

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413 / Fax: (949) 656-7760
Email: aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
8/28/2025 3:31 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By S. Drew, Deputy Clerk

Walter L. Haines, Esq. (SBN 71075)
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Tel.: (562) 256-1047 / Fax: (562) 256-1006
Email: walter@uelglaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff PAUL LOWE, and all others similarly situated

[Additional Counsel on following page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

PAUL LOWE, an individual; on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated and
the general public,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RAPID RELIABLE TESTING, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; RAPID
RELIABLE TESTING CA, LLC, a California
limited liability company; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No. 23STCV07047

) [Assigned for All Purposes to:
) The Hon. Theresa M. Traber, Dept. 1]

) **DECLARATION OF AARON A. BARTZ IN**
) **SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR**
) **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS**
) **ACTION SETTLEMENT**

) Date: February 6, 2026

) Time: 10:30 a.m.

) Dept: 1

1 David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)
david@tomorrowlaw.com
2 Vedang J. Patel (SBN 328647)
vedang@tomorrowlaw.com
3 Brandon M. Chang (SBN 316197)
brandon@tomorrowlaw.com
4 BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
5 8484 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 500
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
6 Tel.: (310) 438-5555 / Fax: (310) 300-1705
7 Attorneys for Plaintiff CORIELYN MARIE HALL
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before all courts of the State of California. I am the owner of Bartz Law Group APC, and am Class Counsel for Plaintiff Paul Lowe (“Plaintiff”). I have personal knowledge of the facts herein. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to those facts under oath.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

4. On January 11, 2023, Plaintiff served a Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) letter, alleging various Labor Code violations, including, among other things, failure to pay all wages, failure to provide meal and rest periods, paystub and waiting time penalties, and failure to reimburse business expenses. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff 's PAGA letter served on January 11, 2023 is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

5. On March 30, 2023, Plaintiff filed a class action and Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) Complaint. Thereafter, on August 26, 2025, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

SUMMARY OF SETTLEMENT

6. After Plaintiff propounded initial discovery in this action, the parties agreed to stay formal discovery in order to pursue the possibility of early resolution. As such, the parties thereafter engaged in informal discovery to evaluate the class and PAGA claims.

7. To that end, Defendant produced a sampling of time and payroll records, and Excel spreadsheets with thousands of lines of data for the class.

8. Thereafter, Class Counsel also hired experienced damages expert EconONE Research, Inc., to analyze the payroll and related wage data and to create a damages model for the various claims alleged in the case. Based upon the analysis of the time records and payroll data, EconONE and Class Counsel were able to calculate damages estimates on a class-wide basis.

9. The parties did not attend Mediation in this matter until they had sufficient data and documents to evaluate the claims in the case. On February 5, 2025, the parties attended a full-day Mediation before experienced wage and hour mediator, Gig Kyriacou, Esq. After an all-day mediation, the parties reached a settlement, memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding on March 25, 2025. Thereafter, the parties entered into a fully-executed long form Settlement Agreement in July 2025.

10. The class members entitled to the settlement fund are all non-exempt current and former employees who worked in California for Defendant from April 5, 2021 through April 5, 2025. Based upon current estimates, there are approximately 570 class members.

11. The settlement fund is all in (except for the employer's share of payroll taxes, which Defendant shall pay in addition to the \$220,000 settlement), there is no claim form requirement, and no residual will revert to Defendant. Class members will be paid as long as they do not opt out of the settlement. If a Settlement Class Member opts out, their share of the Net Settlement Amount will be allocated to other members of the Settlement Class. In the event a class member does not negotiate (cash) his or her settlement check, the settlement administrator

1 shall distribute the unclaimed funds to the California State Controller's Unclaimed Property
2 Fund.

3 12. The payment to the Settlement Class Members will be characterized as eighty
4 percent interest and penalties, and twenty percent wages. The class administrator will issue W-2
5 statements for the wage portion of the settlement, and a form 1099 for all amounts paid as
6 penalties and interest.

7 13. Based upon Class Counsel's independent analysis and investigation in this matter,
8 the Settlement Class will be compensated based on each member's respective number of
9 workweeks worked during the Class Period. Defendant estimates that the total number of
10 workweeks will be no more than 11,900.¹.

11 14. Based on the settlement terms, there will be an approximate net settlement fund of
12 \$93,000. In exchange for their payment, Class Members will release Defendant and each of its
13 former and present directors, officers, shareholders, owners, attorneys, insurers, predecessors,
14 successors, and assigns from all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged,
15 based on the Class Period facts stated in the Action and Plaintiffs' PAGA Notices, including
16 claims under the California Labor Code, California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
17 Orders, regulations, and/or other provisions of law as set forth in more detail in Section 5.3 of the
18 Agreement. The named Plaintiffs will, in addition to releasing claims alleged in the lawsuit, give
19 a general release of all claims pursuant to Civil Code section 1542 as set forth in Section 5.1 and
20 5.2. (*Ibid.*)

21 15. The parties further agree to appoint an experienced claims administrator, Phoenix
22 Class Action Administration Solutions, to prepare and send notice to the class, receive and
23 process objections, and prepare and mail settlement checks to Settlement Class Members. The
24
25

26 ¹ Paragraph 9 of the Settlement Agreement contains an escalator clause.
27
28

claims administrator will conduct skip-tracing for any Settlement Class Member whose addresses cannot be found.

16. The all-in settlement fund will also include all of the attorneys' fees and costs allowed by this Court. The attorneys' fees shall not exceed thirty five percent of the \$220,000 settlement fund, or \$77,000. Defendant will also pay class counsel's costs, not to exceed \$15,000, as well as settlement administration costs not to exceed \$10,000, out of the common fund..

17. The PAGA allocation of the settlement is \$10,000, of which \$7,500 (75%) will be distributed to the Labor Workforce and Development Agency (LWDA), with the remaining portion - \$2,500 (25%) - going to PAGA Members (all allegedly aggrieved persons who worked for Defendant at any time from March 30, 2022 through April 5, 2025).

18. The settlement also includes Plaintiffs' class representative enhancement awards. Based on Plaintiffs' work in connection with this case, including connecting Class Counsel with other witnesses, meeting and conferring with Class Counsel regarding legal strategies, and assisting with developing the claims and theories in this case, Plaintiffs seek a total of \$15,000, with \$7,500 being paid to each of the named Plaintiffs.

19. In summary, the settlement fund is allocated as follows:

(1) A net settlement fund of approximately \$93,000;

(2) Attorney's fees and costs: Up to 35% of the gross settlement, i.e., \$77,000 in attorneys' fees and not to exceed \$15,000 in costs;

(3) Settlement administrator expenses of \$10,000;

(4) PAGA payment: \$7,500 to the LWDA, and \$2,500 for individual PAGA payments;

(5) Class representative enhancement of \$15,000, with \$7,500 paid to each Plaintiff, respectively.

NATURE OF CLAIMS

20. The operative Complaint alleges claims for 1) Failure to Pay All Wages; 2)

Waiting Time Penalties; 3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; 4) Failure to Authorize and Permit Proper Rest Periods; 5) Failure to Properly Maintain and Submit Itemized Wage Statements; 6) Unfair Business Practices; 7) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses; and 8) Violation of Labor Code § 2699 (PAGA). Plaintiffs further allege that they and the Class are entitled to damages, restitution, wages, attorneys’ fees, and interest, among other remedies. The reasonable exposure and the reasonable settlement value for each of the alleged claims are as follows:

CLAIM	TOTAL EXPOSURE	SETTLEMENT VALUE
Failure to Pay Wages	\$296,900	\$59,380
Meal	\$235,000	\$23,500
Rest	\$808,423	\$80,842
Waiting time	\$3,200,000	\$160,000
Paystub	\$323,350	\$32,335
Reimbursement	\$137,845	\$13,784
PAGA	\$2,140,000	\$107,000
TOTAL	\$7,141,518	\$476,841

a. Overtime/Off-the-Clock Wage Violations

Labor Code § 510 provides that “[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek. . . shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.” Further, “[a]ny work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay . . . , [and] any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of an employee.”

1 Labor Code § 1194 states any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage is
2 entitled to recover the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage, including
3 interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

4 Plaintiffs contend that Defendant failed to pay all wages due in numerous respects. **First**,
5 Plaintiffs and other class members had to work prior to their shifts to get the testing sites ready,
6 change into their personal protective equipment (PPE) gear, and after their shifts receiving calls
7 and text messages from managers regarding the following day's testing schedules. Off-the-clock
8 time is compensable when an employer knows or should have known the employees are working
9 off-the-clock time. *See Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.*, 22 Cal.4th 575, 585 (2000). Plaintiffs
10 allege that Defendants' managers knew about such off-the-clock time because they required
11 Plaintiffs and others to show up before their scheduled shifts to get into their PPE gear and to get
12 the sites ready for the day, and to receive and answer text messages and calls after their shifts to
13 be ready for the following workday. **Second**, while on "embark" projects wherein putative class
14 members were staffed aboard cruise ships on excursions, Plaintiffs and putative class members
15 were on call the entire time they were aboard the ship. Under California law, on call hours are
16 considered compensable hours worked where employees remain under employer control. (*See*
17 *generally, Mendiola v. CPS Sec. Sols., Inc.*, 340 P.3d 355 (2015)). An employee is under an
18 employer's control when they are prevented from using the on-call time for their own purposes.
19 (*Id.*) Factors considered in the on-call analysis include "(1) whether there was an on-premises
20 living requirement; (2) whether there were excessive geographical restrictions on employee's
21 movements; (3) whether the frequency of the calls was unduly restrictive; (4) whether a fixed time
22 limit for response was unduly restrictive; (5) whether the on-call employee could easily trade on-
23 call responsibilities; (6) whether use of a pager could ease restrictions; and (7) whether the
24 employee had actually engaged in personal activities during call-in time." (*Id.* at 360.)
25

26 Here, putative class members were on call to help with medical emergencies, and therefore
27 had to stay alert, near the medical offices aboard the ship, and capable of immediate response (in
28

1 other words, “rapidly reliable”). These expectations precluded them from taking time to
2 themselves while “off the clock” and getting much-needed rest. On-call employees were also
3 precluded from engaging in personal activities that would impair their ability to administer a
4 vaccine or render medical aid. Thus, employees were subject to a high level of employer control
5 and all on-call hours were compensable (albeit uncompensated).

6 In addition to not paying employees for all hours worked, Plaintiffs contend that
7 Defendant also fails to pay the full amount of overtime wages due because Defendant
8 miscalculates the regular rate, by among other things, failing to properly include items of
9 remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses and other incentive compensation, when
10 determining the employees' regular rate. Defendant is therefore in violation of Labor Code §§
11 510 and 1194, and the relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

12 Defendant contends that its payment policies were lawful, and that it paid for all time
13 worked by Plaintiffs and the class members. Defendant also contends that it properly calculated
14 Class Members’ overtime at the regular rate of pay.

15 Plaintiffs and their expert analyzed payroll and time records for the class members and
16 calculated that the total verdict value for this claim is approximately \$296,900. Plaintiffs and
17 their expert assumed 15 minutes per shift of unpaid hours, based on discussions with the
18 Plaintiffs and other class members. Plaintiff’s expert reviewed payroll records for the class,
19 including pay period counts per year, and a weighted average rate of pay. Based on the defenses
20 alleged, as well as the fact that failure to pay wage claims will rest on testimony from Plaintiffs
21 and class members, and documented evidence of such violations is scant, Plaintiffs placed a
22 reasonable settlement value of the overtime/minimum wage claim at 20 percent of the total
23 verdict value, or **\$59,380**. This valuation takes into consideration Class Counsel’s analysis of the
24 law, and defenses alleged and evidence produced by the Defendant.

25 **b. Meal and Rest Period Claims**

26 i. Meal period liability and damages

27 Plaintiffs contend that Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and class members with a
28

1 duty-free 30-minute meal period for every five hours of work as is required by Labor Code § 512
2 and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) and in violation of *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior*
3 *Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004 (2012). Failure to provide a meal in accordance with the applicable Wage
4 Order(s) results in payment by the employer of one additional hour of pay at the employee's
5 regular rate of pay for each workday that the rest or meal period is not provided. (Labor Code §
6 226.7.) Defendant also cannot create "incentives to forego, or otherwise encourage[] the skipping
7 of legally protected breaks." *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4th at 1040. Moreover, when time records
8 show short, missed, and late meal periods, there is a presumption that an employer violated
9 California's meal period requirements. *See Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC*, 11 Cal.5th 58, 78
10 (2021) ("If time records show noncompliant meal periods, then a rebuttable presumption of
11 liability arises.").

12 Plaintiffs contend that Defendant's practice of administering its meal period policies is
13 unlawful. **First**, Defendant's time records show substantial violations in which Plaintiffs and other
14 employees' meal periods were cut short, missed entirely, or taken late because Defendants severely
15 understaffed their testing sites, which under *Donahue*, create a presumption that Defendants were
16 not in compliance with the law. Plaintiffs' expert calculated a 32.8% violation rate across the class
17 pay period.

18 **Second**, based on Plaintiffs' expert analysis, despite the presumed violation rate, there
19 were less than \$15,000 in meal period premiums paid during the class period. Plaintiffs contend
20 that the dearth of meal period premiums paid to the putative class demonstrates that Defendants
21 had a pattern and practice of neglecting to pay meal period premiums for meals which were late,
22 short, interrupted, missed, or on-duty – which represents significant liability exposure for
23 Defendants.

24 Notwithstanding the above, Defendant contends that Plaintiff and class members had the
25 ability and in fact did take meal periods which is reflected in the time records. Defendants
26 contend that, if Plaintiff and the class members failed to take their lunch breaks, it was their own
27 choice, and therefore not actionable.
28

1 Class Counsel and their expert calculated the maximum verdict value of the meal break
2 claim to be approximately \$235,000. This calculation is based on a 32.8% violation rate for the
3 class members, and average rate of pay based on the payroll data for the class. Based on
4 discussions with Plaintiffs and interviews of other Class Members, and the defenses raised,
5 Plaintiffs believe they had a ten percent probability of recovering all of these damages.
6 Accordingly, Plaintiff contends the reasonable exposure of the meal break claim is
7 approximately **\$23,500**.

8 i. Rest period liability and damages

9 Section 12(A) of the IWC Wage Order(s) states: “Every employer shall authorize and
10 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
11 each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily
12 at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However,
13 a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three
14 and one-half (3½) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which
15 there shall be no deduction from wages.”

16 During rest periods, “employees must not only be relieved of work duties, but also be
17 freed from employer control over how they spend their time.” *Augustus v. ABM Sec. Servs., Inc.*,
18 2 Cal.5th 257, 270 (2016). Further, when an employer adopts common policies that prevent
19 employees from taking their rest breaks, it presents a common factual issue by which liability
20 may follow. *See Jaimez v. Daiohs USA, Inc.*, 181 Cal.App.4th 1286, 1304 (2010). Indeed, “[t]he
21 wage orders and governing statute do not countenance an employer’s exerting coercion against
22 the taking of, creating incentives to forego, or otherwise encouraging the skipping of legally
23 protected breaks.” *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4th at 1040.

