ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY STATE BAR NUMBER: 258135
NAME: Annabel Blanchard
FIRM NAME: Blackstone Law, APC
STREET ADDRESS: 8383 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 745
CITY: Beverly Hills STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 90211
TELEPHONE NO.: (310) 622-4278 FAX NO.: (855) 786-6356
EMAIL ADDRESS: ablanchard@blackstonepc.com
ATTORNEY FOR *(name)*: Plaintiff Ignacio Duenas

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
STREET ADDRESS: 312 North Spring Street
MAILING ADDRESS: 312 North Spring Street
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90012
BRANCH NAME: Spring Street Courthouse

FOR COURT USE ONLY

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Ignacio Duenas
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Belcan Engineering Group, LLC,

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OR ORDER

CASE NUMBER: 22STCV34198

(Check one): [X] **UNLIMITED CASE** (Amount demanded exceeded $35,000) [ ] **LIMITED CASE** (Amount demanded was $35,000 or less)

TO ALL PARTIES :

1. A judgment, decree, or order was entered in this action on *(date)*: October 21, 2026

2. A copy of the judgment, decree, or order is attached to this notice.

Date: October 27, 2026

Annabel Blanchard
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF [X] ATTORNEY [ ] PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY)

Annabel Blanchard
(SIGNATURE)

Form Approved for Optional Use
Judicial Council of California
CIV-130 [Rev. January 1, 2024]

www.courts.ca.gov

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
10/21/2026
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: M. Elder Deputy

Final Approval of Class Action Settlement
Department SSC-9
Hon. Elaine Lu

Ignacio Duenas v. Belcan Engineering Group, LLC, et al.
Case No.: 22STCV34198
Hearing Date: October 21, 2026 (continued from October 21, 2026)

FINAL RULING

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Ignacio Duenas sues his former employer, Defendants Belcan Engineering Group, LLC, Belcan Services Group Limited Partnership, PRC-DeSoto International, Inc. and Sierracin/Sylmar Corporation (together, "Defendants"), for alleged wage and hour violations. Defendants Belcan Engineering Group, LLC and Belcan Services Group Limited Partnership, provides engineering, consulting, and technical services to various industries such as aerospace, defense, automotive, energy, industrial, and manufacturing. They provide staffing to multiple companies, such as co-Defendants PRC – DeSoto International, and Inc., Sierracin/Sylmar Corporation. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class of Defendants' current and former non-exempt employees.

On October 14, 2022, Plaintiff provided written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and to Defendants Belcan Engineering Group, LLC, Belcan Services Group Limited Partnership, PRC-DeSoto International, Inc. and Sierracin/Sylmar Corporation of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendants. On October 2, 2025 Plaintiff submitted an amended written notice to the LWDA by online submission.

On October 24, 2022, Plaintiff filed a Class Action Complaint for Damages against Defendants. On January 13, 2023, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint which added a cause of action for civil penalties pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code §§2698, et seq. ("PAGA"). On April 26, 2023, Plaintiff filed an Amendment to the First Amended Complaint to add defendant PRC-Desoto International, Inc. to the Action.

On January 24, 2025, the parties participated in a formal mediation conducted by Monique Ngo-Bonnici, which ultimately resulted in settlement with the assistance of the mediator's evaluations. The terms of settlement are finalized in the long-form *Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement* ("Settlement Agreement"), a copy of which is attached to the Declaration of Annabel Blanchard ("Blanchard Decl.") as Exhibit 3.

On October 13, 2025, Plaintiff filed the operative Second Amended Complaint which alleges causes of action for violations of the California Labor Code for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to provide compliant rest periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to timely pay wages upon termination, failure to reimburse business expenses, and for violations of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, et seq.

based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations, and for civil penalties under PAGA based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations.

On December 19, 2025, the Court issued a tentative ruling ordering the parties to address certain deficiencies with the proposed settlement. In response, Class Counsel filed the Amended Settlement Agreement attached to the Supplemental Declaration of Annabel Blanchard filed March 2, 2026. All references below are to that agreement.

