Appletree Answering Services of California, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00180282; Cabral v. Creative Communication Tech., Class Certification Granted, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC402239; Cardoza v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 4:15-cv-01634-DMR; Castro v. Vivint Solar, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00031385-CU-OE-CTL; Cavazos v. Heartland Automotive Services, Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. PSC 1401759; Cohen v. Bosch Tool, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIC 853562; Comstock v. Washington Mutual Bank - Class Certification Granted, San Diego County Superior

Court, Case No. GIC820803; Conley v. Norwest, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. N73741; Connell v. Sun Microsystems, Alameda Superior Court, Case No. RG06252310; Corrente v. Luxe Valet, Inc., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-15-545961; Cruz v. Redfin Corporation, U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-05234-THE; Culley v. Lincare Inc. & Alpha Respiratory Inc., U.S. District Court eastern District of California, Case No. 2:15-cv-00081-GEB-CMK; Cunningham v. Leslie's Poolmart, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02122-CAS; Curry v. California Testing Bureau/McGraw Hill, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-05-4003 JW; Daniels, et al. v. Philip Morris,(In Re Tobacco Cases II) – Class Certification Granted, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4042; Davis v. Genex Holdings Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-13-cv-240830; Davis v. Clear Connection, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00035173-CU-OE-CTL; Day v. WDC Exploration, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00433770; Dedrick v. Hollandia Diary, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00004311-Cu-OE-CTL; Delmare v. Sungard Higher Education - Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 07-cv-1801; Del Rio v. Tumi Stores, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00022008-CU-OE-CTL; Dewane v. Prudential, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SA CV 05-1031; Diesel v. Wells Fargo Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00441368; Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-2745; Dobrosky v.Arthur J. Gallagher Service Company, LLC, Class certification Granted, No. EDCV 13-0646 JGB (Spx); Dodds v. Zaven Tootikian, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC494402; Drumheller v. Radioshack Corporation, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV11-355; Enger v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1670; Escobar v. Silicon Valley Security & Patrol, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv272514; Fierro v. Chase Manhattan - Class Certification Granted, Settled San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIN033490; Figueroa v. Circle K Stores, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101193-CU-OE-CTL; Finch v. Lamps Plus, (Lamps Plus Credit Transaction Cases), San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4532; Fletcher v. Verizon, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1736; Francisco v. Diebold, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1889; Friend v. Wellpoint, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC345147; Frudakis v. Merck Sharp & Dohme, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. SACV 11-00146; Fulcher v. Olan Mills, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-cv-1821; Gabisan v. Pelican Products, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08 cv 1361; Galindo v. Sunrun Installation Services Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00008350-CU-OE-CTL; Gallagher v. Legacy Partners Commercial, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-221688; Ghattas v. Footlocker Retail, Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. CV 13-0001678 PA; Gibson v. World Savings, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 762321; Goerzen v. Interstate Realty Management, Co., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 679545; Gomez v. Enterprise Rent-A-Car, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:10-cv-02373; Gordon v. Wells Fargo Bank, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:11-cv-00090; Grabowski v. CH Robinson, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 10-cv-1658; Gross v. ACS Compiq Corporation, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00587846-CU-OE-CXC; Gripenstraw v. Buffalo Wild Wings, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 12-CV-00233; Gruender v. First American Title, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 06 CC 00197; Guillen v. Univision Television Group, Inc. & Univision Management Co., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-526445; Gujjar v. Consultancy Services Limited, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00365905; Gutierrez v. Five Guys Operations, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00086185-CU-OE-CTL; Handler v. Oppenheimer, Los Angeles Superior Court, Civil Action No. BC343542; Harley v. Tavistock Freebirds, LLC,

Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00173010; Harrington v. Corinthian Colleges – Class Certification Granted, Orange Superior Court; United States Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware; Harvey v. PQ Operations, Inc., Los Angles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497964; Henshaw v. Home Depot U.S.A., United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV10-01392; Heithold v. United Education Institute, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00623416-CU-OE-CXC; Hibler v. Coca Cola Bottling, Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 11cv0298; Hildebrandt v. TWC Administration LLC & Time Warner NY Cable, LLC , U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. ED-cv-13-02276-JGB; Hopkins v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Los Angeles, United states District Court, Central District of California; U.S. Court of Appeals 9th Circuit; Howard v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC586369; Hughes v. Parexel International, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC485950; Hurley v. Comcast of California/Colorado/Texas/Washington, Inc., Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-253801; Irving v. Solarcity Corporation, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV525975; Jacobs v. Nu Horizons - Settled Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 111cv194797; Jefferson v. Bottling Group LLC (Pepsi) - Class Certification Granted, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-0018010; Jones v. E*Trade Mortgage, U.S. District Court, Southern District California Case No. 02-CV-1123 L (JAH); Kennedy v. Natural Balance - Dismissal Reversed on Appeal, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2007-00066201; Keshishzadeh v. Arthur J. Gallagher Service Co., U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0168; Kinney v. AIG Domestic Claims / Chartis, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 8:10-cv-00399; Kizer v. Tristar Risk Management, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00707394-CU-OE-CXC; Kleinberg v. Reeve Trucking Company, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00001601-CU-OE-CTL; Kove v. Old Republic Title, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09477437; Krellcom v. Medley Communications, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00050245-CU-OE-CTL; Ladd v. Extreme Recovery, LP, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC11-02790; Langille v. EMC, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0168; Lawson v. Marquee Staffing, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00103717-CU-OE-CTL; Lazar v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv-273289; Lemmons v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00125488; Levine v. Groeniger, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09476193; Linder v. OCWEN (In re Ocwen Federal Bank FSB Servicing Litig.) U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. 07cv501, U.S. District Court, Northern Dist. Illinois, Case No. MDL 1604; Litton v. Diebold, Incorporated, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV524776; Lohn v. Sodexo, Inc. & SDH Services West, LLC, U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 2:15-CV-05409; Lopez v. K-Mart, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. BC351983; Louie / Stringer v. Kaiser, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-0795; Lucero v. Sears, U.S. District Court Southern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-01620-AJB; Lucero v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00075933-CU-OE-CTL; Magallanes v. TSA Stores, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-15-cv-283586; Magana v. El Pollo Loco, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00613901-CU-OE-CXC; Maitland v. Marriott, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. SACV 10-00374; Mann v. NEC Electronics America, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 109CV132089; Martinez v. Hydro-Scape Products, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00029157-CU-OE-CTL; Mathies v. Union Bank - Class Certification Granted, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-10-498077; McDermott v. Catalina Restaurant Group Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00574113-CU-OE-CXC; McPhail v. First Command, United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No.05CV0179 IEG (JMA); Medina v. Universal Protection Service, LP, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. BC572848; Meierdiercks v. 8x8, Inc., Santa Clara

County Superior Court, Case No. 110CV162413; Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court Eastern District of California, Case No. 16-1133 JGB (Kkx); Meyer v. Thinktank Learning, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-15-cv-282698; Morales v. Wells Fargo Insurance Services USA, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:13-cv-03867-EDL; Morse v. Marie Callender Pie Shop, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 09-cv-1305; Moynihan v. Escalante Golf, Inc. & Troon Golf, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00083250-CU-OE-CTL; Muntz v. Lowe's HIW, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC880932; Najarian v. Macy's West Stores, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00418401; Nelson v. Avon Products, Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court for The Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02276-BLF; Nguyen v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 05 CC 00116; Ochoa v. Eisai, Inc.,U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 3:11-cv-01349; Ogans v. Nationwide Credit, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00121054; Ohayon v. Hertz, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-1662; Olvera v. El Pollo Loco, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00707367-CU-OE-CXC; Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 14-cv-02113-MCE; Ortega v. Prime Healthcare Paradise Valley, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00011240-CU-OE-CTL; Patel v. Nike Retail Services, Inc.,U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-04781-RS; Patelski v. The Boeing Company,United States District Court, Southern District of New York; transferred to United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri; Pearlman v. Bank of America, San Diego Superior Court; Perry v. AT&T, U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 11-cv 01488; Picus v. Wal-Mart Stores, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:07-CV-00682; Pittard v. Salus Homecare, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08 cv 1398; Port v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2007-00067538; Postema v. Lawyers Title Ins. Corp., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00418901; Pratt v. Verizon, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00430447; Proctor v. Ameriquest. Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 06CC00108; Ramirez v. Estenson Logistics, LLC, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2015-00803197-CU-OE-CXC; Ray v. Lawyers Title, Fidelity National, Commonwealth Land Title, Chicago Title, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00359306; Renazco v. Unisys Technical Services, L.L.C. , San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-539667; Reynolds v. Marlboro/Philip Morris U.S.A., United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 08-55114, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 05 CV 1876 JAH; Rezec v. Sony, San Diego Superior Court; Rix v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-2063; Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Summary Judgment *Sua Sponte* Granted for Plaintiff, *Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Inc.*, 870 F. Supp. 2d 856 (C.D. Cal. 2012); Ritchie v. Mauran Ambulance Services, Inc., Los Angeles County, Case No. BC491206; Rivers v. Veolia Transportation Services, Class Certification Granted, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV 255350; Roeh v. JK Hill, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00089046; Rodriguez v. Protransport-1, LLC, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-522733; Romero v. Central Payment Co., LLC, Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV 1106277; Salas v. Evolution Hospitality, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00083240-CU-OE-CTL; Salem v. Alliance Human Services, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. CIVRS1401129; Sanchez v. Beena Beauty Holding, Inc. d/b/a Planet Beauty, Los Angeles County Superior Court, BC566065; Santone v. AT&T – Settled United States District Court, Southern District of Alabama; Santos v. Sleep Train (Sleep Train Wage and Hour Cases), Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00214586, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4553; Saravia v. O.C. Communciations, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00180734; Sawyer v. Vivint, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Case No. 1:14-cv-08959; Sayaman v.