24 Plaintiffs contend that Defendant did not authorize or permit Plaintiffs or the class members
25 duty-free rest periods for several reasons. **First**, rest periods were not allowed, and Defendants
26 disciplined Plaintiffs when they attempted to take them. Defendants’ record sampling reflected
27 that only \$3,400 was paid for rest period premium payments for rest period violations. The almost
28

1 complete lack of premium pay “would require perfection or, more likely, a ‘deep, system-wide
2 error’ in failing to pay such premiums.” *In re Tea Station Inv.*, 2021 Bankr. LEXIS 2985, at *22
3 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 26, 2021). In *Safeway v. Superior Court* (2015) 238 Cal. App. 4th 1138, 1153, the
4 Court counseled against arguments that are based on human perfection.

5 **Second**, because of the short-staffing, Plaintiffs contend that their and other class members’
6 rest periods were always interrupted with work inquiries and other duties, and employees were on-
7 call while they worked, which is “irreconcilable with employees’ retention of freedom to use rest
8 periods for their own purposes. *See Augustus, supra*, 2 Cal.5th at 270.

9 Defendant again contends that Plaintiff and class members had the ability and in fact did
10 take compliant rest breaks and that, if Plaintiff and the class members failed to take rest breaks, it
11 was their own choice, and therefore not actionable. Class Counsel and their expert assumed a
12 100% violation rate for all shifts by class members of 3.5 hours or more, based on discussions
13 with Plaintiffs and other class members. Based on that assumption, Class Counsel calculated
14 total violations across the class, multiplied by an average rate of pay for the class members. As
15 such, Class Counsel calculated the maximum verdict value of the rest period claims to be
16 approximately \$808,423. Based on the defenses raised, the difficulty of proving rest period
17 violations on a class wide basis, and the lack of objective evidence proving such violations,
18 Plaintiffs believe they had a ten percent chance of recovering all of the rest period damages. As
19 such, Plaintiffs believe the reasonable exposure of the rest break claim is approximately **\$80,842**.
20

21 **c. Waiting Time Penalty**

22 The waiting time penalty claim is purely derivative. Class Counsel analyzed the data to
23 find that there are approximately 396 former employees included in the putative class that would
24 be eligible for the Labor Code §203 penalties. Class Counsel calculated the total verdict value at
25 approximately \$3,200,000. (Bartz Decl., ¶ 20.c). This amount was calculated by multiplying the
26 average daily rate of pay during the statutory period by 30, which is the maximum number of
27 days allowable as waiting time penalties under section 203, and then multiplying that by the total
28

number of former employees. Plaintiffs further discounted the waiting time penalty claim based on risk and the fact that waiting time penalties are not awarded if a good faith dispute exists as to whether the wages were owing, including whether in fact non-California based employees would be entitled to waiting time penalties. Further, the class would have the burden of proving a “willful” withholding of wages. Plaintiffs considered that under Labor Code §203 there is only a penalty if "an employer willfully fails to pay" all wages due to an employee upon separation. Willfulness does not exist if there is a "good faith dispute," in fact or law that wages were due, even if the employer's reasoning ultimately proves incorrect. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1204; 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 13520 ("A 'good faith dispute' that any wages are due occurs when an employer presents a defense, based in law or fact which, if successful, would preclude any recover on the part of the employee. The fact that a defense is ultimately unsuccessful will not preclude a finding that a good faith dispute did exist.")

Once Plaintiffs determined the maximum reasonable exposure of the claim, Plaintiffs placed a settlement value of **\$160,000** or approximately ten percent of the reasonable exposure value, based upon the above discounts applied to the reasonable settlement value of the claim.

d. Paystub

As to the paystub penalty, which is derivative of the other claims identified above, Class Counsel arrived at a maximum reasonable exposure of this claim of approximately \$323,350. This figure was arrived at by assuming that each wage statement that was provided to the class members violated LC §226, and multiplying the number of pay periods during the statutory period by \$50 for initial violations, and \$100 for subsequent violations.

Defendant argues that, even assuming there are any violations, which it denies, the derivative violations were minor and that the Defendant presented evidence of a good faith dispute as to any violation. *Hurst v. Buczek Enters., LLC* (N.D. Cal. 2012) 870 F.Supp.2d 810, 829 (no section 226 violation where the employer "makes a good faith claim" in its defense); *Harris v. Vector Mktg. Corp.* (2009) 656 F.Supp.2d 1128, 1146 (N.D. Cal. 2009) (the "employer did not knowingly and intentionally fail to provide itemized wage statements" where there was a

1 "good faith dispute").

2 Based on the raised defenses, as well as the risk of certification and related risks of
3 proving all violations, Plaintiffs have placed a reasonable settlement value of **\$32,335** or ten
4 percent of the reasonable exposure of the pay stub claim.

5 **e. Reimbursement Claim**

6 Labor Code section 2802 provides, in pertinent part: “An employer shall indemnify his
7 or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
8 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
9 the employer. . .” The purpose of section 2802 is “to prevent employers from passing their
10 operating expenses on to their employees.” *Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.*, 42 Cal.4th
11 554, 562 (2007).

12 Plaintiffs and the class members contend that they were required to use their own
13 personal cell phones for their work, and therefore reimbursement was required. *See Cochran v.*
14 *Schwan's Home Serv., Inc.*, 228 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1144 (2014) (finding that reimbursement for
15 personal cell phone usage required when mandatory for performing one’s job). Plaintiffs and
16 putative class members often traveled internationally when on “embark” projects, i.e. when
17 working aboard traveling cruise ships, performing COVID tests and providing vaccines. When
18 traveling internationally, putative class members would pay astronomical fees when using their
19 personal devices, particularly when making calls, sending texts, and data roaming. Defendants
20 failed to furnish putative class members with an international phone plan or reimbursement for
21 text, call, and data-roaming fees, even though putative class members were obligated to use their
22 personal cell-phones to clock in and out, respond to Slack channel and iMessage correspondence,
23 and check their daily schedules.

24 Additionally, class members were required to purchase PPE and other equipment for the
25 testing facilities, but class members were not reimbursed for these reasonable and necessary
26 business expenses.
27
28

1 Defendant contends that it paid for all reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by
2 Plaintiffs and class members, and that the reimbursement claim has little to no value.

3 Based on testimony from Plaintiffs and the class members, Plaintiffs fairly allocate \$50
4 per month for the reimbursement claim. As such, the value of this claim as calculated by
5 Plaintiffs' expert is approximately \$137,845.

6 Based on the Defendant's defenses, and issues in proving the reimbursement claim on a
7 class-wide basis, Plaintiff alleges he had a ten percent chance of recovery here, and the realistic
8 value of the reimbursement claim is therefore approximately **\$13,784**.

9 **f. PAGA**

10 Plaintiffs contend that PAGA penalties are owed based on the numerous alleged Labor
11 Code violations identified above. Once a PAGA violation is found, a court must award civil
12 penalties. *See Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1211-1213.
13 Nevertheless, a court has discretion to reduce the award of civil penalties if it finds that "based
14 on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award
15 that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory." Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(e)(2).

16 Significantly, moreover, because it is an open question regarding the Defendant's
17 liability, there is a very real possibility that a court would substantially reduce the penalties, even
18 if they are proven. *See, e.g., Fleming v. Covidien, Inc.*, 2011 WL 7563047, *3-4 (C.D. Cal.
19 2011) (reducing penalties from \$2.8 million to \$500,000 based on wage statement violations
20 because to assess full penalties would be unjust and arbitrary); *Thurman v. Bayshore Transit*
21 *Mgmt., Inc.*, 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1134 (2012) (reduction of PAGA penalties by 30% affirmed
22 on appeal).

23 Class Counsel and their expert calculated the reasonable PAGA penalties to be valued at
24 \$2,140,000 which includes the stacking of penalties for numerous violations, as set forth above.
25 Based on the uncertainty of recovery on Plaintiff's claims, Plaintiff believes the PAGA claim's
26 reasonable value is five percent of the total value, or approximately **\$107,000**.

1
2 **g. Total Damage Exposure²**

3 Plaintiffs believe that the \$220,000 settlement achieved in this case is a good result for
4 the class members. Based upon a reasonable exposure value of \$476,841, the settlement
5 represents approximately 46% of that total value. Given the many defenses raised, the
6 uncertainty of the certifiability of any class, and the risks of going to trial, Class Counsel believe
7 this settlement is a good result for all of the class members.

8 **NUMEROSITY AND ASCERTAINABILITY**

9 21. Based on payroll and other employment records, Defendant has identified
10 approximately 570 employees who fit within the class, who worked 11,900 workweeks. As
11 such, the Class is ascertainable based on Defendant's employment records and are numerous
12 under any legal standard, therefore satisfying the numerosity requirements in California pursuant
13 to California Code of Civil Procedure §382. The Class is defined as follows:

14 All non-exempt current and former employees who worked in California for Defendant
15 during the Class Period (April 5, 2021 through April 5, 2025).

16
17 **COMMONALITY**

18 22. Common questions of law and fact predominate here for purposes of settlement,
19 as the main issues involve the legality of Defendant's policies regarding the failure to pay all
20 wages, failure to provide all legally compliant off duty and uninterrupted meal periods, the
21 failure to provide all legally compliant off duty and uninterrupted paid rest periods, failure to
22 timely furnish accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to timely pay all former employees
23 all wages owed, and failure to reimburse for business expenses.

24
25 ² The Unfair Competition claim is subsumed into the *Kullar* analysis above. The Unfair
26 Competition claim is based upon the wage and hour violations, and adds an extra year of
27 damages, and is included within the above analysis.
28

23. Plaintiffs contend that these are all pay policy questions that are uniform and can be proven by common objective evidence. The evidence to support these claims consists of pay policies, payroll records, time records and pay stubs given to all Class Members.

TYPICALITY AND ADEQUACY

24. The claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the Class Members. The proposed Class Representatives are adequate Class Representatives because they will adequately and fairly represent the Class and will not place their interests above any Member of the Class. The Class Representatives worked for the Defendant in the state of California during the relevant time period and, therefore, worked under the same policies and procedures and was paid according to the same pay plans for the entire period, as all other Class Members.

ATTORNEY COMPETENCE IN CLASS ACTIONS

25. I am experienced class action counsel, including specializing in wage and hour and employment claims. Some of the class action litigation on which I have served as Class Counsel include:

- a. *Wilkins, et al. v. Equinox Holdings, Inc.*
Los Angeles Superior Court, No.: BC440058
- b. *TBC Retail Group Wage and Hour Cases*
Los Angeles Superior Court, No.: JCCP No. 4701
- c. *Casserly v. Randstad US, L.P., et al.*
U.S.D.C., Central District of California, No. SACV 12-1023-DOC(ANx)
- d. *Crilly v. Micro Electronics, Inc.*
Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30-2013-00662586-CU-OE-CXC
- e. *Concho, et al. v. Pipeline Carriers, Inc. et al.*
Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30:2013-00649600-DU-OE-CXC
- f. *Holsted et al. v. R.J. Noble Company et. al.*
Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30:2010-00379770-CU-OE-CXC
- g. *Piggue v. Chief Protective Services, Inc.*

- 1 Orange County Superior Court, No.:30-2013-00688107-CU-OE-CXC
- 2 h. *Walsh v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company*
- 3 Orange County Superior Court, No.:30-2011-00498062-CU-OE-CXC
- 4 i. *Woods v. JFK Memorial Hospital*
- 5 Riverside County Superior Court, No.: INC 1205209
- 6 j. *Ramirez et. al v. Titan Insurance of New Mexico*
- 7 Riverside County Superior Court, No.: RIC1211890
- 8 k. *DeSantos v. Jaco Oil Company, et al.*
- 9 U.S.D.C. Eastern District of California, No. 1:14-CV-00738-JLT
- 10 l. *Duran v. Big 5 Corp.*
- 11 Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC557154
- 12 m. *Sheahan v. Celtic Leasing Corporation, Inc.*
- 13 Orange County Superior Court No.: 30-2016-00852151-CU-OE-CXC
- 14 n. *Panasis v. Control4 Corporation*
- 15 United States District Court, Central District of California
- 16 Case No. SACV-16-1179-DOC
- 17 o. *O&R Construction, LLC v. Dun & Bradstreet, et al.*
- 18 United States District Court, Western District of Washington
- 19 Case No. C12-2184 TSZ
- 20 p. *Matthews v. Whelan Security of California, Inc.*
- 21 Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30-2016-00833250-CU-OE-CXC
- 22 q. *Rodriguez v. R.J. Noble Company (Navarro/Kles),*
- 23 Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30-2017-00916018-CU-OE-CXC
- 24 r. *Wang v. Fountain Valley Regional Hospital*
- 25 Orange County Superior Court, No. 30-2015-00821329-CU-OE-CXC
- 26 s. *Skerl v. Sutter Bay Hospitals*
- 27 San Mateo Superior Court, No. 21-CIV-02057
- 28

1 26. I graduated from Vanderbilt University in 1992 with a Bachelor of Arts in
2 Economics and English, and graduated from Southwestern Law School in 1998. Since becoming
3 a lawyer in 1998, my practice has focused on complex litigation matters, and for the last decade,
4 complex employment law and wage and hour matters.

5 27. I am a member of the California State Bar, the Orange County Bar Association,
6 and Los Angeles County Bar Association. I have an AV rating from Martindale-Hubbell, the
7 highest possible rating for a lawyer. During my 27+ year career, I have handled many successful
8 employment law matters both at the trial and appellate levels. I estimate that I have represented
9 plaintiffs in hundreds of employment cases, the vast majority of which have resulted in favorable
10 settlements, awards and/or verdicts for my clients. I have successfully prosecuted and obtained
11 significant recoveries in several class action lawsuits and other lawsuits involving complex legal
12 and factual issues. In 2015, I was co-lead counsel in *Walsh v. Pacific Bell*, which settled for
13 \$16,800,000. Recently, in October 2023, I was also co-lead counsel in *Skerl v. Sutter Bay*
14 *Hospitals*, in which final approval was granted for a \$12,000,000 settlement for health care
15 workers. I have also been involved in many other million and multi-million dollar verdicts and
16 settlements over the years.

17 **CLASS ENHANCEMENT AND ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS AND EXPENSES**

18 28. Plaintiffs have assisted Class Counsel in their investigation by corresponding with
19 Class Counsel to answer questions about their employment, as well as the working conditions of
20 other employees. Plaintiffs also spent many hours conferring with Class Counsel both prior to
21 and after initiating this litigation, assisted Class Counsel with interpreting the informal discovery
22 produced by Defendant, and produced payroll and other employment records to assist Class
23 Counsel in pursuing the claims in this case.

24 29. Based on the above, and the Declarations of the Class Representatives Paul Lowe
25 and Corielyn Marie Hall filed concurrently, the requested service payment of \$15,000, that is,
26 \$7,500 to each Plaintiff, is appropriate and justified.
27
28

1 30. Plaintiffs also intend to request attorneys' fees not to exceed thirty five percent of
2 the settlement, and reimbursement of costs not to exceed \$15,000. Class Counsel have achieved
3 a good result, and believe that the percentage requested is fair and appropriate in this case, and
4 all of the costs requested assisted in the prosecution of this case. Class Counsel will submit
5 detailed declarations and attorneys' bills and costs with their motion for final approval. Class
6 Counsel also have a written fee splitting agreement, and Plaintiff Lowe has provided written
7 approval for this fee split.