On March 11, 2026, the Court granted preliminary approval of the settlement.

Notice was given to the Class Members as ordered (see Declaration of Tarus Dancy ("Dancy Decl.")).

At the initial hearing on October 6, 2026 on the Parties' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, Defendant Belcan Engineering Group stated that its understanding is that the Final Approval Order and Judgment that the parties jointly proposed on 8/31/26 resolves only a portion of the case – the class members' claims against only current or former non-exempt employees of Belcan Engineering Group, LLC who were placed to work at the PPG Defendants' facilities in the State of California during the Class Period. (Settlement Agreement ¶12.e.) Defendant Belcan Engineering Group stated that it believes that because the operative Second Amended Complaint defines the class more broadly as "[a]ll current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time during the period from four years prior to the date of the filing of the original Complaint until final judgment," Plaintiff Duenas's class claims as to non-exempt employees whom Defendant Belcan Engineering Group placed to work at different locations – other than PPG Defendants' facilities – shall remain pending even after the Court signed the Final Approval Order and Judgment that the parties jointly proposed on 8/31/26 and must still be resolved or litigated. (10/6/26 Minute Order.) Plaintiff Ignacio Duenas stated on the other hand that Plaintiff Ignacio Duenas' understanding was that the Final Approval Order and Judgment that the parties jointly proposed on 8/31/26 fully and completely resolves all class claims asserted in this matter (22STCV34198) and that there will be no other claims remaining in this matter (22STCV34198) after the Court signs the Final Approval Order and Judgment that the parties jointly proposed on 8/31/26. (10/6/26 Minute Order.)

On October 12, 2026, Plaintiff IGNACIO DUENAS ("Plaintiff") and Defendants BELCAN ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC and BELCAN SERVICES GROUP, LP ("Belcan Defendants") as well as PRC DE SOTO INTERNATIONAL, INC., SIERRACIN/SYLMAR CORPORATION ("PPG Defendants") filed a Joint Statement advising that: "The Parties have since met and conferred and can jointly confirm that the Final Approval Order and Judgment will fully resolve this action, and there will be no claims which would remain pending and unresolved in the action upon the entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment."

On October 21, 2026, Plaintiff, Belcan Defendants, and PPG Defendants each orally confirmed in open court that they are requesting Court approval of the pending Motion for Final Approval of the settlement.

SETTLEMENT CLASS DEFINITION

- "Class" or "Class Member(s)" means all current or former non-exempt employees of Belcan Engineering Group, LLC who were placed to work at the PPG Defendants' facilities in the State of California during the Class Period. (¶12.e)
- "Class Period" means the period from October 24, 2018 through February 12, 2025. (¶12.i)
- "Aggrieved Employee(s)" are all current or former non-exempt employees of Belcan Engineering Group, LLC who were placed to work at PPG Defendants' facilities in the State of California during the PAGA Period. (¶12.a)
- "PAGA Period" means the period from October 24, 2021 through February 12, 2025. (¶12.bb)
- "Settlement Class" or "Settlement Class Member(s)" means all Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion. (¶12.oo)

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The essential terms are as follows:

- The Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") is **$1,775,000**, non-reversionary. (¶12.t)
    - "Belcan Settlement Amount" means the amount of One Million One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,150,000.00) to be paid by the Belcan Defendants. (¶12.d)
    - "PPG Settlement Amount" means the sum of Six Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($625,000.00) to be paid by PPG Defendants. (¶12.gg)
    - Escalator Clause: Defendants have represented that the Class Members worked a total of 49,237 Workweeks from October 24, 2018 to February 3, 2025. If it is determined by the Settlement Administrator that the total number of Workweeks released by the Class Members during the Class Period actually exceeds 49,237 by more than 5% (i.e., if the Workweeks exceed 51,699), then the Gross Settlement Amount will be increased on a pro rata basis equal to the percentage increase in the number of Workweeks worked by the Class Members above 5%. For example, if the number of Workweeks increases by 6%, then the Gross Settlement Amount will increase by 1%. (¶19)
    - At final approval, the settlement administrator represents that the total number of workweeks worked by Participating Class Members during the Class Period is 50,166, which did not trigger the escalator provision set forth in Paragraph 19 of the Settlement Agreement. (Dancy Decl., ¶15.)
- The Net Settlement Amount ("Net") estimated at preliminary approval (**$998,250**) is the GSA minus the following:
    - Up to **$621,250** (35%) for attorney fees (¶15);
    - Up to **$35,000** for litigation costs (*Ibid.*);
    - Up to **$15,000** for an Enhancement Payment to the Named Plaintiff (¶16);
    - Up to **$15,500** for settlement administration costs (¶18); and
    - Payment of **$90,000** PAGA penalty (75% or $67,500 to the LWDA). (¶17)

