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

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

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Putative Classes

[Additional Counsel on Next Page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

TOU HER, RAMON TREJO, DONJA RAYQUON BROOKS, HERMINE ANEO, AURELIO MENDOZA, NICHOLAS ABLES, RONALD MCDILL, DERREONTE WALLACE, BRANDON LUBNER; CEDRICK JACKSON, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TONY'S FINE FOODS, a California Corporation; and DOES 1-50, inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 23CV007645

CLASS ACTION

DECLARATION OF DOUGLAS HAN IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION, APPROVAL OF CLASS NOTICE, SETTING OF FINAL APPROVAL HEARING DATE

HEARING INFORMATION

Date: November 20, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: 8A

Orlando Villalba (SBN 232165)
Helga Hakimi (SBN 257381)
Tyler C. Anderson (SBN 301808)
Jeffrey Jimenez (SBN 338228)
CAPSTONE LAW APC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1860
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 556-4811
Facsimile: (310) 943-0396

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
Enzo Nabiev (SBN 332118)
Sandy Pham (SBN 352753)
MOON LAW GROUP, P.C.
725 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
MICHAEL JONES (SBN 312831)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

DECLARATION OF DOUGLAS HAN

I, **DOUGLAS HAN**, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law before all courts of California. I am the founding member of Justice Law Corporation. I am one of the attorneys of record for Plaintiffs and Class in the instant action. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below and if called to testify I could and would do so competently.

2. In May 2004, I graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law with a Juris Doctor degree. In May 2001, I obtained a Bachelor of Science degree in Political Science with a minor in English from University of Houston.

3. Since its inception, our firm has almost exclusively focused on the prosecution of consumer and employment class actions, involving wage-and-hour claims, unfair business practices or consumer fraud. Our firm has successfully litigated to conclusion over four hundred (400) wage-and-hour class or representative actions. Currently, we are the attorneys of record in over a dozen employment-related putative class actions in both state and federal courts in California. During this time, in association with other law firms, we have obtained millions of dollars on behalf of thousands of individuals in California.

4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a list of some of the class action and representative matters for which Justice Law Corporation has been appointed to serve as class counsel that have been given final approval.

5. Our firm also has appellate experience that resulted in the following cases being published that defined and clarified wage and hour law: (a) *Oswald v. Murray Plumbing & Heating Corp.* (2022) 82 Cal.App.5th 938; (b) *Garner v. Inter-State Oil Co.* (2020) 52 Cal.App.5th 619; (c) *Brooks v. AmeriHome Mortgage Co., LLC* (2020) 47 Cal.App.5th 624; (d) *Nieto v. Fresno Beverage Company, Inc.* (2019) 33 Cal.App.5th 274; and (e) *Esparza v. KS Industries, L. P.* (2017) 13 Cal.App.5th 1228.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

6. Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh is a Partner at my office. Shunt received his undergraduate degree from University of California, Los Angeles and earned a Juris Doctor degree from Southwestern University School of Law. Shunt was admitted to practice law in the State of California in December 2010. Shunt has been admitted to practice law in all state and federal courts in the State of California. The focus of Shunt's practice is class action wage-and-hour law. Shunt has worked on multiple class action cases and representative actions that have been granted approval, including *Keles v. The Art of Shaving – FL, LLC,* Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG13687151; *Esters v. HDB LTD. Limited Partnership,* Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-279879; *Guzman v. International City Mortgage, Inc.*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1502516; *Davidson v. Lentz Construction General Engineering Contractor*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-279853; *Betancourt v. Hugo Boss USA, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC506988; *Porras v. DBI Beverage, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-CV-266154; *Hartzell v. Truitt Oilfield Maintenance Corporation*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-283011; *Navarro-Salas v. Markstein Beverage Co.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00174957-CU-OE-GDS; *White v. Pilot Travel Centers, LLC,* San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2013-0009098; *McKinnon v. Renovate America, Inc., et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00038150-CU-OE-CTL; *Antoine v. Riverstone Residential CA, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2013-00155974-CU-OE-GDS; *Pina v. Zim Industries, Inc.,* Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-284498; *Amaya v. Certified Payment Processing*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00186623-CU-OE-GDS; *Burke v. Petrol Production Supply, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-15-101092; *Ceron v. Hydro Resources-West, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-15-101461; *Chavana v. Golden Empire Equipment, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-16-102796; *De La Torre v. Acuity Brands Lighting, Inc.*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1601800; *Dobbs v. Wood Group PSN, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-16-101078; *Gonzalez v. Matagrano, Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550494; *Harbabikian v. Williston Financial*