8 31. Additionally, Plaintiffs will request that the Settlement Administrator, Phoenix, be
9 paid no more than \$10,000 to administer the settlement. Attached as **Exhibit D** is a true and
10 correct copy of Phoenix's not to exceed quote to administer this case.

11 **TRANSMITTING THE NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT**

12 32. In my opinion, the best and most practicable method to notify class members is by
13 mail, as all members of the Class were at one time employed by Defendant and worked in
14 California. For current employees of Defendant who are class members, Defendant has current
15 addresses. I am also informed and believe that Defendant maintains last known addresses for all
16 of their former employees, so mailing the notices is preferable to some other method. In the
17 event former employees are no longer at the addresses maintained by Defendant, Phoenix will
18 engage in skip tracing to track down their current addresses. In the unlikely event that any
19 member of the Class does not have a verifiable address or cannot be located after skip tracing,
20 any amounts due to go to that member will go to the State of California, State Controller's
21 Office, so that class members can claim his or her settlement funds at a later time.

22 33. Concurrently with the filing of this Motion, Plaintiffs have also transmitted all
23 papers filed with this Court to the Labor Workforce and Development Agency/Department of
24 Industrial Relations, by online submission, at its website located at <https://dir.govfa.net/315>.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true
2 and correct. Executed on August 28, 2025, at Irvine, California.

3
4 //Aaron A. Bartz//

Aaron A. Bartz
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND CLASS NOTICE

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) is made by and between plaintiffs Paul Lowe and Corielyn Marie Hall (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendants Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC, Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC, Ambulnz, Inc., and DocGo Inc. (“Defendants”). The Agreement refers to Plaintiffs and Defendants collectively as “Parties,” or individually as “Party.”

1. DEFINITIONS.

- 1.1. “Actions” mean collectively the Plaintiffs’ lawsuits alleging wage and hour violations against Defendants captioned *Lowe v. Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV07047 (the “Lowe Action”); *Corielyn Marie Hall v. Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV30534 (“Hall Class Action”); and *Corielyn Marie Hall v. Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV04232 (“Hall PAGA Action”).
- 1.2. “Administrator” means Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions (“Phoenix”), 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 of the Settlement.
- 1.4. “Aggrieved Employee” means all current and former non-exempt employees who have worked in California for Defendants at any time during the PAGA Period.
- 1.5. “Class” means all current and former non-exempt employees who worked in California for Defendants during the Class Period.
- 1.6. “Class Counsel” means Bartz Law Group, APC, United Employees Law Group, PC, and Bibiyan Law Group, P.C.
- 1.7. “Class Counsel Fees Payment” and “Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment” mean the amounts allocated to Class Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable attorneys’ fees and expenses, respectively, incurred to prosecute the Actions.
- 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, and number of Class Period Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods.
- 1.9. “Class Member” or “Settlement Class Member” means a member of the Class, as either a Participating Class Member or Non-Participating Class Member (including a Non-Participating Class Member who qualifies as an Aggrieved Employee), during the Class Period.
- 1.10. “Class Member Address Search” means the Administrator’s investigation and search for current Class Member mailing addresses using all reasonably available sources, methods and means including, but not limited to, the National Change of Address database, skip traces, and direct contact by the Administrator with Class Members.
- 1.11. “Class Notice” means the COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL, to be

mailed to Class Members, without material variation, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

- 1.12. "Class Period" means the period from April 5, 2021 through April 5, 2025.
- 1.13. "Class Representatives" mean the named Plaintiffs Paul Lowe and Corielyn Marie Hall, seeking Court approval to serve as Class Representatives.
- 1.14. "Class Representative Service Payments" means the payment to the Class Representatives for initiating the Actions and providing services in support of the Actions.
- 1.15. "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles.
- 1.16. "Defendants" mean Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC, Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC, Ambulnz, Inc., and DocGo Inc.
- 1.17. "Defense Counsel" means Jennifer Jambor-Delgado and Emilie MacLean of Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP.
- 1.18. "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) if no Participating Class Member objects to the Settlement, the day the Court enters Judgment; (b) if one or more Participating Class Members objects to the Settlement, the day after the deadline for filing a notice of appeal from the Judgment; or if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.
- 1.19. "Final Approval" means the Court's order granting final approval of the Settlement.
- 1.20. "Final Approval Hearing" means the Court's hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement.
- 1.21. "Final Judgment" means the Judgment Entered by the Court upon Granting Final Approval of the Settlement.
- 1.22. "Gross Settlement Amount" means Two Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$220,000.00) which is the total amount Defendants agree to pay under the Settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payments, and the Administrator's Expenses.
- 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.
- 1.25. "Judgment" means the judgment approved by Defense Counsel and entered by the Court based upon the Final Approval.
- 1.26. "LWDA" means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the

agency entitled, under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).

- 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 Representatives’ Service Payments, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment. The remainder is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments.
- 1.29. “Non-Participating Class Member” means any Class Member who opts out of the Settlement by sending the Administrator a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.
- 1.30. “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 from March 30, 2022 through April 5, 2025.
- 1.32. “PAGA” means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698. et seq.).
- 1.33. “PAGA Notices” means Plaintiffs’ January 11, 2023 and December 14, 2023 letters to Defendants and the LWDA providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a), asserting claims for civil penalties under, among other things, Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 221, 223, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 245, 246, 432, 510, 512, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1527, 2699, 2802, 2810.5, 3366, 3457, 6403, 6409.6, 8397.4.
- 1.34. “PAGA Penalties” means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount (\$10,000.00), allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees (\$2,500.00) and 75% to LWDA (\$7,500.00) 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 from the Settlement.
- 1.36. “Plaintiffs” mean Paul Lowe and Corielyn Marie Hall, the named plaintiffs in the Actions.
- 1.37. “Preliminary Approval” means the Court’s Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.
- 1.38. “Preliminary Approval Order” means the proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of PAGA Settlement.
- 1.39. “Released Class Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.3 below.
- 1.40. “Released PAGA Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.4 below.
- 1.41. “Released Parties” means: Defendants Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC, Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC, Ambulnz, Inc., and DocGo Inc., and their respective present and former officers, directors, principals, shareholders, employees, representatives, and agents during the Class Period and their respective successors and predecessors in

interest, subsidiaries, affiliates, and parents.

- 1.42. “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.
- 1.43. “Response Deadline” means 45 days after the Administrator mails Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) fax, or mail Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) fax or mail his or her Objection to the Settlement.
- 1.44. “Settlement” means the disposition of the Actions effected by this Agreement and the Judgment.
- 1.45. “Workweek” means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendants for at least one day, during the Class Period.

2. RECITALS.

- 2.1. Plaintiff Paul Lowe filed the *Lowe* Action on March 30, 2023, and Plaintiff Corielyn Marie Hall filed the *Hall* Class Action and the *Hall* PAGA Action on December 14, 2023 and February 20, 2024, respectively. The Actions alleged causes of action against Defendants for Violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, Failure to Pay Wages including Minimum and Overtime Wages, Failure to Maintain Accurate Payroll Records, Failure to Timely Pay Wages, Waiting Time Penalties, Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate Wage Statements, Failure to Provide Meal and Rest Periods, Failure to Reimburse Expenses, Violation of Labor Code § 227.3, and Violation of the PAGA. Defendants deny the allegations alleged in the Actions, deny any failure to comply with the laws identified in the Actions, and deny any and all liability for the causes of action alleged.
- 2.2. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiffs gave written notice to Defendants and the LWDA by sending the PAGA Notices.
- 2.3. On February 5, 2025, the Parties attended a Mediation before Gig Kyriacou, Esq., which resulted in this Agreement to settle the Actions.
- 2.4. Prior to engaging in Mediation, Plaintiffs obtained, through informal discovery, time and payroll records of Defendants, policy documents, and other information and data sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 (“*Dunk/Kullar*”).
- 2.5. The Court has not granted class certification.

3. MONETARY TERMS.

- 3.1. Gross Settlement Amount. Defendants promise to pay Two Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$220,000.00) and no more as the Gross Settlement Amount, and to separately pay any and all applicable employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments. Defendants agree to pay the Gross Settlement Amount, which is the total and all-inclusive amount that Defendants will be obligated to pay under the Settlement embodied by this Agreement. Except as set forth in Paragraph 9, under no circumstances shall the Settlement sum exceed the sum of \$220,000.00, inclusive of class payments, PAGA penalties, attorney’ fees and

costs, and administration expenses. 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. The Administrator will make and deduct the following payments from the Gross Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in the Final Approval:
- 3.3. To Plaintiffs: Class Representatives Service Payments in the amount of not more than Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00) to the Class Representatives, with \$7,500 being paid to Plaintiff Paul Lowe, and \$7,500 paid to Plaintiff Corielyn Marie Hall, in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representatives are entitled to receive as Participating Class Members. Defendants will not oppose Plaintiffs' request for the Class Representatives Service Payments that do not exceed the above amount. If the Court approves Class Representatives Service Payments less than the amount requested, the remainder shall be allocated to the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representatives' Service Payments using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiffs assume full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representatives' Service Payments.
- 3.4. To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than thirty-five percent of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be Seventy-Seven Thousand Dollars (\$77,000.00) and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00). Defendants will not oppose requests for these payments provided that they do not exceed these amounts. 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 the Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation 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.
- 3.5. To the Administrator: An Administrator Expenses Payment not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Expenses are less or the Court approves payment less than 10,000, the Administrator will allocate the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount.
- 3.6. 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.
 - 3.6.1. Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. 20% of each Participating Class

Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on IRS W-2 Forms by the Administrator. The 80% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for 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 by the Administrator. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.

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

3.7. To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 75% (\$7,500.00) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% (\$2,500.00) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

3.7.1. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties of \$2,500.00 by the total number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Period Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

3.7.2. 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.

4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS.

4.1. Class Workweeks. Based on a review of its records to date, Defendants estimate there are approximately 11,900 Workweeks from April 5, 2021 to February 5, 2025.

4.2. Class Data. Not later than 30 days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, Defendants will simultaneously deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of this Settlement and for no other purpose, and restrict access to the Class Data to Administrator employees who need access to the Class Data to effect and perform under this Agreement. 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 Gross Settlement Amount. Defendants shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund the amount necessary to fully pay Defendants' share of payroll taxes within 20 days of the Effective Date. All such funds shall be transmitted to the Administrator.
- 4.4. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Within 20 days after the Defendants fully fund the entire 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 Payments.
 - 4.4.1. The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and/or Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Class Members via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. The face of each check shall prominently state the date (not less than 180 days after the date of 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 Settlement Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator will send checks for Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as Aggrieved Employees (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. Before mailing any checks, the Settlement Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National Change of Address Database.
 - 4.4.2. The Administrator must conduct a Class Member Address Search for all other Class Members whose checks are returned undelivered without a USPS forwarding address. Within 7 days of receiving a returned check the Administrator must re-mail checks to the USPS forwarding address provided or to an address ascertained through the Class Member Address Search. The Administrator need not take further steps to deliver checks to Class Members whose re-mailed checks are returned as undelivered. The Administrator shall promptly send a replacement check to any Class Member whose original check was lost or misplaced, requested by the Class Member prior to the void date.
 - 4.4.3. For any Class Member whose Individual Class Payment check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b).
 - 4.4.4. The payment of Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments shall not obligate 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.

5. **RELEASES 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, Class Members, and Class Counsel will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

5.1. Plaintiffs' Release. Plaintiffs and their respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, generally, fully release and forever discharge Defendants and the Released Parties from any and all claims, causes of action, damages, wages, benefits, expenses, penalties, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, attorney's fees, costs, and any other form of relief or remedy in law, equity, or whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected that arise from or are related to Plaintiffs' employment by Defendants or the Actions, including but not limited to: (1) the Actions and any claims arising out of or related to the Actions; (2) any claims under federal, state or local law for or relating to wages, benefits, compensation, vacation or other paid time off, and claims for liquidated damages, penalties, or costs and fees associated therewith, including under the California Labor Code; (3) wrongful termination, discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation, including under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Family Medical Leave Act, the California Family Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Equal Pay Act, the California Labor Code, the California Government Code, (4) any act, omission, or occurrence or claim arising out of or related to the Actions or Plaintiffs' employment or termination thereof with Defendants taking place on or before the Effective Date; and (5) any other form of relief or remedy of any kind, nature, or description whatsoever, whether premised on statute, contract, tort, or other theory of liability under state, federal, or local law. 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, workers' compensation benefits that arose at any time, or based on occurrences outside the Class Period. 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.

- 5.2. Plaintiffs' Waiver of Rights Under California 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.

- 5.3. Released Class Claims 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 all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the Class Period facts stated in the Actions and Plaintiffs' PAGA Notices, including claims under the California Labor Code, California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, regulations, and/or other provisions of law, failure to pay wages (including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages), failure to pay all minimum wages and overtime wages due, failure to provide compliant meal periods and associated premium pay, failure to provide compliant rest periods and associated premium pay, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to timely pay wages upon termination of employment, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to pay vacation wages, waiting time penalties, failure to maintain requisite payroll records, failure to reimburse expenses, including Labor Code sections section 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 2699, 2802, and unfair or unlawful business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* The Released Class Claims also mean any claims, rights, demands, liabilities, damages, wages, benefits, expenses, penalties, debts, obligations, attorneys' fees, costs, any other form of relief or remedy in law, equity, or whatever kind or nature, and causes of action, that could potentially arise from the receipt of any monies as a result of this Settlement by any member of the Class.

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

5.4. Released PAGA Claims by Aggrieved Employees: All Aggrieved Employees, the State of California and Plaintiffs shall be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, released, and discharged Released Parties from the claims for civil penalties that could have been sought by the Labor Commissioner for the violations of the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 identified in the PAGA Notice and the Actions during the PAGA Period. The Aggrieved Employees will be issued a check for their share of the individual PAGA payment and will not have the opportunity to opt out of, or object to, the individual PAGA payment and release of the PAGA claims set forth herein. The Aggrieved Employees are bound by the release of the PAGA claims regardless of whether they cash or deposit their individual PAGA payment or opt out of being a Class Member.

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

6.1. 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. (s)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of PAGA Settlement; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from the Administrator

attaching its “not to exceed” bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve; competency; and operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data, and other documents reasonable and necessary to secure approval of the Settlement.

- 6.2. Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than 30 days 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. Class Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order to the Administrator.
- 6.3. Duty to Cooperate. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed Motion for Preliminary Approval, proposed Judgment, 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.
- 6.4. Plaintiffs’ Counsel shall submit a copy of the proposed settlement to the LWDA at the same time that it is submitted to the Court pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2). Additionally, Plaintiffs’ Counsel shall submit a copy of the court’s order granting the motion for final approval and Judgment to the LWDA within ten (10) days after entry of the order or Judgment pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(s)(3).

7. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.

- 7.1. Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Phoenix to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Phoenix agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for payment of Administration Expenses. The Parties and their Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.
- 7.2. Employer Identification Number. The Administrator shall have and use its own Employer Identification Number for purposes of calculating payroll tax withholdings and providing reports to state and federal tax authorities.
- 7.3. Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund (“QSF”) under US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1.
- 7.4. Notice to Class Members.
 - 7.4.1. No later than three (3) business days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and

state the number of Class Members, PAGA Members, Workweeks, and Pay Periods in the Class Data.