Baxter Healthcare, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 10-1040; Schuler v. Ecolab, Inc.,U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:10-cv-02255; Schulz v. Qualxserv, LLC / Worldwide Techservices - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0017; Serrato v. Sociedad Textil Lonia, Corp., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101195-CU-OE-CTL; Shrivastara v. Fry's Electonics, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 111cv192189; Sierra v. Oakley Sales Corp., Orange County Superior Court, U.S. District Court Central District of California; U.S. Court of Appeals 9th Circuit; Sirota v. Swing-N-Slide, Wisconsin District Court, County of Rock Wisconsin, Case No. 95CV726J; Small v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00099011-CU-OE-CTL; Smith v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 08-cv-02353; Smith v. Fedex Ground Package system, Inc., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG14734322; Sones v. World Savings / Wachovia; U.S. District Court, Norther District of California, Case No. 3:08-cv-04811; Spradlin v. Trump, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:08-cv-01428; Steele v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 07-5743; Steffan v. Fry's Electronics, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-13-CV-254011; Steroid Hormone Product Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, JCCP4363; Strauss v. Bayer Corporation, United States District Court, District of Minnesota; Sustersic v. International Paper Co., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00331538; Sutton v. Seasons Hospice & Palliative Care of California, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC590870; Swartout v. First Alarm Security & Patrol, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-231989; Talamantez v. The Wellpoint Companies, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 12-cv-08058; Tan v. California State Automobile Assn. - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. 07cv1011, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00231219; Tauber v. Alaska Airlines, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court; Thai v. Staff Assistance, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC567943; Thomas v. Stanford Health Care d/b/a Stanford University Medical Center, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv-273362; Thomas-Byass v. Michael Kors Stores (California), Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 5:15-cv-00369-JGB; Trujillo v. LivHome, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00100372, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4570; Tull v. Stewart Title, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-CV-1095; Turner v. C.R. England, U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 5:14-cv-02207-PSG; Turner v. Ampac Fine Chemicals, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00176993; Valadez v. Schering-Plough, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 10-CV-2595; Van Gorp v. Ameriquest Mortgage/Deutsche Bank, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV05-907 CJC (Anx); Varela v. The Walking Company, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC562520; Veloz v. Ross Dress For Less, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC485949; Vogel v. Price-Simms, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 114CV261268; Vrab v. DNC Parks & Resorts at Tenaya, Inc., Mariposa County Superior Court, Case No. 0010225; Vultaggio-Kish v. Golden State Lumber, Inc., San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV 51661; Wadhwa v. Escrow Plus, Los Angeles Superior Court; Waldhart v. Mastec North Amercia, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1419318; Walker v. Brink's Global Services USA, Inc. & Brinks Incorporated, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC564369; Walsh v. Apple, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 08-04918; Weinman v. Midbar Condo Development (Las Vegas One), U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:08-cv-00684; Weltman v. Ortho Mattress - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-0840, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00327802; West v. Jerome's Furniture Warehouse, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2013-00147707-CU-OE-GDS; Wheat v. Jerome's Furniture Warehouse, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00094419-CU-OE-CTL; Wietzke v. Costar Realty, U.S. District Court,

Southern District California, Case No. 09-cv-2743; Williams v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 3:09-cv-01669; Wilson v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 8:14-cv-1021-FMO; Winston v. Lemore Transportation, Inc, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C-15-00897; Wise v. Cubic, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-2315; Witman v. Level 3 Communications, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00091649-CU-OE-CTL; Yam v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 10-cv-05225-SBA; Zurlo v. Mission Linen, U.S. District Court, Central District, Case No. 08cv1326; Baxt v. Scor U.S., Delaware Court of Chancery; Bronson v. Blech Securities - Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York; Castro & Cardwell v. B & H Education, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC456198; Dibella v. Olympic Financial, U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota; Doyle v. Lorna Jane USA, Inc., Los Angles County Superior Court, Case No. BC526837; Estrella v. B-Per Electronic, Inc. & My Wireless, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00048951-CU-OE-CTL; Ferrari v. Read-Rite, U. S. District Court, Northern District of California; Forever 21 Wage and Hour Cases - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, JCC Proceeding No. 4745; Hart v. United States Tobacco Co., Los Angeles Superior Court; In re Bank of America Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litigation, U.S. District Court, District of Kansas, Case No. MDL 2138; In re Walgreen Co. Wage and Hour Litigation, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 11-cv-07664; Jackson v. Fresh & Easy Neighborhood Market Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497964; U.S. Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware Case No. 13-12569 (KJC); Jordan/Ramos v. DMV -Sacramento County Superior Court; Kensington Capital v. Oakley, U. S. District Court, Southern District of California; Kensington Capital v. Vesta,U. S. District Court, Northern District of Alabama; Lopez v. Tire centers, LLC, U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:13-cv-05444-JCS; Miller v. Western Athletic Clubs, LLC, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-228670; Moffett v. WIS International, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00099909-CU-OE-CTL; Perez v. Urban Oufitters, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02628-JSW; Ridgewood Capital Management v. Gensia, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, #CV-92-1500H; Sandoval v. Redfin Corporation, U.S. District Court Northern District, Case No. 3:14-cv-04444-SC; Shurman v. Scimed, State of Minnesota District Court, Fourth District, #94-17640; Sioson v. AMP Holding, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00663825; Slatton v. G.E. Capital Mortgage Services, Camden County Superior Court, New Jersey, #CAML0256198; Somkin v. Molten Metal, U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, #9710325PBS; Sparks v AT&T, Illinois District Court - Madison County; Sullivan v. Lyon Management Group, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00649432-CU-BT-CXC; Herencia v. Alexander's Steakhouse, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550551; Reinhardt v. Beverly Fabrics, Inc. – Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-257217; DeBettencourt v. Interstate realty Management Company – San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2015-0011942; Torres v. Bhandal Bros, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV01555; Rodriguez v. El Toro Medical Investors Limited Partnership – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00059-JLS-KES; Velez v. Timec Specialty Services, Inc. & Transfield Services– Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC614318; Henry v. Central Freight Lines, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00280-JAM-EFB; Taylor v. TIC – The Industrial Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00186-VAP(SPX); Harvey v. Sears, Roebuck And Co. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00207556; Tapia v. Panda Express, LLC et al. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, JCCP No. 4919; Severson v. Lowe's HIW, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-00189508; Bendon v. DTG Operations, Inc. - U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00861-FMO-AGR; Talavera v. ACS Dataline, LP – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC617159; McHenry v. Prologix Distribution Services (West), LLC – Los Angeles County