Group, LLC, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 56-2016-004485186-CU-OE-VTA; *Prince v. Ponder Environmental Services, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-16-100784; *Ramirez v. Crestwood Operations*, *LLC*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-17-100503; *Reyes v. Halliburton Energy Services, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-280215; *Rodriguez v. B&L Casing Serve, LLC*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-282709; *Marketstar Wage and Hour Cases*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP004820; *Rodriguez v. Delta Sierra Beverage, LLC*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00206727-CU-OE-GDS; *Stuck v. Jerry Melton & Sons Construction, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-16-101516; *Blevins v. California Commercial Solar, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Case, No. BCV-17-100571; *Cisneros v. Wilbur-Ellis Company*, LLC, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-17-102836; and *Castro v. General Production Service of California, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-15-101164. Shunt was also certified as class counsel in *Fulmer v. Golden State Drilling, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-279707; *Manas v. Kenai Drilling Limited*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC546330; *Nuncio v. MMI Services, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-282534; and *Ferrer v. Ameriflex, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2002157, cases that were certified after a contested class certification. Shunt is currently working on several wages-and-hour and PAGA matters across the State of California.

7. Michael Jones is an Associate Attorney at Justice Law Corporation. Michael earned an undergraduate degree from the University of California, Santa Barbara, in Political Science with an emphasis on International Relations. Michael obtained his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Southern California, Gould School of Law in May 2016 and was admitted to practice law in the State of California in December 2016. Michael is also licensed to practice law in the State of California federal courts and is accredited by the Department of Veterans Affairs' Office of General Counsel to represent veterans in disability benefits cases. Michael has practiced in several areas of law, including veterans' rights, commercial property insurance defense, representing health and life insurance policyholders, and spent most of his early career representing employees in harassment, discrimination and retaliation and wrongful

termination cases. Since joining Justice Law Corporation, Michael has worked on wage-and-hour class action and representative PAGA matters that have been granted approval, including *Yesenia v. Snowdrop Holdings, LLC*, Tulare County Superior Court, Case No. VCU316517 and *Woods v. M.D. Atkinson Company, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-25-101232. Michael is currently working on several wages-and-hour and PAGA matters across the State of California, including *Fuentes v. Bellingham Marine Industries, Inc.,* Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2025-01466061-CU-WT-CJC; *Hernandez v. Fomat Medical Research, Inc.*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 2025CUOE037857; *Shinde v. Realm Living, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 25CU021708C; *Moya v. Wing Inflatables, Inc. dba The Wing Group*, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C25-01515; *Blu v. Elite Clinical Network LLC, et al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2025-01477450-CU-BC-CXC; *Serrano v. Mission Liquor & Tobacco, Inc. dba Mission Wine & Spirits*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No.25STCV15822; *Carmona v. Supacolor USA, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 25STCV13503; *Segura v. Airtech International, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2025-01483935-CU-OE-CXC; *Vasquez v. Oceans 11 Casino, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2024-00030996-CU-OE-CTL; *Miatia v. Beneficial Insectary, Inc.*, Shasta County Superior Court, Case No. 207840; *Magaña v. Baja Construction Co., Inc.*, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C25-01842; *Martinez v. American Wood Fibers, Inc.*, Tuolumne County Superior Court, Case No. CV67472; *Hernandez v. Ameriflight, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 25STCV03234; *Herrera v. Cosmetic Group USA*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV29430; *Louis v. Northern Refrigerated Transportation, Inc.*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2417250; *Slaughter v. Renewal Health Group LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 25STCV05220; and *Izaguilre v. California Autism Center*, Merced County Superior Court, Case No. 25CV-00375.