- 7.4.2. Using best efforts to perform as soon as possible, and in no event later than 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will send to all Class Members identified in the Class Data, via first-class United States Postal Service (“USPS”) mail, the Class Notice, substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as Exhibit A. The first page of the Class Notice shall prominently estimate the dollar amounts of any Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment payable to the Class Member, and the number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if applicable) used to calculate these amounts. Before mailing Class Notices, the Administrator shall update Class Member addresses using the National Change of Address database.
- 7.4.3. Not later than 5 business days after the Administrator’s receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.
- 7.4.4. If the Administrator, Defendants or Class Counsel is contacted by or otherwise discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class Data and should have received Class Notice, the Parties will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, in an effort to agree on whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class Members, and the Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than 14 days after receipt of Class Notice, or the deadline dates in the Class Notice, whichever are later.

7.5. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

- 7.5.1. Class Members who wish to exclude themselves (opt-out of) the Class Settlement must send the Administrator, by fax or mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice, plus an additional 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 or postmarked by the Response Deadline.
- 7.5.2. The Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Administrator shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Administrator can reasonably ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member’s desire to be excluded. The Administrator’s

determination shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. If the Administrator has reason to question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Administrator may demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Administrator's determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.

7.5.3. Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the Participating Class Members' Releases under Paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 of this Agreement, regardless of whether the Participating Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.

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

7.6. Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks. Each Class Member shall have 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice 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 or mail. 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, redacting all identifying information, to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination of the challenges. The Court will have the final authority in the event that challenges from Class Members remain unresolved.

7.7. Objections to Settlement.

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

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

additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed. Not later than 5 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Objections, 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 Objections; and (b) copies of all Objections submitted (whether valid or invalid).

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

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

7.8.1. Website, Email Address and Toll-Free Number. The Administrator will establish 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 Representatives' Service Payments, 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.

7.8.2. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-outs) and Exclusion List. The Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than 5 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing the number of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"). Unless otherwise instructed by the Court, the Class Administrator shall keep all class contact information confidential.

7.8.3. Weekly Reports. The Administrator must, on a weekly basis, provide written reports to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel that, among other things, tally the number of: Class Notices mailed or re-mailed, Class Notices returned undelivered, Requests for Exclusion (whether valid or invalid) received with all identifying information redacted, objections received with all identifying information redacted, challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods received and/or resolved with all identifying information redacted, 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 redacted copies of all Requests for Exclusion and objections received.

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

otherwise.

- 7.8.5. Administrator's Declaration. Not later than 14 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 Exclusion from Settlement it received (both valid or invalid), the number of written objections and attach the redacted Exclusion List (unless the Court later requires identification of individuals on the Exclusion list). The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court, including as to disclosure of the identity of individuals who opted out of the settlement class. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration(s) in Court.
- 7.8.6. Final Report by Settlement Administrator. Within 10 days after the Administrator disburses all funds in the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing its disbursements by employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least 15 days before any deadline set by the Court, the Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration in Court.

8. MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL. Not later than 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, subd. (s)(2), 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 five days prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval and proposed Judgment.

- 8.1. 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 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered or accepted by the Court.
- 8.2. Duty to Cooperate. If the Court does not grant Final Approval or conditions Final Approval on any material change to the Settlement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Class Members), the Parties will expeditiously work together in good faith to address the Court's concerns by revising the Agreement as necessary to obtain Final Approval. The Court's decision to award less than the amounts requested for the Class Representative Service Payments, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Administrator

Expenses Payment shall not constitute a material modification to the Agreement within the meaning of this paragraph.

- 8.3. Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court. The Parties agree that, after entry of Judgment, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the Parties, Actions, and the Settlement solely for purposes of (i) enforcing this Agreement and/or Judgment, (ii) addressing settlement administration matters, and (iii) addressing such post-Judgment matters as are permitted by law.
- 8.4. Waiver of Right to Appeal. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement or later revisions or amendments thereto, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment reflected set forth in this Settlement, the Parties, their respective counsel, and all Participating Class Members who did not object to the Settlement as provided in this Agreement, waive all rights to appeal from the Judgment, including all rights to post-judgment and appellate proceedings, the right to file motions to vacate judgment, motions for new trial, extraordinary writs, and appeals. The waiver of appeal does not include any waiver of the right to oppose such motions, writs or appeals. If an objector appeals the Judgment, the Parties' obligations to perform under this Agreement will be suspended until such time as the appeal is finally resolved and the Judgment becomes final, except as to matters that do not affect the amount of the Net Settlement Amount.
- 8.5. 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, with any additional Administration Expenses reasonably incurred after remittitur to come from the Gross Settlement Amount. An appellate decision to vacate, reverse, or modify the Court's award of the Class Representatives' Service Payments 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.

9. CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES AND ESCALATOR CLAUSE

Based on its records, Defendants estimate that between April 5, 2021 through February 5, 2025, there are approximately 11,900 Workweeks. Should the final Workweek Amount increase by more than 10% (i.e. if the final workweeks being released are greater than 13,090) for the Class Period, the Gross Settlement Amount shall be increased proportionally by the Workweeks in excess of 13,090. For example, if the Workweeks exceed 11,900 by 12%, then the Gross Settlement Amount will increase by 2%.

10. **AMENDED JUDGMENT.** If any amended judgment is required under Code of Civil Procedure section 384, the Parties will work together in good faith to jointly submit a proposed amended judgment.
11. **DEFENDANTS' RIGHT TO RESCIND.** Defendants retain the right, in the exercise of its sole discretion, to rescind this Settlement Agreement within ten (10) days after the expiration

of the opt out period in section 7.5 above, if ten percent (10%) or more of Class Members opt out of this Settlement. All signatories and their counsel must not encourage opt-outs. All signatories and their counsel specifically agree not to solicit opt-outs, directly or indirectly, through any means. In the event that Defendants exercise the right to rescind pursuant to this paragraph, Defendants shall be responsible for all Administrator costs incurred to the date of the rescission.

12. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.

12.1 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 Actions 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 Actions have merit. The Parties agree that class certification and representative treatment is for purposes of this Settlement only. If, for any reason the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval, Final Approval or enter Judgment, Defendants reserve the right to contest certification of any class for any reason, and Defendants reserve all available defenses to the claims in the Actions, and Plaintiffs reserve the right to move for class certification on any grounds available and to contest Defendants' defenses. The Settlement, this Agreement and Parties' willingness to settle the Actions 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).

12.2. Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendants and Defense Counsel separately agree that, until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement is filed, they and each of them will not disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly, specifically or generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity except: (1) to the Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement confidential; (2) counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency.

12.3. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendants, and Defense Counsel separately agree not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any conversation or other communication, before the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, with any third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class Counsel's communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

12.4. No Solicitation. The Parties separately agree that they and their respective counsel and employees will not solicit any Class Member to opt out of or object to the Settlement, or appeal from the Judgment. Nothing in this paragraph shall be

construed to restrict Class Counsel's ability to communicate with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

- 12.5. 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.
- 12.6. Attorney Authorization. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and represent that they are authorized by Plaintiffs and Defendants, 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.
- 12.7. 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 seek the assistance of a mediator and/or the Court for resolution.
- 12.8. No Prior Assignments. The Parties separately represent and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity any portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action, or right released and discharged by the Party in this Settlement.
- 12.9. No 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.
- 12.10. 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.
- 12.11. Agreement Binding on Successors. This Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors of each of the Parties.
- 12.12. 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.
- 12.13. 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.
- 12.14. Confidentiality. To the extent permitted by law, all agreements made, and orders entered during the Actions and in this Agreement relating to the confidentiality of information shall survive the execution of this Agreement.

- 12.15. Use of Class Data. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Cal. Evid. Code §1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by 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 no other purpose, and may not be used in any way that violates any existing contractual agreement, statute, or rule of court.
- 12.16. 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.
- 12.17. 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.
- 12.18. 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:

Bartz Law Group APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92617
Attn: Aaron A. Bartz
aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

Bibiyan Law Group, P.C.
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Attn: David Bibiyan
david@tomorrowlaw.com

To Defendants:

Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP
633 W. 5th Street, 52nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Attn: Jennifer Jambor-Delgado/Emilie MacLean
jjambordelgado@grsm.com/emaclean@grsm.com

- 12.19. 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.

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

12.21. No Additional Contribution by Defendants. Defendants' monetary obligation under this Agreement is limited to the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendants shall not be required to pay more than the Gross Settlement Amount to obtain the relief (including, but not limited to, the Settlement, releases of claims and, issuance of the final order and Judgment) provided in this Agreement or to fully and finally settle and resolve the class action claims, individual claims, and PAGA claims.

Notwithstanding the above, in the event that this Agreement is voided or nullified, in whole or in part, however that may occur, or the Settlement of the Actions is barred by operation of law, or invalidated, or ordered not to be carried out by a court of competent jurisdiction, Defendants will cease to have any obligation to pay any portion of the Gross Settlement Amount to anyone under the terms of this Agreement.


12.22. Taxes. Plaintiffs and each Participating Class Member and Aggrieved Employee will be responsible for paying all applicable state, local, and federal income taxes on their respective amounts received pursuant to this Settlement, and they shall not seek any indemnification from Defendants or the Released Parties in this regard. Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel shall cooperate with Defendants and provide documentation to the extent possible and as reasonably requested to demonstrate any payment of taxes made by Plaintiffs and/or any Participating Class Member and aggrieved employee should any taxing authority challenge the allocation of any payments under this Agreement.

12.23. In the event that any portion of this Agreement is deemed illegal, invalid or unenforceable in any respect, then such invalidity, illegality or unenforceability will not affect any other provision of this Agreement, and this Agreement shall be construed as though such illegal, invalid or unenforceable provision had never been contained herein, unless a court determines the primary purpose of this Agreement would be frustrated.

IT IS SO AGREED:

Dated: 6/12/2025

PLAINTIFF PAUL LOWE

By: 
Plaintiff, Paul Lowe

PLAINTIFF LOWE'S COUNSEL

Bartz Law Group APC

Dated: 6/12/2025

By: Aaron Bartz

Signed by:
Aaron Bartz
EC5A3FE789D1423...

PLAINTIFF CORIELYN HALL

Dated:

By: Plaintiff, Corielyn Marie Hall

PLAINTIFF HALL'S COUNSEL:

Bibiyan Law Group, P.C.

Dated:

By: David Bibiyan

DEFENDANTS

Dated:

Defendant, Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC
By:
Its:

Dated:

Defendant, Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC
By:
Its:

Dated:

Defendant, Ambulnz, Inc.
By:
Its:

Dated:

Defendant, DocGo, Inc.
By:
Its:

DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL:

Bartz Law Group APC

Dated: _____

By: _____
Aaron Bartz

PLAINTIFF CORIELYN HALL

Dated: 07/08/25

By: 
Corielyn Hall (Jul 8, 2025 08:28 PDT)
Plaintiff, Corielyn Marie Hall

PLAINTIFF HALL'S COUNSEL:


Bibiyan Law Group, P.C.

Dated: _____



By: _____
David Bibiyan

DEFENDANTS


Dated: June 17, 2025

Signed by: 
Defendant, Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC
By: Ely Tendler
Its: General Counsel


Dated: June 17, 2025

Signed by: 
Defendant, Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC
By: Ely Tendler
Its: General Counsel

Dated: June 17, 2025

Signed by: 
Defendant, Ambulnz, Inc.
By: Ely Tendler
Its: General Counsel

Dated: June 17, 2025

Signed by: 
Defendant, BooGo, Inc.
By: Ely Tendler
Its: General Counsel

DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL:

Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP

Dated: June 17, 2025


By: 
Jennifer Jambor-Delgado

EXHIBIT A

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

Paul Lowe; Corielyn Marie Hall v. Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC et al.

Los Angeles Superior Court Case Nos. 23STCV07047; 23STCV30534; 24STCV04232

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.

You may be eligible to receive money from employee class action lawsuits (“Actions”) against Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC, Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC, Ambulnz, Inc. and DocGo, Inc. (“Defendants”) for alleged wage and hour violations. The Actions were filed by former employees Paul Lowe and Corielyn Marie Hall (“Plaintiffs”) and seek payment of (1) past due wages and other relief for a class of all current and former non-exempt employees (“Class Members”) who worked for Defendants in California during the Class Period (April 5, 2021 to April 5, 2025); and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) for all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California during the PAGA Period (March 30, 2022 to April 5, 2025) (“Aggrieved Employees”).

Defendants deny these allegations and maintain that they complied with the law at all times. Defendants believe that Plaintiffs’ claims are without merit.

The proposed Settlement has two main parts: (1) a Class Settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual Class Payments, and (2) a PAGA Settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual PAGA Payments and pay penalties to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”).

Based on Defendants’ records, and the Parties’ current assumptions, **your Individual Class Payment is estimated to be \$_ (less withholding) and your Individual PAGA Payment is estimated to be \$_____**. The actual amount you may receive likely will be different and will depend on a number of factors. (If no amount is stated for your Individual PAGA Payment, then according to 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 _____ pay periods** during the PAGA Period. If you believe that you worked more workweeks during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section D of this Notice.

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 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 Defendants to make 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. As a Participating Class Member, though, you will give up your right to assert Class Period wage claims and PAGA Period penalty claims against Defendants.
- (2) **Opt-Out of the Class Settlement.** You can exclude yourself from the Class Settlement (opt-out) by submitting a 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. You will, however, preserve your right to personally pursue Class Period 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 Claims).
You Can Opt-out of the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement The Opt-out Deadline is _____	If you don't want to fully participate in the proposed Settlement, you can opt-out of the Class Settlement by sending the Administrator a written Request for Exclusion. 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 F of this Notice. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement. Defendants must pay Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees and the Aggrieved Employees must give up their rights to pursue Released Claims (defined below).

Participating Class Members Can Object to the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement Written Objections Must be Submitted by _____	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 Actions on behalf of the Class. You are not personally responsible for any payments to Class Counsel or Plaintiffs. You can object to the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs if you think they are unreasonable. See Section G of this Notice.
You Can Participate in the _____ Final Approval Hearing	The Court’s Final Approval Hearing is scheduled to take place on _____. 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, by telephone 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 H of this Notice.
You Can Challenge the Calculation of Your Workweeks/Pay Periods Written Challenges Must be Submitted by _____	The amount of your Individual Class Payment and PAGA Payment (if any) depend on how many workweeks you worked at least one day during the Class Period and how many Pay Periods you worked at least one day during the PAGA Period, respectively. The number of Class Period Workweeks 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 _____. See Section D of this Notice.

A. WHAT ARE THE ACTIONS ABOUT?

Plaintiffs are former employees of Defendants. The Actions accuse Defendants of violating California labor laws by failing to pay overtime wages, minimum wages, wages due upon termination and failing to provide meal periods, rest breaks, failure to pay vacation wages, reimbursement of expenses and accurate itemized wage statements. Based on the same claims, Plaintiffs have also asserted claims for civil penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.) (“PAGA”). Plaintiffs are represented by attorneys in the Actions: Bartz Law Group APC, United Employees Law Group PC, and Bibiyan Law Group, PC (“Class Counsel.”) Defendants strongly deny violating any laws or failing to pay any wages and contend that they complied with all applicable laws.

B. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE ACTIONS HAVE SETTLED?

So far, the Court has made no determination whether Defendants or Plaintiffs are correct on the merits. In the meantime, Plaintiffs and Defendants attended Mediation with Gig Kyriacou, Esq., to resolve the case by agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations at the Mediation were successful. By signing a lengthy written settlement agreement (“Agreement”) and agreeing to jointly ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Actions 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 do 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 the risks and uncertainties of continued litigation; and (2) Settlement is in the best interests of the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine Final Approval.

C. WHAT ARE THE IMPORTANT TERMS OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT?

1. Defendants will pay Two Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$220,000.00) as the Gross Settlement Amount ("Gross Settlement"). Defendants have agreed to deposit the Gross Settlement into an account controlled by the Administrator of the Settlement. The Administrator will use the Gross Settlement to pay the Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, Class Representatives' Service Payments, Class Counsel's attorney's fees and expenses, the Administrator's expenses, and penalties to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"). Assuming the Court grants Final Approval, Defendants will fund the Gross Settlement no later than 15 days after the Judgment is entered by the Court becomes final. The Judgment will be final on the date it is entered, or a later date if Participating Class Members object to the proposed Settlement or the Judgment is appealed.
2. Court Approved Deductions from Gross Settlement. 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:
 - a. Up to Seventy-Seven Thousand Dollars (\$77,000.00) (thirty-five percent of the Gross Settlement) to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees and up to Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00) for their litigation expenses. To date, Class Counsel have worked and incurred expenses on the Actions without payment.
 - b. Up to Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00) to Plaintiffs as a Class Representative Service Payments, with \$7,500 to Plaintiff Paul Lowe, and \$7,500 to Plaintiff Corielyn Marie Hall, for filing the Actions, working with Class Counsel and representing the Class. The Class Representative Service Payments will be the only monies Plaintiffs will receive other than Plaintiffs' Individual Class Payments and any Individual PAGA Payments.
 - c. Up to Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) to the Administrator for services administering the Settlement.
 - d. Up to Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) for PAGA Penalties, allocated 75% to the LWDA PAGA Payment (\$7,500.00) and 25% in Individual PAGA Payments (\$2,500.00) to the Aggrieved Employees based on their PAGA Period Pay Periods. Participating Class Members have the right to object to any of these deductions. The Court will consider all objections.

3. Net Settlement Distributed to Class Members. After making the above deductions in amounts approved by the Court, the Administrator will distribute the rest of the Gross Settlement (the “Net Settlement”) by making Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members based on their Class Period Workweeks.
4. Taxes Owed on Payments to Class Members. Plaintiffs and Defendants are asking the Court to approve an allocation of 20% of each Individual Class Payment to taxable wages (“Wage Portion”) and 80% to interest and penalties (“Non-Wage Portion”). The Wage Portion is subject to withholdings and will be reported on IRS W-2 Forms by the Administrator. Defendants will separately pay employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion. The Individual PAGA Payments are counted as penalties rather than wages for tax purposes. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments and the Non-Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

Although Plaintiffs and Defendants have agreed to these allocations, neither side is giving you any advice on whether your Payments are taxable or how much you might owe in taxes. You are responsible for paying all taxes (including penalties and interest on back taxes) on any Payments received from the proposed Settlement. You should consult a tax advisor if you have any questions about the tax consequences of the proposed Settlement.

5. Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check issued for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments 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 monies will be sent to the California Controller’s Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member.
6. Requests for Exclusion from the Class Settlement (Opt-Outs). You will be treated as a Participating Class Member, participating fully in the Class Settlement, unless you notify the Administrator in writing, not later than **[DATE]**, that you wish to opt-out. In order to opt-out of the Settlement, you should set forth your name, present address, telephone number, and request exclusion from the settlement to the Administrator by the date set forth above. Excluded Class Members (i.e., Non-Participating Class Members) will not receive Individual Class Payments, but will preserve their rights to personally pursue wage and hour claims against Defendants.

You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the Settlement. Class Members who exclude themselves from the Class Settlement (Non-Participating Class Members) remain eligible for Individual PAGA Payments and are required to give up their right to assert PAGA claims against Defendants based on the PAGA Period facts alleged in the Actions.

7. 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.
8. Administrator. The Court has appointed a neutral company, **[INSERT]** (the

“Administrator”) to send this Notice, calculate and make payments, and process Class Members’ Requests for Exclusion. The Administrator will also decide Class Member Challenges over Workweeks, mail and re-mail settlement checks and tax forms, and perform other tasks necessary to administer the Settlement. The Administrator’s contact information is contained in Section I of this Notice.

9. Participating Class Members’ Release. After the Judgment is final and Defendants have fully funded the Gross Settlement (and separately paid the employer-side payroll taxes), Participating Class Members will be legally barred from asserting any of the claims released under the Settlement. This means that unless you opted out by validly excluding yourself from the Class Settlement, you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendants or related entities for wages based on the Class Period facts and PAGA penalties based on PAGA Period facts, as alleged in the Actions and resolved by this Settlement. The Participating Class Members will be bound by the following release:

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 all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the Class Period facts stated in the Actions and Plaintiffs’ PAGA Notices, including claims under the California Labor Code, California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, regulations, and/or other provisions of law, including failure to pay wages, failure to pay all minimum wages and overtime wages due, failure to provide compliant meal periods and associated premium pay, failure to provide compliant rest periods and associated premium pay, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to timely pay wages upon termination of employment, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to pay vacation wages, waiting time penalties, failure to maintain requisite payroll records, failure to reimburse expenses, including Labor Code sections section 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 2699, and 2802, and unfair or unlawful business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* The Released Class Claims also means any claims, rights, demands, liabilities, damages, wages, benefits, expenses, penalties, debts, obligations, attorneys’ fees, costs, any other form of relief or remedy in law, equity, or whatever kind or nature, and causes of action, that could potentially arise from the receipt of any monies as a result of this Settlement by any member of the Class.

10. Aggrieved Employees’ PAGA Release. After the Court’s judgment is final, and Defendants have paid the Gross Settlement (and separately paid the employer-side payroll taxes), all Aggrieved Employees will be barred from asserting PAGA claims against Defendants, whether or not they exclude themselves from the Settlement. This means that all Aggrieved Employees, including those who are Participating Class Members and those who opt-out of the Class Settlement, cannot sue, continue to sue, or participate in any other PAGA claim against Defendants or its related persons and

entities based on the PAGA Period facts alleged in the Actions and resolved by this Settlement. The Aggrieved Employees' Releases for Participating and Non-Participating Class Members are as follows:

All Aggrieved Employees, the State of California and Plaintiffs shall be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, released and discharged Defendants and Released Persons from the claims for civil penalties that could have been sought by the Labor Commissioner for the violations of the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 identified in the PAGA Notice and those based solely upon the facts alleged in the PAGA Notice and the Actions during the PAGA Period. The Aggrieved Employees will be issued a check for their share of the individual PAGA payment and will not have the opportunity to opt out of, or object to, the individual PAGA payment and release of the PAGA claims set forth herein. The Aggrieved Employees are bound by the release of the PAGA claims regardless of whether they cash or deposit their individual PAGA payment or opt out of being a Class Member.

D. HOW WILL THE ADMINISTRATOR CALCULATE MY PAYMENT?

1. Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual Class Payments 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.
2. Individual PAGA Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual PAGA Payments by (a) dividing \$2,500 by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees and (b) multiplying the result by the number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by each individual Aggrieved Employee.
3. Workweek/Pay Period Challenges. The number of Class Workweeks you worked during the Class Period and the number of PAGA Pay Periods you worked during the PAGA Period, as recorded in Defendants' records, are stated in the first page of this Notice. You have until **DATE** to challenge the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you. You can submit your challenge by signing and sending a letter to the Administrator via mail or fax. **Section I** of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

You need to support your challenge by sending copies of pay stubs or other records. The Administrator will accept Defendants' calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods based on Defendants' records as accurate unless you send copies of records containing contrary information. You should send copies rather than originals because the documents will not be returned to you. The Administrator will resolve Workweek and/or Pay Period challenges based on your submission and on input from Class Counsel (who will advocate on behalf of Participating Class Members) and Defendants' Counsel. The Administrator's decision is final. You can't appeal or otherwise challenge its final decision.

E. HOW WILL I GET PAID?

1. Participating Class Members. The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single

check to every Participating Class Member (i.e., every Class Member who doesn't opt-out) including those who also qualify as Aggrieved Employees. The single check will combine the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment.

2. Non-Participating Class Members. The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single Individual PAGA Payment check to every Aggrieved Employee who opts out of the Class Settlement (i.e., every Non-Participating Class Member).

Your check will be sent to the same address as this Notice. If you change your address, be sure to notify the Administrator as soon as possible. Section I of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

F. HOW DO I OPT-OUT OF THE CLASS SETTLEMENT?

Submit a written and signed letter with your name, present address, telephone number, and a simple statement that you do not want to participate in the Settlement. The Administrator will exclude you based on any writing communicating your request be excluded. Be sure to personally sign your request, and include your identifying information (full name, address, telephone number, approximate dates of employment, and social security number for verification purposes). You must make the request yourself. If someone else makes the request for you, it will not be valid. **The Administrator must be sent your request to be excluded by DATE, or it will be invalid.** Section I of the Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

G. HOW DO I OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT?

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. If you wish to remain a Class Member, but you object to the proposed settlement (or any of its terms) and wish the Court to consider your objection at the Final Approval Hearing, you may object to the proposed settlement in writing. You may also appear at the Final Approval Hearing, either in person or through an attorney at your own expense. All written objections, supporting papers, and/or notices of intent to appear at the Final Approval Hearing must clearly identify the case name and number and be mailed to the Settlement Administrator, _____, at _____. Objections must be postmarked no later than _____. You still may appear at the Final Approval Hearing and raise an objection to the settlement even if you did not submit written objections within this deadline.

H. CAN I ATTEND THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING?

You can, but don't have to, attend the Final Approval Hearing on DATE at TIME in Department 1, of the Los Angeles Superior Court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. At the Hearing, the judge will decide whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement and how much of the Gross Settlement will be paid to Class Counsel, Plaintiffs, and the Administrator. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will hear all objections, as well as arguments for and against the proposed Settlement. You have a right to attend this hearing, but you are not required to do so. You also have the right to hire an attorney to represent you, at your own expense, or to enter an appearance and represent yourself.

I. HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION?

The above is a summary of the basic terms of the settlement. For the precise terms and

conditions of the settlement, you can telephone or send an email to Class Counsel or the Administrator using the contact information listed below, or consult the Superior Court website by going to (<http://www.lacourt.org/casesummary/ui/index.aspx>) and entering the Case Numbers for the Actions, Case Nos. 23STCV07047; 23STCV30534; 24STCV04232. You can also make an appointment to personally review court documents in the Clerk's Office at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse by calling (213) 830-0800.

**DO NOT TELEPHONE OR CONTACT THE SUPERIOR COURT TO OBTAIN
INFORMATION ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT.**

**DO NOT TELEPHONE OR CONTACT DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL TO OBTAIN
INFORMATION ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT.**

Class Counsel:

Aaron A. Bartz, Esq.
aaron@bartzlawgroup.com
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Telephone: (949) 504-4413

Walter Haines, Esq.
walter@uelglaw.com
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Telephone: (562) 256-1047

David Bibiyan, Esq.
david@tomorrowlaw.com
BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Telephone: (310) 438-5555

Settlement Administrator:

Name of Company

Email Address:

Mailing Address:

Telephone:

Fax Number:

J. WHAT IF I LOSE MY SETTLEMENT CHECK?

If you lose or misplace your settlement check before cashing it, the Administrator will replace it as long as you request a replacement before the void date on the face of the original check. If your check is already void, you will have no way to recover the money. If your check is already void, you should consult the Unclaimed Property Fund for

instructions on how to retrieve your funds.

K. WHAT IF I CHANGE MY ADDRESS?

To receive your check, you should immediately notify the Administrator if you move or otherwise change your mailing address.

EXHIBIT B

BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC

5151 California Ave., Suite 100

Irvine, California 92617

(949) 504-4413

aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

January 11, 2023

Notice Via Online Submission

PAGA Administrator
California Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Via Certified Mail (Return Receipt Requested)

Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC
c/o Business Filings Incorporated
dba Delaware Business Filings Inc.
Agent for Service of Process
8020 Excelsior Drive
Madison, WI 53717

Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC
c/o Business Filings Incorporated
dba Delaware Business Filings Inc.
Agent for Service of Process
8020 Excelsior Drive
Madison, WI 53717

Re: *PAGA Letter – Paul Lowe v. Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC; Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC*

Dear PAGA Administrator:

Please be advised that Bartz Law Group, APC and United Employees Law Group represent Paul Lowe and all other similarly situated aggrieved employees (“Plaintiffs”) with respect to their employment in California with Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC and Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC (“Employers”).

Employers have committed numerous violations of the California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1198.5, and 2802. The facts and theories to support the alleged violations are set forth herein.

Employers provide testing services to customers in California. Plaintiff Lowe was employed as a non-exempt employee for Employers until November 2022. Plaintiffs worked for Employers in California within the last year, and were subject to the same wage and hour violations as Plaintiff Lowe.

A. Failure to Pay All Wages

Employers have regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs all wages that they are owed, including overtime compensation, based upon Employers’ policy and practice of failing to pay overtime compensation at the proper regular rate of pay. That is, Employers fail to properly calculate the regular rate of pay for Plaintiffs who are paid hourly wages plus other compensation. As a result of failing to calculate the regular rate properly, the overtime premium rate is not calculated properly

such that the Employers do not pay the full 1.5 premium for overtime hours and do not pay the full 2 times premium when calculating the double time premium. Further, Employers fail to pay Plaintiffs for missed meal and rest periods at the regular rate, pursuant to *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*, 11 Cal.5th 858 (2021). As such, Employers are in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510 and 1194.

Employers further fail to pay all wages owed because Plaintiffs must work off-the-clock to complete their job duties, and Employers coerce Plaintiffs to perform work before clocking in, and after clocking out for the day.

Labor Code § 204(a) provides in pertinent part that “[a]ll wages, other than those mentioned in [Labor Code] Section 201, 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.” Pursuant to Labor Code § 204(b)(1), moreover, “all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.” Here, Employers did not pay Plaintiffs’ all wages owed in a timely manner, based on the allegations above, thereby violating Labor Code § 204.

B. Meal Breaks

Employers adopted, implemented and enforced uniform meal period policies that are not lawful under California law. Employers are required to provide a first meal period no later than the end of the 5th hour of work, and a second meal period no later than the end of the 10th hour of work. Because of Employers’ policies and procedures, understaffing, and other reasons, Plaintiffs’ meal periods often were late, missed, or short, because Plaintiffs were required to complete their jobs before taking their required meal period. Moreover, Plaintiffs frequently have to work through their meal periods, and even when getting their meal period, Plaintiffs are often interrupted and/or otherwise meal periods are taken while Plaintiffs are still attending to customers, and as such, the meal periods are not duty-free.