- Defendants shall pay the Employer Taxes in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. (¶12.o)
- There is no claim form requirement. (Notice p. 1)
- Individual Settlement Payment Calculation: After Final Approval, the Settlement Administrator will divide the final Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Settlement Class Members to yield the "Final Workweek Value," and multiply each Settlement Class Member's individual Workweeks by the Final Workweek Value to each Settlement Class Member's final Individual Settlement Share. (¶20.b)
    - PAGA Payments: The Settlement Administrator will divide the Aggrieved Employee Amount, i.e., 25% of the PAGA Amount, by the Pay Periods of all Aggrieved Employees to yield the "Pay Period Value," and multiply each Aggrieved Employee's individual Pay Periods by the Pay Period Value to yield each Aggrieved Employee's Individual PAGA Payment. (¶21)
    - Tax Allocation**:** Class Members' Individual Settlement Shares will be allocated as follows: 20% as wages, 40% as interest, and 40% as penalties and non-wage damages. Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties. (¶22)
- Response Deadline: "Response Deadline" means the deadline by which Class Members must submit a Request for Exclusion, Notice of Objection, and/or Dispute, which shall be the date that is forty-five (45) calendar days from the initial mailing of the Class Notice by the Settlement Administrator to Class Members, unless the 45th day falls on a Sunday or Federal holiday, in which case the Response Deadline will be extended to the next day on which the United States Postal service is open. The Response Deadline may also be extended by express agreement between Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel. In the event that a Class Notice is re-mailed to a Class Member, the Response Deadline for that Class Member shall be extended fifteen (15) calendar days from the original Response Deadline. (¶12.ll)
    - If Settlement Class Members representing more than an aggregate total of five percent (5%) of the outstanding workweeks submit timely and valid Requests for Exclusion, Defendants may elect to rescind the Settlement Agreement. (¶35)
- Funding of Settlement**:** No later than twenty-one (21) business days after the Effective Date, Defendants will deposit the Gross Settlement Amount into a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") within the meaning of Treasury Regulation Section 1.468B-1, et seq., to be established by the Settlement Administrator. (¶38)
- Disbursement: Within ten (10) business days of the funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator will issue the Individual Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members, Individual PAGA Payments to Aggrieved Employees, LWDA Payment to the LWDA, Enhancement Payment to Plaintiff, Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel, and Settlement Administration Costs to itself. The Settlement Administrator shall also set aside the Employer Taxes and all employee-side payroll taxes, contributions, and withholding, and timely forward these to the appropriate government authorities. (¶39)