8. This case involves all individuals who are or were employed by Defendant Tony's Fine Foods ("Defendant") as hourly paid, non-exempt employees in the State of California during the period from August 29, 2019, through April 1, 2026 ("Class" and "Class Period").

9. On July 31, 2023, Plaintiff Ramon Trejo filed a lawsuit against Defendant Tony's Fine Foods; United Natural Foods, Inc.; United Natural Foods West, Inc.; UNFI Grocers Distribution, Inc.; and Nor-Cal Produce, Inc. in the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, alleging various wage and hour violations under California law, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 23CV005704 ("*Trejo* Action").

10. On August 29, 2023, Plaintiff Tou Her filed a lawsuit against Defendant Tony's Fine Foods in the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, alleging various wage and hour violations under California law, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 23CV010748 ("*Her* Action").

11. On October 12, 2023, Plaintiffs Donja Rayquon Brooks and Hermine Aneo filed their lawsuit against Defendant Tony's Fine Foods in the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, alleging various wage and hour violations under California law, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 23CV009861 ("*Brooks* Action").

12. On July 19, 2024, Plaintiff Cedric Jackson filed his lawsuit against Defendant Tony's Fine Foods and United Natural Foods West, Inc. in the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, alleging various wage and hour violations under California law, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 24CV084062 ("*Jackson* Action").

13. On August 15, 2024, Claimant Brandon Lubner submitted a demand for arbitration with the American Arbitration Association against Defendant Tony's Fine Foods and United Natural Foods West, Inc., AAA Case No. 01-24-0007-2820 ("*Lubner* Action").

14. On February 13, 2025, Plaintiff Aurelio Mendoza filed his lawsuit against Defendant Tony's Fine Foods and United Natural Foods West, Inc. in the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, alleging various wage and hour violations under California law, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 25CV003386 ("*Mendoza* Action").

15. On February 18, 2025, Plaintiffs Nicholas Ables, Ronald McDill, and Derreonte Wallace filed their lawsuit against Defendant Tony's Fine Foods and United Natural Foods West, Inc. in the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, alleging various wage and hour violations under California law, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No.

25CV003826 ("*Ables* Action").

16. Thereafter, the Parties in the lawsuits agreed to attend a global private mediation with David Phillips, Esq. on October 28, 2025, to potentially resolve all the lawsuits. On October 28, 2025, the Parties attended private mediation. However, the Parties were unable to resolve the lawsuits at the time.

17. Through the help of the experienced mediator, David Phillips, Esq., the Parties eventually accepted a mediator's proposal to settle the lawsuits. On June 4, 2026, the Parties executed a Memorandum of Understanding containing the essential terms of the settlement.

18. In line with the settlement, Plaintiffs filed a consolidated class and representative action complaint in the *Her* Action.

19. Defendant generally and specifically denies any and all liability or wrongdoing of any sort regarding any of the claims alleged, makes no concessions or admissions of liability, and contends that for any purpose other than settlement, the matter is not appropriate for class or representative treatment. Defendant asserts several defenses against the claims and has denied any wrongdoing or liability arising out of any of the alleged facts or conduct in this matter.

20. After initiating this lawsuit, the Parties engaged in discovery (*e.g.*, drafting and propounded special interrogatories and requests for production of documents). Thereafter, the Parties met and conferred and agreed to engage in an informal exchange of information and then eventually attended mediation.

21. Defendant produced several documents relating to its policies, practices, and procedures regarding reimbursement of business expenses, paying hourly-paid and non-exempt employees for all hours worked, and meal and rest breaks. Class Counsel also reviewed time records, pay records, and information relating to the size and scope of the Class, as well as data permitting Class Counsel to understand the number of workweeks and pay periods within the Class Period. Putative class members were also located and interviewed to attain a better understanding of the extent and frequency of the alleged day-to-day violations.

/ / /

/ / /

22. The Parties agree that the above-described investigation and evaluation, as well as the information exchanged during the settlement negotiations, are more than sufficient to assess the merits of the positions and to compromise the issues on a fair and equitable basis.