Employers have also failed to pay Plaintiffs one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that a compliant meal period was not provided. As such, Employers have violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

C. Rest Breaks

Employers failed to adopt, implement, or enforce a rest break policy that complied with California law. Employers failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take duty-free rest periods of 10 minutes for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof, by requiring Plaintiffs to regularly work through their rest periods to complete their duties. Moreover, Employers imposed obstacles to taking of rest periods, including restricting Plaintiffs from taking their rest periods because they were attending to customers, disciplining Plaintiffs when they left their work stations to take rest periods, and otherwise discouraging the taking of rest periods. As a result of Employers’ lack of a rest break policy that complies with California law, Employers have violated Labor Code section 226.7.

Employers also failed to pay Plaintiffs one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that a compliant rest period was not authorized or permitted. As such, Employers have violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

D. Failure to Reimburse Expenses

Employers also failed to reimburse Plaintiffs for all of their necessary and reasonable expenses incurred on behalf of the Employers. For example and without limitation, Plaintiffs were required to use their personal cell phones for company business, including responding to work calls and text messages on their personal cell phones, but Employers fail and refuse to reimburse Plaintiffs for the usage of their personal cell phones while attending to work matters.

E. Wage Statement Violations

In conjunction with the above-referenced violations, Employers willfully failed to provide properly itemized wage statements to Plaintiffs pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Violations include, but are not limited to: an inaccurate showing of wages due and owing, failing to include gross wages earned as a result of not showing the correct meal and rest period premium payments on Plaintiffs' paystubs, failing to show all hourly rates in effect and the corresponding number of hours at each hourly rate, failing to identify the name of the legal entity that is the employer, failing to show the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, and failing to maintain accurate payroll and itemized wage statements. The failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements violates Labor Code § 226 and 1174.

F. Waiting Time Penalties

Employers willfully failed and refused to timely pay all compensation due and owing to Plaintiffs whose employment was terminated during the relevant time period, by failing to pay overtime, straight time and minimum wages for all hours worked, failing to pay Plaintiffs the correct regular rate of pay for overtime hours worked, and failing to pay Plaintiffs for an extra hour at the regular rate of pay because Employers failed to provide compliant meal and rest periods. As such, Employers are liable for accrued wages due, and waiting time penalties owed, in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203.

CONCLUSION

Pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699.3, the undersigned, on behalf of Plaintiff Paul Lowe and other aggrieved employees, are providing written notice of the alleged Labor Code violations. Please advise the undersigned if the agency intends to investigate the alleged violations. If not, Plaintiffs intend to pursue their claims under PAGA in a representative action lawsuit. Please also consider this letter as providing notice on behalf of other similarly aggrieved employees working for Employers, that were subject to the same Labor Code violations described above.

Should you have any questions with respect to the above, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC

/s/ Aaron A. Bartz
Aaron A. Bartz

EXHIBIT C

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413 / Fax: (949) 656-7760
Email: aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

Walter L. Haines, Esq. (SBN 71075)
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Tel.: (562) 256-1047 / Fax: (562) 256-1006
Email: walter@uelglaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff PAUL LOWE and all others similarly situated

[Additional Counsel listed on following page]

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

PAUL LOWE, an individual; CORIELYN
MARIE HALL, an individual; on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated and
the general public,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RAPID RELIABLE TESTING, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; RAPID
RELIABLE TESTING CA, LLC, a California
limited liability company; AMBULNZ, INC.,
a Delaware corporation; DOCGO INC., a
Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

08/26/2025

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: R. Lozano Deputy

) Case No.: 23STCV07047

) CLASS ACTION

) **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR:**

-) 1. Violation of B&PC §17200, et seq.
-) 2. Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198;
-) 3. Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq.;
-) 4. Failure to Pay Meal and Rest Break Premiums at the Proper Regular Rate of Pay (Labor Code §226.7)
-) 5. Failure to Provide & Maintain Accurate Wage Statements Pursuant to Labor Code §226;
-) 6. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §226.7);
-) 7. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code §226.7);
-) 8. Failure to Reimburse Expenses (Lab. Code §2802);
-) 9. Violation of Labor Code §§2698-2699 (PAGA).

) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)
david@tomorrowlaw.com
2 Vedang J. Patel (SBN 328647)
vedang@tomorrowlaw.com
3 Brandon M. Chang (SBN 316197)
brandon@tomorrowlaw.com
4 BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
5 1460 Westwood Blvd.
6 Los Angeles, CA 90024
7 Tel.: (310) 438-5555 / Fax: (310) 300-1705
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff CORIELYN MARIE HALL
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Plaintiffs PAUL LOWE and CORIELYN MARIE HALL, on behalf of themselves and
2 all other persons similarly situated, and the general public (hereinafter, “Plaintiffs”), hereby
3 complain against Defendants, RAPID RELIABLE TESTING, LLC, a Delaware limited
4 liability company; RAPID RELIABLE TESTING CA, LLC, a California limited liability
5 company; AMBULNZ, INC., a Delaware corporation; DOCGO INC., a Delaware corporation
6 and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (hereinafter collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”),
7 and on information and belief allege as follows:

8 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

9 **JURISDICTION**

10 1. This is a civil action seeking recovery of unpaid wages, waiting time penalties,
11 pay stub penalties and meal and rest period premiums under California Labor Code §§ 510,
12 1194 et seq., 201 et seq., 226 and 226.7. Plaintiffs bring an action for monetary damages for
13 failure to pay wages as well as for restitution for Defendants’ violations of Business and
14 Professions Code (B&PC) §17200, et seq., including full restitution of all compensation
15 retained by Defendants as a result of their unlawful, fraudulent and unfair business practices.
16 Plaintiffs seek all available relief, including full restitution of all compensation retained by
17 Defendants as a result of their unlawful and unfair business practices. Further, Plaintiffs seek
18 injunctive relief under B&PC §17200, et seq.

19 **VENUE**

20 2. Venue as to each of the Defendants is proper in this judicial district pursuant to
21 California Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts
22 complained of herein occurred in the County of Los Angeles. Each defendant either owns,
23 maintains offices, transacts business, has an agent or agents within the County of Los
24 Angeles, or otherwise is found within the County of Los Angeles, and each defendant is
25 within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.
26
27
28

PARTIES

3. Paul Lowe (“Lowe”) is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). Corielyn Marie Hall (“Hall”) is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein, Plaintiffs Lowe and Hall worked for Defendants within the State of California.

4. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times mentioned herein, defendant Rapid Reliable Testing, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company, that Rapid Reliable Testing CA, LLC is a California limited liability company, Ambulnz, Inc. is a Delaware corporation, and DocGo Inc. is a Delaware corporation.

5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants were authorized to do business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles, and offering mobile Covid-19 testing and related services. Thus, each named defendant and DOES 1 to 100 are subject to B&PC §17200, et seq. (Unfair Competition Law) and the Labor Code, as hereinafter alleged.

6. Plaintiffs do not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that reason, those defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiffs will seek from this Court leave to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the Defendants and each fictitious defendant, whether individual, partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the circumstances alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated hereinafter alleged and the general public to be subjected to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.

7. At all times herein mentioned, each of the Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Plaintiffs

1 herein allege that Defendants and each of them is the joint employer of Plaintiffs and the
2 classes.

3 8. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of
4 and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the
5 course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common
6 enterprise.

7 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants,
8 and each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and
9 every one of the other Defendants in proximately causing the complaints, injuries and
10 damages alleged herein.

11 10. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, approved of,
12 condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of
13 herein. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the
14 acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants, thereby proximately
15 causing the damages, as herein alleged.

16 11. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because both
17 the individual and aggregate monetary damages and restitution sought herein exceed the
18 minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established at trial, according to
19 proof. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because Plaintiffs and
20 the putative classes herein worked within the State of California, and were subject to
21 California's wage and hour laws.

22 **PLAINTIFF CLASSES**

23 12. The class representative Plaintiffs who worked in the position of an hourly
24 non-exempt employees or other similar title while employed by Defendants within the State of
25 California, are as follows:

26 a. Paul Lowe

27 Plaintiff Lowe worked within California as a non-exempt hourly employee for
28 Defendants between 2021 and November 2022.

1 b. Corielynn Marie Hall
2 Plaintiff Hall worked within California as a non-exempt hourly employee for
3 Defendants between August 2021 and July 2023.

4 13. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiffs and the entirety of the hourly Class
5 identified herein are current and former employees of Defendants who were not properly paid
6 all their wages, including but not limited to, proper premium overtime, and/or double time due
7 to Defendants' failure to properly calculate the regular rate and/or include all hours worked in
8 a week to determine hours over eight (8) in a given day, or forty (40) in a week.

9 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

10 14. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly
11 situated as a class action pursuant to CCP §382. The Classes which Plaintiffs seek to
12 represent are composed of and defined as follows:

13 **Class 1:**

14 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
15 2019 through the date of judgment, who were not paid premium overtime and/or double time
16 at the employee's regular rate of pay.

17 **Subclass 1:**

18 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California who were
19 paid for a missed meal or rest period at an allegedly "reduced" rate of pay from 2019 through
20 the date of judgment (Meal and Rest Reduced Rate Subclass);

21 **Class 2:**

22 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
23 2019 through the date of judgment, who were not paid the minimum wage for all hours
24 worked (Minimum Wage Class);

25 **Class 3:**

26 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California and who
27 worked at some point from 2020 through the present, who are no longer employed with
28

1 Defendants and to whom Defendants willfully failed to pay all wages due upon separation
2 from Defendants (Waiting Time Penalty Class);

3 **Class 4:**

4 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
5 2019 to the present who were not provided legally compliant meal periods (Meal Break
6 Class);

7 **Class 5:**

8 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
9 2019 through the present who were not provided legally-compliant rest breaks (Rest Break
10 Class);

11 **Class 6:**

12 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
13 2022 through the present who were provided a paystub (a.k.a. wage statement) which failed to
14 list all hours actually worked and wages owed (Pay Stub Class).

15 **Class 7:**

16 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
17 2019 through the present who were not reimbursed for their necessary and reasonable
18 business expenses (Reimbursement Class).

19 The members of the classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be
20 unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the classes are unknown to Plaintiffs at
21 this time; however, it is estimated that the classes number greater than 100 individuals. The
22 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants'
23 employment records.

24 15. There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiffs and all others
25 similarly situated which predominate over questions affecting only individual members
26 including, without limitation to:

- 27 i. Whether Defendants paid their employees proper premium overtime
28 and/or double time at the employees' regular rate for hours over eight

(8) in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week, in paying their hourly non-exempt employees;

- ii. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions including §510, 1194, and 203 by requiring substantial overtime work and not paying for said work according to the overtime laws of the State of California;
- iii. Whether Defendants failed to pay the appropriate premium overtime compensation to the hourly employees;
- iv. Whether Defendants improperly retained, appropriated or deprived Plaintiffs and the class members of the use of monies or sums to which Plaintiffs and the class were legally entitled;
- v. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices;
- vi. Whether Defendants, and each of them, were participants in the alleged unlawful conduct;
- vii. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- viii. The effect upon and the extent of injuries suffered by Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated and the appropriate amount of compensation;
- ix. The appropriate amount of monetary penalties allowed by Labor Code §201, et. seq.;
- x. Whether Defendants pay and continue to pay for missed meal and rest period premiums at an allegedly "reduced" rate of pay in violation of Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders;
- xi. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §226 and relevant IWC Wage Orders by failing to, among other violations, accurately report total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly work, by Plaintiffs and the members of the Class;

xii. Whether Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to maintain records for Plaintiffs and members of the Class as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders;

xiii. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the class members for necessary expenditures incurred in the performance of their work for Defendants;

16. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of all members of the classes and subclasses mentioned herein. Plaintiffs, as representative parties, will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the classes by vigorously pursuing this suit through their attorneys who are skilled and experienced in handling matters of this type. Plaintiffs have no claim or interest that is antagonistic to any class member.

17. The nature of this action and the nature of laws available to the members of the classes and subclasses identified herein make use of the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to afford relief to Plaintiffs for the wrongs alleged herein. Further, this claim involves large corporate employers, and a large number of individual employees (Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated) with many relatively small claims with common issues of law and fact. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, the corporate defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Requiring each class member to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to pursue an action against their present and/or former employer for an appreciable and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damage to their careers at present and/or subsequent employment. Proof of a common business practice or factual pattern, of which the Plaintiffs experienced, is representative of the class mentioned herein and will establish the right of each of the members of the named class to recovery on the causes of action alleged herein.

1 18. The prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if
2 possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
3 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would
4 establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or (b) legal
5 determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter,
6 be dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which
7 would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests.
8 Further, the claims of the individual members of the class are not sufficiently large to warrant
9 vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses
10 attending thereto.

11 19. Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated are entitled to the wages and other
12 monies unlawfully withheld. This action is brought for the benefit of the public.

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Violation of B&PC §17200, et seq.)**

15 20. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
16 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

17 21. Beginning on an exact date unknown to Plaintiffs but believed to have
18 occurred from 2019 on, Defendants have engaged in a pattern and practice of acts of unfair
19 competition in violation of B&PC §17200, including the practices alleged herein.

20 22. Defendants, and each of them, provide Covid-19 mobile testing and related
21 services within California, and have engaged in the practice of paying their non-exempt
22 employees, in a fashion that circumvents California's wage and hour laws.

23 **FAILURE TO PAY PROPER WAGES AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION**

24 23. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that as part of
25 Defendants' ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants' hourly employees worked in
26 excess of eight (8) hours per day, and in excess of forty (40) hours per week without receiving
27 the proper regular rate of pay and/or minimum wage rate because Defendants fail to account
28 for all compensation due Plaintiffs, including the fact that Plaintiffs regularly work off-the-

1 clock and on-call hours to ensure that testing services are completed. Defendants are
2 therefore in violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194, and the relevant California Industrial
3 Welfare Commission Orders.

4 24. Defendants, and each of them, consistently administered a corporate policy
5 regarding off-the-clock and on-call time, which required that employees work overtime
6 without proper premium overtime pay, the regular rate of pay, and/or minimum wage. This
7 corporate policy and pattern of conduct is accomplished with the advanced knowledge and
8 designed intent to avoid paying non-exempt employees for all hours worked. Accordingly,
9 Plaintiffs and the class members are entitled to all unpaid wages due under California law.
10 Further, Plaintiffs and the class are entitled to restitution of these wages obtained by
11 Defendants, and each of them.

12 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 200, ET SEQ.**

13 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that as part of
14 Defendants' ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants failed to provide all employees all
15 wages at the time of their separation in violation of Labor Code § 200, et. seq., including but
16 not limited to, §§201, 202, 203 & 204.

17 26. Labor Code § 200, et seq. provides that an employer is required to pay an
18 employee all wages (including accrued vacation) immediately upon the employee's
19 involuntary separation from employment; immediately upon his or her voluntary separation if
20 the employee gave at least seventy-two (72) hours notice, and within seventy-two (72) hours,
21 if the employee voluntarily separated, but did not give at least seventy-two (72) hours notice.