- Uncashed Settlement Checks: Each Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment check will be valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days from the date the checks are issued, and thereafter, shall be canceled. Any funds associated with such canceled checks shall be distributed by the Settlement Administrator to the State of California's Unclaimed Property Division in the name of the Settlement Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee. The Parties agree that this disposition results in no "unpaid residue" under California Civil Procedure Code Section 384, as the entire Net Settlement Amount will be paid out to Settlement Class Members, whether or not they cash their settlement checks. (¶40)
- The settlement administrator will be Apex Class Action, LLC. (¶12.mm)
- The proposed Settlement Agreement was submitted to the LWDA on October 13, 2025. (Blanchard Decl. ISO Prelim, Exhibit 4.)
- Releases:
    - Class Settlement Release. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiff and all Settlement Class Members will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released Class Claims. (¶41) "Released Class Claims" means any and all claims which were alleged or which could have been reasonably alleged based on the factual allegations in the Operative Complaint, arising during the Class Period, which shall specifically include claims for Defendants' alleged failure to pay all wages (including minimum, regular, overtime double time, on-call time, reporting time, paid sick leave), provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide accurate wage statements, failure to maintain accurate payroll records, and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 225, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558,1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, and 2802, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, and California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. (¶12.hh)
    - PAGA Settlement Release. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiff, the State of California with respect to all Aggrieved Employees, and all Aggrieved Employees will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released PAGA Claims. (¶42) "Released PAGA Claims" means any and all claims arising from any of the factual allegations in the Amended PAGA Letter, and Operative Complaint, , arising during the PAGA Period, for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698 et seq., which shall specifically include claims for Defendants' alleged failure to pay all wages (including minimum, regular, overtime double time, on-call time, reporting time, paid sick leave), provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide accurate

wage statements, failure to maintain accurate payroll records, and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 225, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558,1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order. (¶12.ii)

- Class Members who exclude themselves from the Class Settlement, shall still receive an Individual PAGA Payment and release all claims for penalties pursuant to the PAGA during the PAGA Period. (¶32)

- "Released Parties" means Defendants and their current and former officers, directors, members, insurers, shareholders, parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, successors, and assigns, including PPG Industries, Inc. (¶12.jj)
- Named Plaintiff will also provide a general release and CC § 1542 waiver. (¶43)

ANALYSIS OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

A. Does a presumption of fairness exist?

The Court preliminarily found in its Order of March 11, 2026 that the presumption of fairness should be applied. No facts have come to the Court's attention that would alter that preliminary conclusion. Accordingly, the settlement is entitled to a presumption of fairness as set forth in the preliminary approval order.

B. Is the settlement fair, adequate, and reasonable?

The settlement was preliminarily found to be fair, adequate and reasonable. Notice has now been given to the Class.

Reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement.

Number of class members: 2,049 (Dancy Decl., ¶5.)
Number of notice packets mailed: 2,049 (*Id.* at ¶7.)
Number of undeliverable notices: 48 (*Id.* at ¶9.)
Number of opt-outs: 2 (*Id.* at ¶11.)
Number of objections: 0 (*Id*. at ¶12.)
Number of participating class members: 2,047 (*Id.* at ¶14.)
Average individual payment: $487.96 (*Id.* at ¶16.)
Highest individual payment: $4,758.75 (*Ibid.*)

The Court finds that the notice was given as directed and conforms to due process requirements. Given the reactions of the Class Members to the proposed settlement and for the reasons set for in the Preliminary Approval order, the settlement is found to be fair, adequate, and reasonable.

C. Attorney Fees and Costs

Class Counsel requests an award of **$621,250 (35%)** in fees and **$23,441.98** in costs. (Memo ISO Final at 2:16-20.) The Settlement Agreement provides for up to $621,250 (35%) of the GSA for attorney fees and up to $35,000 in costs (¶15).

"Courts recognize two methods for calculating attorney fees in civil class actions: the lodestar/multiplier method and the percentage of recovery method." (*Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 254.) Here, class counsel request attorney fees using the percentage method, as crosschecked by lodestar. (Memo ISO Final at pp. 15-24.)

In common fund cases, the Court may employ a percentage of the benefit method, as cross-checked against the lodestar. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503.) The fee request represents 35% of the gross settlement amount, which is above the average generally awarded in class actions. (See *In re Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 558, fn. 13 ["Empirical studies show that, regardless whether the percentage method or the lodestar method is used, fee awards in class actions average around one-third of the recovery."].)

Class Counsel has provided information, summarized below, from which the lodestar may be calculated:

Attorney	**Rates**	**Hours**	**Totals**
Jonathan M. Genish	$1,295	48	$62,160
Barbara DuVan-Clarke	$1,050	177	$185,850
Danielle GruppChang	$825	81	$66,825
P.J. Van Ert	$850	95	$80,750
Annabel Blanchard	$750	42	$31,500
Totals		**443**	**$427,085**

(Declaration of Annabel Blanchard ISO Final, ¶35.)