Superior Court, Case No. BC608948; Stone v. Progistics Distribution, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, JCCP No 4881; Easton v. Handy Technologies, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00004419-CU-OE-CTL; Singh v. Total Renal Care, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550847; Conners v. Rag Traders Melrose, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC591413; Saporito v. Space Explorations Technologies Corporation, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC554258; Calhoun v. Celadon Trucking Services, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-01351-PSG-FFM; Conners v. Mission Valley Kilt, LLC - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00036888-CU-OE-CTL; Shibley v. New Prime, Inc. - U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 17-CV-00321-DOC; Lawrenz v. Blacktalon Enterprises, Inc. - Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-258205; Jamison v. Fitness 19 CA 121, LLC - Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS046697; Brooks v. Archer Trucking, Inc. – Mendocino County Superior Court, Case No. SCUK-CVG-16-67106; Montgomery v. New Prime, Inc. - San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1611884; Mills v. Core-Mark International, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, case No. 37-2016-00009669-CU-OE-CTL; Lopez v. Networked Insurance Agents, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00843587-CU-OE-CXC; Yberri v. Agent Provocateur, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC620413; Woodard v. BKD Twenty-One Management Company, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00009682-CU-OE-CTL; Gallagher v. H.H. Restaurant, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00031247-CU-OE-CTL; San Nicolas v. West Covina Corporate Fitness, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC16304; Summerlin v. Maplebear Inc., d/b/a Instacart – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 603030; Padilla v. Sutter West Bay Hospitals – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV538977; Quagliariello v. Victory Entertainment, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC620273; Mohammad v. Tee It Up LLC – Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C16-01188; Pucilowski v. Esurance Insurance Services, Inc. – Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0038790; Arias v. Alamitos Enterprises, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00865183-CU-OE-CXC; Orzano v. Hazelwood Enterprises, Inc. - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00029231-CU-OE-CTL; Tejero v. Firstmed Ambulance Services, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00885355-CU-OE-CXC; Artis v. T-W Transport, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00013010-CU-OE-CTL; Searles v. Navajo Express, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1613846; Lara v. Commercial Protective Service, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC648921; Picos v. Culinart of California, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4892; Samaniego v. A&I Transport, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV01894; Bailey v. Romanoff Floor Covering, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-00685-TLN-CMK; Aguirre v. Bitech, Inc.– Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-002022; Phillips v. DI Overnite LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00016800-CU-OE-CTL; Jacob v. Pride Transport, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV1337; Bennett v. Heartland Express, Inc. of Iowa – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00015056-CU-OE-CTL; Stapf v. Mercer Health & Benefits Administration LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC643007; Armstrong v. Ruan Transport Corporation – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1605897; Geiger v. Floyd's 99-California LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00874943-CU-OE-CXC; Mondrian v. Trius Trucking, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 16CECG01501; Johnson v. Fedex Office and Print Services, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG17856291; Rios v. Pacific Western Bank - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00038083; Sanders v. Old Dominion Freight Lines, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00030725-CU-OE-CTL; Taylor v. Gardner Trucking, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1614280; Couture v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, case No. 16-CV-02202-VC; Bertuol v.