22 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that all employees who
23 have been separated from Defendants did not timely receive a final paycheck detailing the
24 proper amount of pay from Defendants in violation of Labor Code § 200, et. seq.

25 28. Pursuant to Labor Code § 200, et seq. employees that no longer work for
26 Defendants, and who were not timely paid, are entitled to one (1) day of pay in penalties for
27 each day that he or she was paid late, until payment was made, up to a maximum of thirty (30)
28 days.

1 **VIOLATION OF MEAL AND REST PERIOD PROVISIONS**

2 29. Defendants' improper meal and rest period policies are in violation of
3 California law including, but not limited to Labor Code § 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC
4 Wage Orders. Plaintiffs and the class were entitled to 1 hour of pay for each meal and rest
5 break violation at their regular rate of pay. Defendants failed and continue to fail to pay for
6 meal and rest period violations at the employees' regular rate of pay in violation of Section 11
7 of the applicable Wage Orders.

8 30. Plaintiffs seek restitution and injunctive relief for said violations.

9 31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times herein
10 mentioned, Defendants have engaged in unlawful, deceptive, and unfair business practices
11 prohibited by California B&PC §17200, thereby depriving their employees and the putative
12 class the minimum working standards and conditions due to them under the California labor
13 laws and Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders as specifically described herein.
14 Plaintiffs seek an injunction preventing Defendants from continuing their unfair business
15 practice of improperly depriving their employees of overtime pay, and payment of their
16 regular rate of pay for meal and rest period premiums. Plaintiffs further seek an order
17 requiring Defendants to identify by full name, telephone number, and last known address
18 employees who worked or still work for Defendants between 2019 through the date of
19 judgment; Plaintiffs further seek an order requiring Defendants to timely pay restitution to all
20 current and former employees, including back wages, premium payments, and interest.

21 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

22 32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that as part of
23 Defendants' ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants, and each of them, fail to provide
24 their employees with proper and understandable itemized wage statement, as required by Labor
25 Code § 226.

26 33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants, and
27 each of them, fail to provide each employee with an itemized statement which states the actual
28 regular rate paid, the total hours worked by the employee, the gross and net wages earned, and

1 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
2 hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

3 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**

4 34. Defendants have adopted and implemented an illegal reimbursement policy
5 that fails to compensate Plaintiffs for all of their necessary business expenses incurred in
6 discharging their duties for Defendants.

7 35. Defendants' conduct in failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the class for their
8 necessary business expenses is also unfair within the meaning of Business and Professions
9 Code §17200 because it is against established public policy and has been pursued to attain an
10 unjustified monetary advantage for Defendants by unfairly and unlawfully reducing Plaintiffs'
11 and the other class members' compensation, as Plaintiffs and the class are required to come
12 out of pocket for such expenses. As such, Defendants' business practices, including their
13 illegal reimbursement policy and practice, is unfair, illegal and fraudulent, in that such policy
14 and practice was intended to reduce Plaintiffs' and the class' due and owing compensation.
15

16 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **RECOVERY OF UNPAID WAGES & PENALTIES**

18 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

19 36. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
20 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

21 37. Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated identified herein were and are
22 employed and scheduled as a matter of established company policy to work and in fact
23 worked as non-exempt hourly employees in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or in excess
24 of forty (40) hours per week. Defendants employed and scheduled all employees without
25 providing overtime compensation for such excess hours worked in violation of Labor Code §§
26 510 and 1194 and the relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) orders.
27 Labor Code § 204 establishes the fundamental right of all employees in the State of California
28 to be paid the proper amount of wages in a timely fashion for their work, including overtime.

1 Defendants always had a written and verbal agreement to pay overtime and double time based
2 on the Plaintiffs' and classes' regular rate of pay.

3 38. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218 and 1194(a), Plaintiffs may bring a civil action
4 for overtime wages directly against the employer without first filing a claim with the Division
5 of Labor Standards Enforcement (hereinafter "DLSE") and may recover such wages, together
6 with interest thereon, penalties, attorneys' fees and costs.

7 39. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants have failed to pay to Plaintiffs and all
8 persons similarly situated wages when due as required by Labor Code § 204.

9 40. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer
10 than the hours set by the IWC or under conditions prohibited by the applicable IWC Wage
11 Orders.

12 41. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon
13 allege that Defendants have treated Plaintiffs as hourly non-exempt employees. Despite this
14 classification, Defendants have willfully violated the Labor Code with respect to meeting the
15 requirements of paying one (1) regular rate of pay and calculating overtime and double time
16 based on that regular rate, as herein before alleged. Defendants have failed to properly pay
17 premium overtime for hours worked in a week, and as such, Defendants are able to reduce
18 their overhead and operating expenses and gain an unfair advantage over competing
19 companies complying with state law. Furthermore, Defendants have failed to include all
20 items of remuneration when determining the employees' regular rate of pay, as described
21 above.

22 42. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants
23 consistently administered a corporate policy regarding both staffing levels and duties and
24 responsibilities of the members of the classes which required the entirety of all classes to work
25 overtime without proper premium pay, and to fail all wages for hours worked. This corporate
26 policy and pattern of conduct was/is accomplished with the advance knowledge and design of
27 all Defendants herein. Thus, Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated routinely, regularly
28

1 and customarily performed overtime work and/or work that they failed to be compensated at
2 the appropriate hourly wage.

3 43. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the obligations and
4 responsibilities of the class employees are irrelevant because Plaintiffs and all others similarly
5 situated merely allege wrongdoing with Defendants' pay plans, policies and practices.
6 Further, the duties of Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated are not relevant in certifying
7 any of the classes.

8 44. Defendants, and each of them, had a consistent and uniform policy, practice
9 and procedure of willfully failing to pay the earned and unpaid wages of all such non-exempt
10 employees. Defendants have willfully failed to pay the earned and unpaid wages of such
11 individuals, including, but not limited to regular pay, premium pay, and other wages earned
12 and remaining uncompensated according to amendment, or proof.

13 45. The pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding
14 illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to
15 recovery by Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated, in a civil action, for the unpaid balance
16 of the full amount of all wages owing, including the proper calculation of the regular rate and
17 the proper overtime premiums calculated at 1.5 or 2 times the legal regular rate which are
18 owing, including interest thereon, willful penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of
19 suit according to the mandate of Labor Code § 1194, et. seq.

20 46. Likewise, Defendants have a pattern, practice and uniform administration of
21 corporate policy regarding failure to comply with the required provisions of Labor Code §
22 226.7, in failing to pay Plaintiffs and the class the meal and rest period premium payments at
23 the regular rate.

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq.)**

26 47. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
27 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
28

1 48. Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq., provides that an employer is required to pay an
2 employee all wages (including accrued vacation) immediately upon an employee's
3 involuntary separation from employment; immediately upon her voluntary separation if the
4 employee gave at least seventy two (72) hours notice, and within seventy two (72) hours, if
5 the employee voluntarily separated, but did not give at least seventy two (72) hours notice.

6 49. Plaintiffs Lowe, Hall and other former employees of Defendants employed in
7 the State of California separated from employment with Defendants, and did not timely
8 receive a final pay check with all of their wages due from Defendants in violation of Labor
9 Code §§
10 200, et seq. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants also
11 violated the mandates of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq., as to other employees whose
12 employment ended during the period of time covered by this action.

13 50. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq., each member of the class that no
14 longer works for Defendants, and who was not timely paid all of his or her wages due is
15 entitled to one (1) day of pay in penalties for each day that he or she was paid late, until
16 payment was made, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

17 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **FAILURE TO PAY MEAL AND REST PERIOD PREMIUMS AT THE PROPER**
19 **REGULAR RATE OF PAY**

20 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512, et seq.)**

21 51. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
22 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

23 52. Plaintiffs believe and thereon allege that Labor Code §226.7 requires an
24 employer to pay an additional hour of compensation at the employee's regular rate of pay for
25 each meal period and rest period violation. During the class period, Plaintiffs are informed
26 and believe, and based thereon allege that Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiffs and the
27 class members meal period and rest period premium pay at their regular rate of pay.
28

Defendants' improper meal and rest period practices and policies are in violation of California law including, but not limited to Labor Code § § 226.7, 512, and the IWC Wage Orders.

53. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.7, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of the employee's regular rate of pay per each meal and rest period violation, in a sum to be proven at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

(Violation of Labor Code § 226)

54. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

55. Labor Code §226(a) provides, in pertinent part:

An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. . . .

56. During the Class Period, Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide the Class Members, including Plaintiffs Lowe and Hall, with timely and accurate wage and hour statements showing gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions made, net wages earned, the name and address of the legal entity employing that Class Member, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the

1 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by that Class Member.

2 57. The Class Members, including Plaintiffs, suffered injury as a result of
3 Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to provide the Class Members, with the wage and
4 hour statements required by law.

5 58. Based on Defendants' conduct as alleged herein, Defendants are liable for actual
6 damages, statutory damages and/or statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §
7 226, attorney's fees and costs and other applicable provisions of the Labor Code and
8 applicable Wage Order.

9 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

11 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512)**

12 59. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
13 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

14 60. California Labor Code § 512 and IWC Wage Orders state that an employer
15 may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without
16 providing the employee a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, and an employer may not
17 employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the
18 employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes. Unless the employee is
19 relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an
20 "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. California Labor Code § 226.7(a) further
21 states that no employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period
22 mandated by an applicable order of the IWC.

23 61. Employers are prohibited from exerting coercion against the taking of, creating
24 incentives to forego, or otherwise encouraging the skipping of legally protected breaks.

25 62. Plaintiffs and members of the Class were not provided with or given the
26 opportunity to take the requisite meal periods before the end of the first 5 hours of work, nor
27 were they provided with or given the opportunity to take a proper second meal period during
28 the days when they worked more than 10 hours in a day. Defendants coerced Plaintiffs and

1 the members of the Class to forego meal periods by disciplining and/or threatening
2 disciplinary action against them if they attempted to take meal periods, created incentives to
3 forego meal breaks, and encouraged the skipping of meal periods by scheduling work to
4 coincide with the meal periods, among other things. In addition, Defendants placed
5 unnecessarily tight timelines on Plaintiffs' work, forcing them to miss their meal periods in
6 order to complete their jobs. As a result, Plaintiffs and members of the Class were required to
7 work and/or were not relieved of all duties during any meal period taken, and thus were
8 considered "on duty;" however, Defendants failed to count as time worked any "on duty"
9 meal period taken by Plaintiffs and the members of the Class.

10 63. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c) and IWC Wage Orders, if an
11 employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable
12 provisions of the IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay
13 at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that the meal period is not provided.
14 As such, Plaintiffs and members of the Class are entitled to an additional one hour's pay for
15 each day in which Plaintiffs and members of the Class were not provided a proper meal break
16 under the above-described authorities.

17 64. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class request that the Court award interest on
18 all unpaid wages at the legal rate specified by California Civil Code § 3289(b), accruing from
19 the date the wages were due and payable pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6.

20 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE OR PERMIT REST PERIODS**

22 **(Violation of Labor Code § 226.7)**

23 65. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
24 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

25 66. The applicable IWC Wage Orders state that every employer shall authorize and
26 permit all employees to take rest periods. The authorized rest period time shall be based on
27 the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four hours of
28 work, or major fraction thereof. An employer must provide employees with 10 minutes' rest

1 for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
2 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.

3 67. Plaintiffs and Class Members were not permitted to take rest periods, were
4 required to work during their rest periods, and/or were disciplined and/or were advised that
5 they would be disciplined if they took rest periods during work hours, in contravention of
6 California law.

7 68. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c) and the applicable IWC Wage
8 Orders, if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the
9 applicable IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
10 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

11 69. As such, Plaintiffs and the Class members are entitled to an additional one
12 hour's pay for each day in which they were not provided a proper rest period under the above-
13 described authorities.

14 70. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class request that the Court award interest on
15 all unpaid wages at the legal rate specified by California Civil Code § 3289(b), accruing from
16 the date the wages were due and payable pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6.

17 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**

19 **(Violation of (Labor Code § 2802)**

20 71. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
21 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

22 72. California Labor Code § 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his
23 or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
24 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties."

25 73. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that at all
26 relevant times Plaintiffs and the class members incurred certain expenses for their jobs with
27 Defendants, including but not limited to using their own personal cell phones for company
28 business, including responding to work calls and text messages on their personal cell phones

1 for their work. Despite this, Defendants failed and refused to indemnify Plaintiffs and the
2 class for all of their expenditures in carrying out their duties for Defendants.

3 74. As a result of Defendants' failure to indemnify Plaintiff and the class members,
4 they have suffered losses according to proof, including prejudgment interest, costs, and
5 attorneys' fees in prosecuting this case.

6 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

8 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699)**

9 75. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
10 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

11 76. On or about January 11, 2023, and thereafter on December 14, 2023, Plaintiffs
12 Lowe and Hall, respectively, provided written notice to the Labor and Workforce
13 Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor
14 Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
15 violations.

16 77. The LWDA failed to respond to Plaintiffs' counsel's correspondence and failed
17 to notify Plaintiffs' counsel as to whether it would investigate the allegations contained
18 therein, within the time period requirements of the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA),
19 under Labor Code §2699.3. Plaintiffs have fully complied with the notice requirements set
20 forth in Labor Code §2699.3 in order to commence a civil action against an employer
21 pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

22 78. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs for all hours worked, minimum wages,
23 overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest
24 periods, failure to pay all wages upon termination or resignation, and failure to provide
25 accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to reimburse expenses, will subject Defendants
26 to civil penalties pursuant to, without limitation, Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 221, 223,
27 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 245, 246, 432, 510, 512, 551, 552, 1174, 1182.12, 1194,
28 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1527, 2699, 2802, 2810.5, 3366, 3457, 6409.6, 8397.4, and IWC Wage

1 Orders.

2 79. Plaintiffs are aggrieved employees as defined in Labor Code §§2699(a) and
3 (c), and related Labor Code provisions. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of
4 themselves, as private attorneys general, and in a representative capacity on behalf of other
5 aggrieved employees, affected by the labor law violations alleged herein.

6 80. Defendants committed numerous violations of the California Labor Code and
7 IWC Wage Orders against the Plaintiffs, and on information and belief, against members of
8 the Class and other current and former employees while they were employed by Defendants,
9 including but not limited to:

10 a. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 510, 511, 1194 and/or IWC Wage Orders
11 by failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
12 current and former employees of Defendants, all minimum, straight time and overtime wages
13 owed in compliance with California law;

14 b. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 1194, 1197 and/or IWC Wage
15 Orders by failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class by failing to pay for a missed
16 meal or rest period at the regular rate of pay;

17 c. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
18 failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
19 current and former employees of Defendants, all minimum wages owed in compliance with
20 California law;

21 d. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 204, 510, 511 and/or IWC Wage
22 Orders by failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and
23 belief, other current and former employees of Defendants, all wages owed in a timely manner
24 in compliance with California law;

25 e. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7, 512, and /or IWC Wage Orders by
26 failing to provide Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
27 current and former employees of Defendants, the opportunity to take the requisite meal
28 periods in compliance with California law;

f. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7 and/or IWC Wage Orders by

1 failing to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information
2 and belief, other current and former employees of Defendants, the opportunity to take the
3 requisite rest periods in compliance with California law;

4 g. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226, 1174 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
5 failing to properly maintain accurate employment time and records, maintain and/or submit
6 accurate itemized wage statements on behalf of Plaintiffs, members of the Class, and on
7 information and belief, on behalf of other current and former employees of Defendants as
8 described herein; and

9 h. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
10 failing to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and on information and belief, other current and former
11 employees of Defendants as described herein;

12 i. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiffs and
13 members of the Class and on information and belief, other current and former employees of
14 Defendants as described herein;

15 j. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 551 and 552 and/or the IWC Wage Orders
16 by requiring Plaintiffs and other members of the Class to work seven consecutive days
17 without a day of rest.