Counsel's percentage-based fee request is higher than the unadjusted lodestar, and would represent application of a multiplier of approximately 1.45x. Notice of the fee request was provided to class members in the notice packet, and no one objected. (Dancy Decl., ¶12, Exhibit A.)

No evidence is presented suggesting a fee award at 35% is appropriate. There is nothing to suggest this case involved novel legal issues or particularly difficult facts. Plaintiff's counsel is experienced in wage and hour cases and do not show they took any risk in excess of that normally taken in any other contingent fee case of this type.

Fees are set at 33 1/3% of the GSA or **$591,666.67**, resulting in a multiplier of 1.39x, which is ample given that it is already in excess of the lodestar and rewards counsel for any risk they took in this case.

As for costs, Class Counsel is requesting a cost amount of **$23,441.98**. This is less than the $35,000 cap estimated at preliminary approval, which was not objected to. (Dancy Decl., ¶12, Exhibit A.) Counsel represent that costs include, but are not limited to: mediation fees, expert fees, and filing and service fees. (Blanchard Decl. ISO Final, ¶37, Exhibit 4.) These costs appear to be reasonable in amount and reasonably necessary to this litigation.

Based on the above, the Court hereby awards **$591,666.67** in fees and **$23,441.98** in costs.

D. Incentive Award

The class representative, Ignacio Duenas, seeks an enhancement payment of **$15,000** for his contributions to the action. (Memo ISO Final at 23:13-15.)

In connection with the final fairness hearing, named Plaintiffs must submit declarations attesting to why they should be entitled to an enhancement award in the proposed amount. The named Plaintiffs must explain why they "should be compensated for the expense or risk he has incurred in conferring a benefit on other members of the class." (*Clark v. American Residential Services LLC* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 806.) Trial courts should not sanction enhancement awards of thousands of dollars with "nothing more than *pro forma* claims as to 'countless' hours expended, 'potential stigma' and 'potential risk.' Significantly more specificity, in the form of quantification of time and effort expended on the litigation, and in the form of reasoned explanation of financial or other risks incurred by the named plaintiffs, is required in order for the trial court to conclude that an enhancement was 'necessary to induce [the named plaintiff] to participate in the suit . . . .'" (*Id*. at 806-807, italics and ellipsis in original.)

Plaintiff represents that his contributions to this litigation include: conferring with his attorneys about the case, searching for and providing documents, answering questions, providing information regarding the company's practices and the duties of other hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees, and reviewing the settlement. He estimates spending 65 hours on the case. (Declaration of Ignacio Duenas ISO Final, ¶¶4-9.)

Based on the above, as well as the benefits obtained on behalf of the class, theCourt hereby grants an enhancement payment in the amount of **$7,500** to Plaintiff.

E. Settlement Administration Costs

The settlement administrator, Apex Class Action, LLC, is requesting **$14,890** for the costs of settlement administration. (Dancy Decl., ¶19.) This is less than the cost of $15,500 estimated at preliminary approval (¶18) and disclosed to the Class on the Notice form, to which there were no objections. (Dancy Decl., ¶12, Exhibit A.) Based on the above, the Court hereby awards administration costs in the requested amount of **$14,890.**

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The Parties' Motion for Final Approval of class action settlement is GRANTED as the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

The essential terms are:

- The Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") is **$1,775,000**, non-reversionary. (¶12.t)
- The Court hereby approves and awards the following payments from the GSA:

- **$591,666.67** (33 1/3%) for attorney fees to Class Counsel, Blackstone Law, APC (¶15);

- **$23,441.98** for attorney costs to Class Counsel (*Ibid.*);

- enhancement payment of **$7,500** to the class representative, Ignacio Duenas; (¶16);

- **$14,890** for settlement administration costs to Apex Class Action, LLC (¶18); and

- **$90,000** PAGA penalty (75% or $67,500 to the LWDA; 25% or $22,500 to the Aggrieved Employees). (¶17)

- Defendants shall pay the Employer Taxes in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. (¶12.o)

- There is no claim form requirement. (Notice p. 1)

- Plaintiffs shall release Defendants from the claims pursuant to the release in the settlement.