AHMC Anaheim Regional Medical Center LP – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00899024-CO-OE-CXC; Espinoza v. Prime Communications of California, LLC – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 16CIV01563; Archuletta v. Tidy Services, Inc.– Orange County Superior court, Case No. 30-2016-008611892-CU-OE-CXC; Puccini v. Earthbound Farm, LLC– Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV308643; Vikram v. First Student Management, LLC – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-04656-KAW; Blair v. Ashley Distribution Services, LTD. – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 17-CV-01427-JAK-SP; Richardson v. Service Staffing, LLC– Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00899039-CU-OE-CXC; Coffin v. Certified Freight Logistics, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00036523-CU-OE-CTL; Encarnacion v. S.A.S. Services Group, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00026726-CU-OE-CTL; Vasquez v. Golden State Overnight Delivery Service, Inc.– Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG17862924; Karr v. Tristar Managed Care, Inc. – Contra Costa Superior Court, case No. MSC17-00650; Gouveia v. Central Cal Transportation – San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2017-0001765;Miranda v. Genex Services, LLC – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-01438-JD; Spears v. Health Net of California, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00210560; Martinez v. Geil Enterprises, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG01879; McComack v. Marriott Ownership Resorts, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 17CV1663 BEN WVG; Velasco v. Lemonade Restaurant Group, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC672235; Smith v. Personnel Services, Inc.– U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case NO. 17-CV-03594-SK; Gabriel v. Kuni SDA, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-000251191-CU-OE-CTL; Miller v. Mattress Firm, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV313148; Provost v. Yourmechanic, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00024056-CU-OE-CTL; Zirpolo v. UAG Stevens Creek II, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV313457; Salazar v. Aids Healthcare Foundation – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00033482-CU-OE-CTL; Knipe v. Amazon.com, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00029426-CU-OE-CTL; Erwin v. Caremeridian, LLC – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG03048; Davis v. Cox Communications California, LLC – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00989-BAS-BLM; Lara v. RMI International, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC597695; Harper v. C.R. England, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Utah Central Division, Case No. 16-CV-00906-DB; Mrazik v. C.H. Robinson Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 12-CV-02067-CAS-PLA; Horn v. Rise Medical Staffing, LLC – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:17-cv-01967-MCE-KJN; Pasallo v. GSG Protective Services CA Inc.– San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00037611-CU-OE-CTL; Smith v. Pacific Personnel Services, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-cv-03594-SK; Terrado v. Accredited Debt Relief, LLC – San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00014181-CU-OE-CTL; Escobedo v. Pacific Western Bank – Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC682686; Wade v. Automobile Club of Southern California – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00960268-CU-OE-CXC; Montano v. American Automobile Association of Northern California – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. CIVMSC18-01539; Perez v. Summit Interconnect, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00995403-CU-OE-CXC; Wolleson v. Gosch Imports, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC170356; Banuelos v. Ortho Mattress, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01161304-CU-OE-CXC; Castellanos v. Miller Automotive Group, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC699211; Tressler v. Spoonful Management, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC71940; Delph v. Employee Retention Services, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00007885; Romero v. May Trucking Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 5:17-cv-02166-JGB-SHK; Miranda v. Genex Services, LLC – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1700779; Moore v. Zirx

Transportation Services, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566655; Sottile v. Motion Recruitment Partners – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV321677; Shahbazian v. Fast Auto Loans, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:18-cv-03076-ODW-KS; Salazar v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC702468; Conti v. L'Oreal USA S/D, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Fresno, Case No. 1:19-CV-00769-LJO-SKO; Mercado v. Security Industry Specialists, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV320059; Vikili v. Dignity Health – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-569456; Bagby v. Swissport SA, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC691058; Henry v. Motion Entertainment Group, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC18565643; Dandoy v. West Coast Convenience, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20051121; Lanuza v. AccentCare, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-565521; Thomas v. Easy Driving School, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00047639-CU-OE-CTL; Erickson v. Erickson – Contra Costa Counrt Superior Court, Case No. MSC18-00307; Martin v. Menzies Aviation (USA) Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566072; Mortimer v. Healthsouth Bakersfield Rehabilitation Hospital, LLC – Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-102761; Alcaraz v. Red Lion Hotels Corporation – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-570310; Calhoun v. Total Transportation and Distribution, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00058681-CU-OE-CTL; Rataul v. Overton Security Services, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG18891882; Beltran v. Compass Bank –San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00024475-CU-OE-CTL; Kirshner v. Touchstone Golf, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00028865-CU-OE-CTL; Pizarro v.The Home Depot, Inc. – U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia-Atlanta Division; Hatanaka v. Restore Rehabilitation, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00034780-CU-OE-CTL; Faria v. Carriage Funeral Holdings, Inc. – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC18-00606; Ontiveros v. Baker Concrete Construction, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV328679; Morales v. Redlands Automotive Services, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1807525; Ramirez v. Carefusion Resources, LLC –U.S. District Court, Southern District of California; Amster v. Starbucks Corporation – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1922016; Kutzman v. Derrel's Mini Storage, Inc. – U.S. District, Eastern District of California, Case No. 1:18-cv-00755-AWI-JLT; Marks v. Universal Propulsion Company, Inc.– Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS051608; Martinez v. Geil Enterprises, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG01480; Teniente v. Cirrus Asset Management, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV16302; Blackshear v. California Fine Wine & Spirits LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2018-00245842; Warnick v. Golden Gate America West LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC714176; Bennett v. Dnata Aviation USA, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566911; George v. PF Stockton Fitness LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00261113-CU-OE-GDS; Oshana v. Farmers and Merchants Bank of Central California – Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-19-003427; Vasquez v. Packaging Corporation of America, – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:19-cv-01935-PSG-PLA; Palomino v. Zara USA Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00992682-CU-OE-CXC; Simmons v. Joe & The Juice LA, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court; Pacia v. CIM Group, L.P. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC709666; Flores v. Plastic Express – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC71971; Madera v. William Warren Properties, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01055704-CU-OE-CXC; Hernandez v. Quality Custom Distribution – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-01010611-CU-OE-CXC; Arango v. Schlumberger Technology Corporation –Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01056839-CU-OE-CXC; Dandoy v. West Coast Convenience, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20051121; Ramirez v. J E H Enterprises, Inc. – San Francisco County