18 81. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiffs, members of the Class, and all other
19 aggrieved current and former employees seek to recover civil penalties, as otherwise provided
20 by statute and wage order, for which Defendants are liable as a result of their violations of the
21 California Labor Code and applicable wage order(s) in an amount to be proven at trial. These
22 penalties include, but are not limited to, those provided by Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204,
23 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 2699, 2802 and IWC Wage
24 Orders. Plaintiffs and aggrieved current and former employees further seek and award of
25 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 and 2699.
26
27
28

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray:

3 1. That the Court determine this action may be maintained as a class action;

4 **As to the First Cause of Action:**

5 2. For an order preliminarily and permanently enjoining Defendants from
6 engaging in the practices challenged herein;

7 3. An order for full restitution of all monies, as necessary and according to proof,
8 to restore any and all monies withheld by the Defendants by means of the unfair practices
9 complained of herein. Plaintiffs seek, on behalf of the putative class, the appointment of a
10 receiver, as necessary. The restitution includes all monies retained as wages, as defined in
11 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 510 and 1194, and interest, and attorneys' fees as a result of the
12 unfair business practices;

13 4. For an order finding and declaring that Defendants' acts and practices as
14 challenged herein are unlawful, and unfair and/or fraudulent;

15 5. For an accounting, under administration of Plaintiffs and subject to court
16 supervision, to determine the amount to be returned by Defendants and the amounts to be
17 refunded to members who are or were not paid all their wages due to Defendants' unfair
18 business practices;

19 6. For the creation of an administrative process wherein each injured current and
20 former employee receives his or her back wages in the form of overtime pay or alternatively
21 that each current or former eligible employee may submit a claim in order to receive his/her
22 money;

23 7. For an order requiring Defendants to make full restitution and payment
24 pursuant to B&PC §§ 17200, et seq.;

25 8. For all other appropriate declaratory and equitable relief;

26 9. For pre-judgment interest to the extent permitted by law;

1 10. For an order requiring Defendants to identify, by name, address and telephone
2 number of each person who worked in California as an hourly non-exempt employee for
3 Defendants between 2018 through the time of judgment;

4 11. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

5 **As to the Second and Fourth Cause of Action:**

6 12. For damages according to proof, as set forth in Labor Code §§ 510, 226.7 and
7 1194, et seq., (and the applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders)
8 regarding wages due and owing;

9 13. For pre-judgment interest as allowed by Labor Code § 1194 and California
10 Civil Code § 3287(b), for waiting time penalties as authorized by Labor Code § 203, and for
11 reasonable attorneys' fees;

12 14. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

13 **As to the Third Cause of Action:**

14 15. For waiting time penalties for all former employees not timely paid their last
15 pay check, including vacation pay;

16 16. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

17 17. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

18 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action:**

19 18. For recovery as authorized by Labor Code §226(e);

20 19. For injunctive relief to ensure Defendants' compliance with Labor Code §226
21 and the IWC Wage Orders §7(A) pursuant to Labor Code §226(h);

22 20. For an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code
23 §226(e) and/or §226(h);

24 21. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

25 **As to the Sixth Cause of Action:**

26 22. One (1) hour of pay at each of the employees' regular rate of compensation for
27 each workday that a meal period was not provided, impeded, discouraged and/or dissuaded;

28 23. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

1 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action:**

2 24. One (1) hour of pay at each of the employees' regular rate of compensation for
3 each workday that a rest period was not authorized or permitted, or impeded, interrupted,
4 discouraged and/or dissuaded;

5 25. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

6 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action:**

7 26. For recovery of all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by Plaintiffs and
8 the class members, according to proof;

9 27. For pre-judgment interest as allowed by Labor Code §§ 218.6, 1194(a), and
10 Civil Code § 3287;

11 28. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §
12 2802(c);

13 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action:**

14 29. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
15 Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2698 and 2699;

16 30. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law;

17 31. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
18 California Labor Code § 2699(g); and

19 32. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
20 appropriate.

21 **As to All Causes of Action:**

22 33. For reasonable costs incurred;

23 34. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

24
25 Dated: August 26, 2025

BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC

26
27 By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
28 AARON A. BARTZ
Attorneys for Plaintiff Paul Lowe

1 Dated: August 26, 2025

2 BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

3
4 By: /s/David Bibiyan
5 David Bibiyan
6 Vedang J. Patel
7 Brandon M. Chang
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff Corielyn Marie Hall
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand a jury trial on all issues triable to a jury.

Dated: August 26, 2025

BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC

By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
AARON A. BARTZ
Attorneys for Plaintiff Paul Lowe

Dated: August 26, 2025

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

By: /s/David Bibiyan
David Bibiyan
Vedang J. Patel
Brandon M. Chang
Attorneys for Plaintiff Corielyn Marie Hall

I, the undersigned, am employed in the State of California. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the action. My business address is 5151 California Ave., Suite 100, Irvine, California 92617.

On August 26, 2025, I served true copies of the foregoing documents described as: **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action, addressed as follows:

Debra Ellwood Meppen
dmeppen@grsm.com
Dina Glucksman
dglucksman@grsm.com
Jennifer Jambor-Delgado
jjambordelgado@grsm.com
Emilie MacLean
emaclean@grsm.com
GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI
633 W. 5th Street, 52nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel.: (213) 576-5000 / Fax: (213) 680-4470

*Attorneys for Defendant Rapid Reliable
Testing, LLC and Rapid Reliable Testing CA,
LLC*

Walter Haines, Esq.
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Email: walter@uelglaw.com

Co-Counsel for Plaintiff Paul Lowe

David D. Bibiyan
david@tomorrowlaw.com
Vedang J. Patel
vedang@tomorrowlaw.com
Brandon M. Chang
brandon@tomorrowlaw.com
BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
1460 Westwood Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Tel.: (310) 438-5555 / Fax: (310) 300-1705

Co-Counsel for Plaintiff Corielyn Marie Hall

(X) BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE VIA CASE ANYWHERE: Based on a court order I caused the above-entitled document(s) to be served through Case Anywhere at www.caseanywhere.com addressed to all parties appearing on the electronic service list for the above-entitled case. The service transmission was reported as complete and a copy of the Case Anywhere Filing Receipt Page/Confirmation will be filed, deposited, or maintained with the original document(s) in this office.

(X) BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I transmitted a PDF version of this document by electronic mail to the party(s) identified on the above service list using the e-mail address(es) indicated.

(X) (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on August 26, 2025.

/s/ Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc/s/
Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc

EXHIBIT D



CASE ASSUMPTIONS

Class Members	570
Opt Out Rate	1%
Opt Outs Received	6
Total Class Claimants	564
Subtotal Admin Only	\$10,000.00

Not-to-Exceed Total \$10,000.00

For 570 Class Members

Pricing Good for Scope of Estimate Only

June 11, 2025

Case: Lowe v. Rapid Reliable Testing Opt-Out Administration

Phoenix Contact: Jodey Lawrence

Contact Number: 949.566.1455

Email: Jodey@phoenixclassaction.com

Requesting Attorney: Aaron A. Bartz

Firm: BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC

Contact Number: (949) 504-4413

Email: aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

Assumptions and Estimate are based on information provided by counsel. If class size changes, PHX will need to adjust this Estimate accordingly.

Estimate is based on 570 Class Members. Class data Must be sent in Microsoft Excel or uploaded in the same format. Class Data Must be sent in one

spreadsheet, with no additional programming needed. A rate of \$150 per hour will be charged for any additional analysis or programming. Pricing good for 90 days.

Case & Database Setup / Toll Free Setup & Call Center / NCOA (USPS)

Administrative Tasks:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Programming Manager	\$125.00	3	\$375.00
Programming Database & Setup	\$125.00	3	\$375.00
Toll Free Setup*	\$147.10	1	\$147.10
Call Center & Long Distance	\$2.00	16	\$32.00
NCOA (USPS)	\$200.00	2	\$400.00
Total			\$1,329.10

* Up to 120 days after disbursement

Data Merger & Scrub / Notice Packet, Opt-Out Form & Postage / Spanish Translation / Reporting

Project Action	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Notice Packet Formatting	\$125.00	2	\$250.00
Data Merge & Duplication Scrub	\$0.50	570	\$285.00
Notice Packet & Opt-Out Form	\$1.50	570	\$855.00
Estimated Postage (up to 2 oz.)*	\$0.69	570	\$393.30
Static Website	\$200.00	1	\$200.00
Total			\$1,983.30

* Prices good for 90 days. Subject to change with the USPS Rate or change in Notice pages or Translation, if any.



PHOENIX

CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION SOLUTIONS

Skip Tracing & Remailing Notice Packets / Tracking & Programming Undeliverables

Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Case Associate	\$55.00	3	\$165.00
Skip Tracing Undeliverables	\$2.00	57	\$114.00
Remail Notice Packets	\$1.25	57	\$71.25
Estimated Postage	\$0.76	57	\$43.32
Programming Undeliverables	\$50.00	3	\$150.00
Total			\$543.57

Database Programming / Processing Opt-Outs, Deficiencies or Disputes

Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Programming Claims Database	\$125.00	2	\$250.00
Non Opt-Out Processing	\$125.00	1	\$125.00
Case Associate	\$55.00	2	\$110.00
Opt-Outs/Deficiency/Dispute Letters	\$10.00	3	\$30.00
Case Manager	\$85.00	2	\$170.00
Total			\$685.00

Calculation & Disbursement Programming/ Create & Manage QSF/ Mail Checks

Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Programming Calculations	\$135.00	2	\$270.00
Disbursement Review	\$135.00	2	\$270.00
Programming Manager	\$95.00	2	\$190.00
QSF Bank Account & EIN	\$125.00	2	\$250.00
Check Run Setup & Printing	\$100.00	4	\$400.00
Mail Class Checks *	\$1.25	564	\$705.38
Estimated Postage	\$0.69	564	\$389.37
Total			\$2,474.74

* Checks are printed on 8.5 x 11 in. sheets with W2/1099 Tax Filing



PHOENIX

CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION SOLUTIONS

Tax Reporting & Reconciliation / Re-Issuance of Checks / Conclusion Reports and Declarations			
Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Case Supervisor	\$125.00	3	\$375.00
Remail Undeliverable Checks (Postage Included)	\$1.50	113	\$169.29
Case Associate	\$55.00	2	\$110.00
Reconcile Uncashed Checks	\$85.00	3	\$255.00
Conclusion Reports	\$125.00	3	\$375.00
Case Manager Conclusion	\$100.00	2	\$200.00
Final Reporting & Declarations	\$125.00	2	\$250.00
IRS & QSF Annual Tax Reporting * (1 State Tax Reporting Included)	\$1,250.00	1	\$1,250.00
Total			\$2,984.29

* All applicable California State & Federal taxes, which include SUI, ETT, and SDI, and FUTA filings. Additional taxes are Defendant's responsibility.

Estimate Total: \$10,000.00



PHOENIX

CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION SOLUTIONS

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Provisions: The case estimate is in good faith and does not cover any applicable taxes and fees. The estimate does not make any provision for any services or class size not delineated in the request for proposal or stipulations. Proposal rates and amounts are subject to change upon further review, with Counsel/Client, of the Settlement Agreement. Only pre-approved changes will be charged when applicable. No modifications may be made to this estimate without the approval of PSA (Phoenix Settlement Administrators). All notifications are mailed in English language only unless otherwise specified. Additional costs will apply if translation into other language(s) is required. Rates to prepare and file taxes are for Federal and California State taxes only. Additional charges will apply if multiple state tax filing(s) is required. **Pricing is good for ninety (90) days.**

Data Conversion and Mailing: The proposal assumes that data provided will be in ready-to-use condition and that all data is provided in a single, comprehensive Excel spreadsheet. PSA cannot be liable for any errors or omissions arising due to additional work required for analyzing and processing the original database. A minimum of two (2) business days is required for processing prior to the anticipated mailing date with an additional two (2) business days for a National Change of Address (NCOA) update. Additional time may be required depending on the class size, necessary translation of the documents, or other factors. PSA will keep counsel apprised of the estimated mailing date.

Claims: PSA's general policy is to not accept claims via facsimile. However, in the event that facsimile filing of claims must be accepted, PSA will not be held responsible for any issues and/or errors arising out of said filing. Furthermore, PSA will require disclaimer language regarding facsimile transmissions. PSA will not be responsible for any acts or omissions caused by the USPS. PSA shall not make payments to any claimants without verified, valid Social Security Numbers. All responses and class member information are held in strict confidentiality. Additional class members are \$10.00 per opt-out.

Payment Terms: All postage charges and 50% of the final administration charges are due at the commencement of the case and will be billed immediately upon receipt of the data and/or notice documents. PSA bills are due upon receipt unless otherwise negotiated and agreed to with PSA by Counsel/Client. In the event the settlement terms provide that PSA is to be paid out of the settlement fund, PSA will request that Counsel/Client endeavor to make alternate payment arrangements for PSA charges that are due at the onset of the case. The entire remaining balance is due and payable at the time the settlement account is funded by Defendant, or no later than the time of disbursement. Amounts not paid within thirty (30) days are subject to a service charge of 1.5% per month or the highest rate permitted by law.

Tax Reporting Requirements

PSA will file the necessary tax returns under the EIN of the QSF, including federal and state returns. Payroll tax returns will be filed if necessary. Under the California Employment Development Department, all taxes are to be reported under the EIN of the QSF with the exception of the following taxes: Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Employment Training Tax (ETT), employer-side taxes, and State Disability Insurance (SDI), an employee-side tax. These are reported under Defendant's EIN. Therefore, to comply with the EDD payroll tax filing requirements we will need the following information:

1. Defendant's California State ID and Federal EIN.
2. Defendant's current State Unemployment Insurance (UI) rate and Employment Training Tax (ETT) rate. This information can be found in the current year DE 2088, Notice of Contribution Rates, issued by the EDD.
3. Termination dates of the class members, or identification of current employee class members, so we can account for the periods that the wages relate to for each class member.
4. An executed Power of Attorney (Form DE 48) from Defendant. This form is needed so that we may report the UI, SDI, and ETT taxes under Defendant's EIN on their behalf. If this form is not provided we will work with the EDD auditors to transfer the tax payments to Defendant's EIN.
5. Defendant is responsible for reporting the SDI portion of the settlement payments on the class member's W-2. PSA will file these forms on Defendant's behalf for an additional fee and will issue an additional W-2 for each class member under Defendant's EIN, as SDI is reported under Defendant's EIN rather than the EIN of the QSF. The Power of Attorney (Form DE 48) will be needed in order for PSA to report SDI payments.