The Court will sign the [PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT that Plaintiff electronically lodged on 8/31/26. However, the Court will make the following revisions consistent with the instant ruling:

- Because no objectors appeared at the October 6, 2026 or October 21, 2026 hearings on the Parties' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, the Court will add a sentence to paragraph 8 reflecting that "No objectors appeared at the duly noticed hearing on the Parties' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement."

- The Court will add the following language to paragraph 6: "The Court hereby approves the Gross Settlement Amount of **$1,775,000**, non-reversionary."

- In paragraph 9, the amount of Plaintiff's incentive award shall be amended from **$15,000** to **$7,500**.

- In paragraph 10, the amount of Plaintiff's attorneys' fees shall be amended from **$621,250.00** to **$591,666.67.**

- Paragraph 22 shall be amended to add that "Class Counsel is ordered to file and serve a Final Report re: Distribution of the settlement funds by **September 9, 2027**, and a Non-Appearance Case Review re Distribution of Settlement Funds is set for **September 16, 2027**, 8:30 a.m., Department 9."

Within 10 days of this order, Class Counsel must give notice to the class members pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.771(b) (which may be effected by posting on the Administrator's website if consistent with the parties' Class Action Settlement) and to the LWDA, if applicable, pursuant to Labor Code §2699 (1)(3).

THE COURT'S JUDICIAL ASSISTANT IS TO GIVE NOTICE TO THE MOVING PARTY (PLAINTIFF). THE MOVING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE TO ALL OTHER PARTIES.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 21, 2026

Elaine Lu / Judge

ELAINE LU
Judge of the Superior Court

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I, Bany Funez, certify and declare as follows:

I am over eighteen years of age and not a party to the within action; my business address is 8383 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 745, Beverly Hills, California 90211. On October 27, 2026, I served a copy of the following document(s):

- **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OR ORDER**

On the interested parties as follows:

Brendan Y. Joy
E-Mail: bjoy@fisherphillips.com
Teri A. Gibbs
E-Mail: tgibbs@fisherphillips.com
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP
444 South Flower Street, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 330-4500
Facsimile: (213) 330-4501

Attorneys for Defendants BELCAN ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC, and BELCAN SERVICES GROUP LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Shiva Davoudian, Esq.
(sdavoudian@littler.com)
Lauren Manso, Esq.
(lmanso@littler.com)
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
633 West Fifth Street, 63rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Phone: (213) 443-4300
Fax: (213) 443-4299

Attorneys for Defendant PPG INDUSTRIES, INC.

Donna Leung, Esq.
(dleung@littler.com)
LITTLER MENDELSON P.C. 2049 Century Park East, Fifth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067
Phone: (310) 553-0308
Fax: (310) 553-5583

Benjamin Haber, Esq.
(benjamin@wilshirelawfirm.com)
Daniel Kramer, Esq.
(dkramer@wilshirelawfirm.com)
HARVILLE WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Phone: (800) 649-9988
Fax: (213) 381-9988

Attorneys for Plaintiff MAURICE HARVILLE

Anthony Draper, Esq.
(anthony@jameshawkinsaplc.com)
Isandra Fernandez, Esq.
(isandra@jameshawkinsaplc.com)
James Hawkins, Esq.
(james@jameshawkinsaplc.com)
JAMES HAWKINS APLC
9880 Research Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92618
Phone: (949) 387-7200
Fax: (949) 387-6676

Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTHONY BRANDEN GONZALEZ, ET AL.

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE (CASE ANYWHERE):** I caused said document(s) to be delivered to the addressee(s) listed above via Case Anywhere. I did not receive any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

☒ **BY ONLINE SUBMISSION:** The above-referenced documents were transmitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency through the online system established for the submission of notices and documents, in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(I). I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

☒ **STATE:** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on October 27, 2026 at Beverly Hills, California.

/s/ Bany Funez
Bany Funez