Superior Court, Case No. CGC-19-574691; Sullen v. First Service Residential California, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-19-575131; Valentino v. East Bay Tire Co, – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS053067; Murphy v. Rockler Retail Group, Inc. – Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00251220; Shahbazian v. Onewest Bank – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV23722; Bruemmer v. Tempur Retail Stores LLC – Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV1803646; Antonios v. Interface Rehab, Inc. – Orange County Superior, Case No. 30-2019-01067547-CU-OE-CXC; Tavallodi v. DC Auto, Inc. – San Bernardino, Case No. CIVDS1833598; Miranda v. The Lloyd Pest Control Co. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00052510-CU-OE-CTL; Soenardi v. Magnussen Imports, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV340003; Thai v. Team Industrial Services, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV21953; Castillo v. A.J. Kirkwood & Associates, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV04435; Moss v. Jabil Inc, – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20050536; Billosillo, Jr. v. Crown Energy Services, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00058254-CU-OE-CTL; Tarkington v. Freetime, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00011473-CU-OE-CTL; McIntyre v. J.J.R. Enterprises, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00251220; Bucur v. Pharmaca Integrative Pharmacy, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00009409-CU-OE-CTL; Batin v. McGee Air Services, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV347733; Terry v. McGee Air Services, Inc. – King County Superior Court of Washington, Case No. 19-2-3321-5 KNT; Weiss v. Niznik Behavioral Health Resources, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00039441-CU-OE-CTL; Cavada v. Inter-Continental Hotels Group, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:19-cv-01675-GPC-AHG;Lesevic v. Spectraforce Technologies, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 5:19-cv-03126-LHK; Mutchler v. Circle K Stores, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00016331-CU-OE-CTL, Azima v. CSI Medical Group, – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV345450; Porras v. Baypointe Enterprises, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV31015; Mitchell v. Mack Trucking, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1928334; Watts v. T.R.L. Systems, Incorporated – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01102457-CU-OE-CXC; Price v. DMSD Restaurants Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00024062-CU-OE-CTL; Jacobs v. Nortek Security & Control LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-0019735-CU-OE-CTL; Gonzalez v. Hub International Midwest – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1900463; Cisneros v. Bluepearl California, Inc. – San Mateo Superior Court, Case No. 19-CIV-05707; Garcia v. Gallagher Basset Services – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2004140; Callow v. Adventist Health System/West – Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0043607; Dominguez v. Kimco Facility Services, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV37592; Searles v. Robert Heath Trucking, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCY30808; Rangel v. Pioneer Hi-Bred international, Inc. – Yolo County Superior C ourt, Case No. CV-19-1797; Ivon v. Sinclair Television of California, Humboldt County Superior Court, Case No. DR190699; Williams v. Henkels & McCoy, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2003888; Cano v. Larry Green Chrysler Jeep Dodge, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. BLC1900184; Lopez v. Cepheid – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV358827; Hernandez v. Quick Dispense, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV29405; Lopez v. Lacoste USA, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1914626; Duhe v. Hospital Couriers Nevada, LLC – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC19-01377; Law v. Sequoia Equities, Incorporated – Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C19-01925; Dvorak v. Rockwell Collins, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00064397-CU-OE-CTL; Noguera v. Metal Container Corporation – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2003235; Leon v. Miller Event Management, Inc. – San Luis Obispo Superior Court, Case No. 19CV-0435; Leon v. Miller Event Management, Inc. – San Luis Obispo County Superior Court,