23. The Parties attended mediation with an experienced mediator. During the mediation, the Parties discussed the risks of continued litigation, certification, and merits of the claims versus the benefits of settlement. Under the auspices of the mediator, the Parties eventually reached a settlement via a mediator's proposal, the terms were memorialized in the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement," "Settlement," or "Agreement").

24. The Parties agreed (subject to the Court's approval) this action be settled and compromised for the non-reversionary total sum of $2,100,000 ("Gross Settlement Amount") which includes: (a) Class Counsel Fees Payment up to $735,000 (35% of the Gross Settlement Amount) to Class Counsel; (b) Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment up to $50,000 for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses to Class Counsel; (c) Class Representative Service Payments up to $5,000 to each Plaintiff (totaling $50,000); (d) Administration Expenses Payment up to $20,000 to the Administrator; and (e) PAGA Penalties up to $200,000 to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees.

25. The settlement was reached because of arm's-length negotiations. Though cordial and professional, the settlement negotiations have always been adversarial and non-collusive in nature. At the mediation, the Parties' counsel conducted arm's-length settlement negotiations until an agreement was ultimately reached after mediation.

26. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of additional proceedings necessary to continue the litigation through trial and any possible appeals. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel considered the uncertainty and risk of further litigation, potential outcome, and difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation. Pursuant to this, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel conducted settlement negotiations, including formal discovery and mediation. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel believe that the settlement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement and is in the best interests of the Class Members.

/ / /

27. The Parties investigated and evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses before reaching the settlement and engaged in research and discovery to support the settlement. The settlement was only possible following investigation and evaluation of the relevant policies and practices, as well as the data produced, permitting Class Counsel to engage in a comprehensive analysis of liability and potential damages. This case has reached the stage where the Parties understand "the strength of the case; the reasonableness of the settlement in light of the attendant risks of litigation, and in light of the best possible recovery" sufficient to support the reasonableness, adequacy, and fairness of the settlement. (*Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.* (N.D.Cal. 1979) 485 F.Supp. 610, 617.)

28. The claims are predicated on the alleged: (a) failure to pay overtime wages; (b) failure to pay minimum wages; (c) failure to provide meal and rest breaks and pay applicable premium wages; (d) failure to timely pay wages; (e) failure to issue compliant wage statements; (f) failure to reimburse business expenses; and (g) violation of PAGA.

29. Defendant denies the theories of liability. Defendant contends that: (a) all meal and rest breaks were provided in compliance with the law; (b) all wages were paid; (c) all wages were timely paid; (d) wage statements were provided in compliance with the law; and (e) all business expenses were reimbursed. Defendant further contends that any mistakes made (which it denies) were honest rather than willful. Finally, Defendant argues that if litigation were to continue, it feels confident that it would prevail.

30. The Settlement Agreement is the product of serious, informed, non-collusive negotiations, has no obvious defects, does not grant preferential treatment to Plaintiffs or segments of the Class, and falls within the range of fair and reasonable settlements. I believe that this non-reversionary settlement is in the best interests of the Class as fair, reasonable, and adequate. I recommend the approval of the Settlement Agreement.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

31. The Class Counsel Fees Payment is fair, reasonable, and adequate to compensate Class Counsel for the work that they put into this case and the risk that they assumed by taking it in the first place. The Class Counsel Fees Payment is also intended to reimburse Class Counsel for all uncompensated work that they have done and for all the work that they will continue to do following preliminary approval.

32. I am aware that the common and acceptable rate for contingency representation in wage-and-hour class action litigation is normally forty percent (40%) before trial, with the range being from thirty-three and one-third percent (33.3%) to fifty percent (50%).

33. Our office took this case on a contingent fee basis against a business represented by a reputable defense firm. When taking these cases, we anticipate that they shall, if successful, receive a fee that exceeds our normal hourly rate, otherwise the risk is too great. When we became involved in this case, we realized the time commitment that it would entail and were forced to turn down other matters.