Case No. 19CV-0435, Camacho-Bias v. Serve U Brands Inc. – Butte County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV00603; La Pietra v. Entertainment Partners Services, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV39529; Celis v. Theatre Box - San Diego, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. ____ ; Ignacio v. Laboratory Corporation of America – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:19-cv-06079-AB-RAO; Kovnas v. Cahill Contractors LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19037852; Hersh v. Mrs. Gooch's Natural Food – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV10444; Miller v. The Permanente Medical Group – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19045904; Vasquez v. Autoalert, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01114549-CU-OE-CXC; Cavanaugh v. Morton Golf, LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00270176; Coley v. Monroe Operations, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20063188; Ramirez v. Sierra Aluminum Company – U.S. District Court, California Central District Court, Case No. 5:20-cv-00417-JGB-KK; Marrero v. Stat Med, P.C. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG19043214; Enriquez v. Solari Enterprises, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV11129; Craig v. Hometown Heart – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-582454; Lopez v. Hy0Lang Electric California, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00012543-CU-OE-CTL; Heuklom v. Clara Medical Group, P.C. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-585918; Dominguez v. Lifesafer of Northern California – Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV002586; Kiseleva v. Totalmed Staffing Inc. – U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Case No. 5:19-cv-06480; Vires v. Sweetgreen, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV365918; Kim v. Wireless Vision, LLC – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2000074; Senoren v. Air Canada Corporation – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV13942; Clark v. Quest Diagnostics Incorporated – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2018707; Green v. Shipt, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV01001; Respass v. The Scion Group LLC – Sacramento County Superior County, Case No. 34-2020-00285265; Jackson v. Decathlon USA LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG2003024; Avacena v. FTG Aerospace Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV28767; Perez v. Butler America, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV20218; Christensen v. Carter's Retail, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01138792-CU-OE-CXC; Astudillo v. Torrance Health Association, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV18424; Hansen v. Holiday Al Management Sub LLC – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. CIVMSC20-00779; Almahdi v. Vitamin Shoppe Industries Inc – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV365150; Krisinda v. Loyal Source Government Services LLC – U.S. District Court, California Southern District, Case No. 3:20-cv-879-LAB-NLS; Ettedgui v. WB Studio Enterprises Inc – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:20-CV-08053-MCS (MAAx); Fernandez v. Nuvision Federal Credit Union – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01161691-CU-OE-CJC; Aviles v. UPS Supply Chain Solutions, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2000727; Alcocer v. DSV Solutions, LLC – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2010345; Wilson v. Wholesome Harvest Baking, LLC – U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Case No. 4:20-cv-05186-YGR; Gregory v. Verio Healthcare, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV37254; Rose v. Impact Group, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01141107-CU-OE-CXC; Monasterio v. Citibank, N.A. – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 20-CIV-03650; Martinez-Lopez v. Medamerica, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00034393-CU-OE-CTL; Cox v. PRB Management, LLC – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS055514; Nash v. K. Hovnanian Companies, LLC – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2003319; Kyler v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00015828-CU-OE-CTL; Roberts v. Solantic Corporation – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV41117; Price v. Mistras Group, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV22485; Macias v. ABM Electrical & Lighting Solutions, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-

00024997-CU-OE-CTL; Basu-Kesselman v. Garuda Labs, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-585229; Armstrong v. Prometric LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV29967; Ashlock v. Advantis Medical Staffing, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00022305-CU-OE-CTL; Wilson v. WXI Global Solutions, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV25007; Gandhale v. Select Rehabilitation, LLC – Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV002240; Starvoice v. G4S Secure Solutions (USA) Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00029421-CU-OE-CTL; Mbise v. Axlehire, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20067350; Points v. C&J Services, Inc. – Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-20-102483; Marshall v. PHI Air Medical, LLC – Lassen County Superior Court, Case No. 62973; Jauregui v. Cyctec Egineered Materials, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01164932-CU-OE-CXC

**EXHIBIT #3**

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:
**Nick@bamlawca.com**

**WRITERS EXT:**
**1004**

October 21, 2022
CA2739

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC
Certified Mail #70221670000126674896
C T CORPORATION SYSTEM
330 N BRAND BLVD STE 700
GLENDALE, CA 91203

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 et seq., 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

"Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of October 21, 2021 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Catherine Robertson ("Plaintiff") and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC ("Defendant"). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California as a non-exempt employee from May of 2017 to August of 2022 and entitled to the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment for all time worked under Defendant's control. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but "furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work," Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours' worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest

periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq*. The lawsuit consists of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statue of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Nicholas J. De Blouw*

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL: **SergioJulian@bamlawca.com**
**WRITERS EXT: 1002**

July 14 2026
CA2739

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC
Certified Mail #9589071052704052147673
Todd Nunn, Esq.
**Todd.Nunn@arnoldporter.com**
Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111

**AMENDED NOTICE OF LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-915279-22**

Re: Amended Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 et seq., 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

Our offices represent Catherine Robertson ("Plaintiff Robertson"), Bailey Kilmer ("Plaintiff Kilmer"), Cuauhtemoc Olivo ("Plaintiff Olivo") Lynn Hillegeist ("Plaintiff Hillegeist"), Maureen Lytle ("Plaintiff Lytle") Pamela Casady ("Plaintiff Cassady"), John Sellers ("Plaintiff Sellers") Janelle Wilson ("Plaintiff Wilson") and Holly Miller ("Plaintiff Miller"), and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against St. Joseph Health Northern California, LLC ("Defendant').

Plaintiff Robertson originally sent a PAGA Notice on October 21, 2022, which gave notice to the LWDA and Defendant to enable Plaintiff Robertson to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699 et. seq.

This Amended Notice is intended to amend Plaintiff Robertson's original PAGA Notice to add Plaintiffs Kilmer, Olivo, Hillegeist, Lytle, Casady, Sellers and Miller, and to clarify the PAGA Period and Aggrieved Employee Definition.

"Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendants who were classified as non-exempt in the State of California from

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

October 21, 2021 to February 9, 2026, excluding all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant St. Joseph Health Norther California, LLC dba St. Joseph Hospital - Eureka from October 21, 2021 to March 25, 2022 and who did not work after March 25, 2022.

Plaintiff Catherine Robertson ("Plaintiff Robertson") was employed at Defendants' Queen of the Valley Medical Center in West Covina, California as a Staff Nurse and Emergency Room Nurse from May of 2017 through August of 2022. Plaintiff Robertson typically worked three 12.5 hour shifts per week from 7am to 7:30pm.

In addition to the typical wage and hour pay and penalties owed to her, Plaintiff Robertson has been underpaid and is owed more than $13,000.00. This includes unpaid Bonus on July 4, 2022 for 6 hours of 40% bonus totaling $163.25 and July 25, 2022 for 4 hours of 40% bonus totaling $108.83 that Plaintiff was specifically promised for working with Covid patients.

Plaintiff Cuauhtemoc "Tim" Olivo ("Plaintiff Olivo") was employed at Defendants' Redwoods Memorial Hospital in Fortuna, California as a Emergency Room Registered Nurse from February of 2019 through August 8, 2024. Plaintiff Olivo typically worked thee 12.5 hour shifts per week from 11am to 11:30pm.

Plaintiff Bailey Kilmer ("Plaintiff Kilmer") was employed at Defendants' Queen of the Valley Medical Center in Napa, California as a Registered Nurse from November 2023 through January of 2024. Plaintiff Kilmer was at all times classified by Defendants as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

Plaintiff Lynn Hillegeist has been employed at Providence Redwood Memorial Hospital in Fortuna California as a Nursing Administrative Supervisor from June 2007 to the present. She is a non-exempt, non-union, full-time hourly employee. Her typical shift is 6:30 a.m. to 7:00p.m, three days per week.

Plaintiff Holly Miller has been employed at Providence St. Joseph Hospital in Eureka, California as a Nursing Administrative Supervisor from February 2022 to the present. She is a non-exempt, non-union, full-time hourly employee. Her typical shift is 5:30 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., six days on, eight days off.

Plaintiff Pamela Cassady has been employed at Providence Redwood Memorial Hospital in Fortuna, California as a Med Surg Nurse and Charge Nurse from October 2000 to 2003, a relief Nursing Administrative Supervisor from 2003 to 2005, and a permanent Nursing Administrative Supervisor from 2005 to the present. She is a non-exempt, non-union, full-time hourly employee. Her typical shift is 6:30 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., six days on, eight days off.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

Plaintiff Maureen Lytle has been employed at Providence Redwood Memorial Hospital in Fortuna, California as a Nursing Administrative Supervisor from May 1994 to the present. She is a non-exempt, non-union hourly employee. She was full-time until 2023, at which time she switched to part-time. Her typical shift is 6:30 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., two days per week.

Plaintiff John Sellers has been employed at Providence Redwood Memorial Hospital in Fortuna, California as a Nursing Administrative Supervisor from March 2016 to the present. He is a non-exempt, non-union full-time hourly employee. His typical shift is 6:30 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., three days per week.

Plaintiff Jeanelle Wilson is currently employed at Defendants' Queen of the Valley Medical Center in Napa, California as a Scheduler beginning in March 2009. Plaintiff Wilson typically worked 40 hours per week from 8:30am to 5pm. Plaintiff Wilson was at all times classified by Defendants as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant in California as a non-exempt employees and entitled to the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment for all time worked under Defendant's control. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but "furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work," Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours' worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiffs and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiffs further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided

to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiffs contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Plaintiffs clocked in and out for meals on the same wall clock for starting and ending their shifts. Meals were not scheduled by Defendants. Typically, the charge nurse would relieve Plaintiffs for their meal periods. However, this did not occur prior to the end of the 5th hour. At least once every two weeks, the facilities became very busy or multiple ambulances came in so the charge nurse would reach Plaintiffs in the break room to come back. At least once per month, Plaintiffs report missing their lunch completely.

Pursuant to Defendants' practices, Plaintiffs were only provided one 15-minute rest period per day. Rest periods were not scheduled nor did employees clock in and out for them. For almost each and every shift worked, only a rest period within the first four hours of Plaintiffs' shifts were provided. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's Meal period policy contained an unlawful blanket meal period waiver.

Due to under staffing in the Emergency Rooms coupled with state required guidelines, Plaintiffs were not able to leave the premises on meal and rest breaks because there needed to be a minimum number of nurses per patients. Plaintiffs argue Defendants paid only 420,294 or 18.6% of meal period premiums owed during the Class Period and only 290,700 rest period premiums despite a 71% violation rate. Notably, Plaintiffs allege there were 2,264,181 unique Meal Break Violations is (41% violation rate net of premiums) and 50.3% unique Meal Break Violations.

Plaintiffs allege Defendant did not factor incentive payments and additional remunerations that were not factored into the regular rate or pay causing massive underpayments for meal, rest, and sick pay premiums. The additional remunerations include but are not limited to: "Wellness Incen"; "Education"; "Award Spot Bonus"; "Bonus Incntv"; "Dscretnry Spot Bonus" "Other Non-Dscretnry Bonus" "Dscretnry Spot Bonus GU" "Referral Bonus" "Retention Bonus" "Surge RN" "Reimb Tuition Ntxbl" "NonCash Gift Taxable GU" "NonCash Gift Taxable GU_SE" and "Intentive Shift Pay".

Further, Defendants violated Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2) by failing to state the total hours worked. Plaintiffs allege that if the employee adds up all the hours, the employee would get an inaccurate count that does not match up with their actual working hours. Such

a sum would inaccurately include break premiums and differential hours that are either not working hours or duplicative of working hours.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq*. The lawsuit consists of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statue of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Sergio J. Puche*

Sergio J. Puche, Esq.