34. The Class Counsel Fees Payment is reasonable for the services provided to the Class Members and for the benefits that they will receive. A full lodestar analysis justifying the Class Counsel Fees Payment will be provided at the Final Approval Hearing. Moreover, an itemized detail of the costs incurred to date and estimated future costs in support of the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment will be provided at the Final Approval Hearing.

35. Our office has no actual or potential conflicts of interest with the Class or Administrator.

I declare that under the penalty of perjury under the laws of California the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on the 20th of October 2026 at Pasadena, California.



Douglas Han

EXHIBIT 1

Cases	Court	Case Number	Judge
Rodney Hoffman v. Blattner Energy Inc.	United States District Court of California Central District	ED CV 14-2195-DMG (DTBx)	Dolly Gee
Nabor Navarro v. Trans-West Intermodal, Inc.	San Bernardino County Superior Court	CIVDS1700850	Brian McCarville
Caryn Rafferty et al. v. Academy Mortgage Corporation	Sacremento County Superior Court	34-2016-00191285-CU-OE-GDS	David Brown
Carrie Baker v. Central Coast Home Health	San Luis Obispo County Superior Court	17CV-0219	Tana Coates
Jamar Farmer v. Cooks Collision, Inc.	Napa County Superior Court	17CV000969	Diane Price
Ricardo Ortega et al. v. Nestle Waters North America, Inc.	Los Angeles County Superior Court	BC623610	Carolyn Kuhl
Landon Fulmer, Jr. et al. v. Golden State Drilling, Inc.	Kern County Superior Court	S-1500-CV0279707-SDS	Stephen Schuett
Carlos McCollum et al. v. Delta Tech Service, Inc.	Solano County Superior Court	FCS049504	Scott Daniels
Carl Morel et al. v. Aseptic Solutions USA Ventures, LLC	Riverside County Superior Court	RIC1711383	Craig Riemer
Genio Chuen v. 911 Mobile Mechanic, LLC	Orange County Superior Court	30-2017-00943421-CU-OE-CXC	Glenda Sanders
Elbern Gentry v. Eugene Burger Management Corporation	Sacremento County Superior Court	34-2015-00182515-CU-OE-GDS	David Brown
Maurice Bunche et al. v. Mettler-Toledo Rainin, LLC	Alameda County Superior Court	RG18899279	Winifred Smith
Carlos Koreisz et al. v. On Q Financial, Inc	Ventura County Superior Court	56-2018-00511 126-CU-OE-VTA	Mark Borrell
Jason Manas et al. v. Kenai Drilling Limited	Los Angeles County Superior Court	BC546330	Daniel Buckley
Michelle Xiong et al. v. Hilltop Ranch, Inc.	Merced County Superior Court	18CV-01340	Brian McCabe
Karen Morgan v. Childtime Childcare, Inc.	United States District Court of California Central District	8:17-cv-01641 AG (KESx)	Andrew Guilford
Daniel Flores v. Wilmar Oils & Fats (Stockton), LLC	San Joaquin County Superior Court	STK-CV-UOE-2018-0012758	Barbara Kronlund
Jordan Dahlberg et al. v. Fresno Beverage Company dba Valley Wide Beverage	Tulare County Superior Court	VCU279083	Bret Hillman
Jorge Proctor v. Helena Agri Enterprises, LLC	San Diego County Superior Court	37-2018-00057894-CU-0E-CTL	Joel Wohlfeil
Christine Arman v. Circor Aerospace, Inc.	Riverside County Superior Court	RIC1613578	Sunshine Sykes
Anthony Nuncio et al. v. MMI Services, Inc.	Kern County Superior Court	S-1500-CV-282534	David R. Lampe
Mario R. Guerrero et al. v. Plaza Home Mortgage, Inc.	Imperial County Superior Court	ECU001150	L. Brooks Anderholt
Mansour Nije v. Lucira Health, Inc. f/k/a Diassess, Inc.	Alameda County Superior Court	RG20055890	Julia A. Spain
Patricial Alcantar et al v. Bay Equity, LLC	Marin County Superior Court	CIV1903376	James Chou
Efrain Perez v. Freedom Medical, Inc.	San Bernardino County Superior Court	CIVDS1903517	Bryan F. Foster
Beverly Saolom v. Pulmonox Corporation	San Mateo County Superior Court	19-CIV-05070	Nancy Fineman
Matthew Tucker v. BYD Coach & Bus, LLC	Los Angeles County Superior Court	BC698921	Amy Hogue
Jose Duval v. Dawson Oil Company	Sacramento County Superior Court	34-2020-00276862-CU-OE-GDS	Shama H. Mesiwala
Steven DelCorso v. Westland Technologies, Inc.	Stanislaus County Superior Court	CV-20-002807	John R. Mayne
Priscilla Ramirez v. Amphastar Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	San Bernardino County Superior Court	CIVDSZOI1327	David Cohn
Jose Zuniga v. Central Valley Concrete, Inc.	Merced County Superior Court	20CV-00490	Brian McCabe
Robert Enriquez v. MCE Corporation	Contra Costa County Superior Court	MSC20-01744	Edward Weil
Amanda Cunningham v. Cottonwood H.C., Inc. dba Cottonwood Post-Acute Rehab	Yolo County Superior Court	CV2021-1375	Daniel M. Wolk
Nguyen Ngo, et al. v. Medimpact Healthcare Systems, Inc.	San Diego County Superior Court	37-2020-00015657-CU-OE-CTL	Keri Katz
Steven Jefferson v. McCormack Baron Management, Inc.	San Francisco County Superior Court	CGC-20-588162	Richard B. Ulmer Jr.
Allen Morgan v. Wehah Farm, Inc dba Lundberg Family Farms	Butte County Superior Court	20CV02554	Stephen E. Benson
Earl Rhodes, et al. v. Cavotec Dabico US Inc., et al.	Orange County Superior Court	30-2021-01177305-CU-OE-CXC	Peter Wilson
Alexandra Pelgrift v. The 21st Amendment Brewery Cafe	San Francisco County Superior Court	CGC-20-585227	Ethan P. Schulman
Beverly Salom, et al. v. Lumentum Operations LLC, et al.	Santa Clara County Superior Court	19CV354198	Sunil R. Kulkarni
Leroy Rost v. Lehigh Hanson, Inc. et al.	San Luis Obispo County Superior Court	20CV-0225	Tana L. Coates
Suleni Itzep, et al. v. Axonics Modulation Technologies, Inc.	Orange County Superior Court	30-2020-01140962-CU-OE-CXC	Lon F. Hurwitz
Earl Gandionco v. Allergan, Inc. et al.	San Joaquin County Superior Court	STK-CV-UOE-2022-0003077	Robert T. Waters
Kris Brehm, et al. v. Platinum Living Services, Inc. dba Oakwood Village	Placer County Superior Court	S-CV-0046296 (Consolidated with S-CV-0046676)	Michael Jones
Jarid Gomez, et al. v. Parker-Hannifin Corporation	Ventura County Superior Court	56-2022-00563952-CU-OE-VTA	Benjamin Coats
Ana Vargas, et al. v. Spates Fabricators, Inc.	Riverside County Superior Court	CVRI2100462	Harold W. Hopp
Jacob Blea v. Pacific Groservice Inc., et al.	Santa Clara County Superior Court	20CV275150	Sunil R. Kulkarni
Anthony Penca v. Sierra Nevada Brewing Co.	Butte County Superior Court	21CV02883	Tamara L. Mosbarger
Armoni Lloyd v. National Warehouse Management, LLC	Kern County Superior Court	BCV-22-102213	David R. Zulfa
Edgar Mata, et al. v. Day-Lee Foods Inc.	Los Angeles County Superior Court	20STCV21663	Kenneth R. Freeman
Samyra McCrea v. Rockridge Market Hall, LLC dba Market Hall Foods, et al.	Alameda County Superior Court	22CV005647	Evelio Grillo
Sarah Chasen, et al. v. Alliance Building Services, LLC (WA)	King County Superior Court	24-2-02041-1	Cindi Port
Joshua King v. Beacon Sales Acquisition, Inc. (WA)	King County Superior Court	22-2-14226-0 SEA	Marshall L. Ferguson